

Commission, composed of representatives of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Comments were also received from the following organizations: Arkansas Basin Development Association; Association of Western State Engineers; Connecticut River Valley Flood Control Association; H. C. Gee; Kaskaskia Valley Association; Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; McCall, Parkhurst, & Crowe; National Reclamation Association; Northwest Public Power Association; Water Resources Associated; Engineers Joint Council.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his very frank, candid, and forthright statement on the resolution, and for his sentiments. I was impressed by the fact that the Senator from Utah, who made the motion to recommit, did so on the basis that the resolution should be recommitment until it could be made a joint resolution.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire very frankly said that it should be recommitment until the provisions were made more restrictive and less comprehensive, but I did not gather from his remarks that he felt that if that objective were achieved, it would be necessary to make it a joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 28, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 27, 1958:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Henry J. Cook, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky for a term of 4 years, vice Edwin R. Denney, resigned.

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant commanders

Dewey G. Rushford
Steven L. Hollis, Jr.

To be lieutenants

Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.
Dale E. Westbrook

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Albert Larsen, Jr., effective February 9, 1958	Paul L. Schock
Herman H. Druebert	Robert F. Shoolbred
Charles I. Harding	Charles E. Fuller
James C. Sainsbury	Philip J. Taetz
Victor V. Tilley, Jr.	Earl R. Scyoc
William M. Lee	Ogden Beeman
Arthur M. Cook	Ronald D. Bernard
Lawrence C. Haverkamp	K. William Jeffers
Thomas E. Simkin	Bernard L. Gabrielsen
	Oliver J. Weber
	Merlyn D. Christensen

To be ensigns

Jerome P. Guy
Leroy L. Pate
George F. Wirth

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1958:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the country indicated:

Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, of New Hampshire, to El Salvador.

Robert McClintock, of California, to the Republic of Lebanon.

Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut, to the Federation of Malaya.

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Gerard C. Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Manager of the Development Loan Fund in the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State.

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be Director of the United States Information Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Nelson P. Rose, of Ohio, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, to fill an existing vacancy.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William P. Rogers, of Maryland, to be the Attorney General.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Tom B. Coughran, of California, to be the United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years.

DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

John S. Patterson, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, of Maryland, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

I John 2:17: *He that doeth the will of God abideth forever.*

Almighty God, may our life and labors always be in accord with Thy holy will and well pleasing unto Thee.

Grant that each day we may have a vivid and vital sense of Thy divine counsel and companionship, inspiring our minds with understanding and our hearts with peace.

Thou art able to take and use our finite wisdom and frail human strength in fulfilling Thy blessed purposes for all mankind.

We are commending unto Thee the needs and longings of Thy children everywhere for Thy concern for them is far greater than our own.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 23, 1958, 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. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 244

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Lawrence H. Smith, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Monday next.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of title 10, section 1056, of the United States Code, the Vice President had appointed the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Purtell] as members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

The message further announced that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Purtell] were appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Payne] were appointed members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy on the part of the Senate.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN H. DENT, be permitted to take the oath of office today. The certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*The Speaker, United States House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture has today considered the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication 1404 and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are: High Pine Creek, Ala.; Big Sandy Creek, Colo.; Abbotts Creek and Deep Creek, N. C.; Knob Creek and York Creek, Tex.

Copies of the resolutions are attached.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1958.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Honorable AIME J. FORAND, of the Committee on Ways and Means, has been designated as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to fill the vacancy created by the death of the late Chairman Cooper.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO COM- MITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONES- SENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDI- TURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures to fill the existing vacancy thereon, the following member of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. GREGORY, of Kentucky.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

JANUARY 22, 1958.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

I greatly enjoyed serving on this committee and am resigning only because the responsibilities of the position I now have do not permit me to continue to devote the time to the Joint Economic Committee that should be, and which I would like to devote to its work.

With highest personal regards, I am,
Respectfully yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 15, section 1024, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Economic Committee the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 73)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the 43d annual report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 27, 1958.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO VARI- OUS COMMITTEES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 452

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on the District of Columbia: ERWIN MITCHELL, Georgia.

Committee on Education and Labor: JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: VINCENT J. DELLY, New Jersey.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: VINCENT J. DELLY, New Jersey.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: ERWIN MITCHELL, Georgia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 318)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Education best fulfills its high purpose when responsibility for education is kept close to the people it serves—when it is rooted in the home, nurtured

in the community, and sustained by a rich variety of public, private, and individual resources. The bond linking home and school and community—the responsiveness of each to the needs of the others—is a precious asset of American education.

This bond must be strengthened, not weakened, as American education faces new responsibilities in the cause of freedom. For the increased support our educational system now requires, we must look primarily to citizens and parents acting in their own communities, school boards, and city councils, teachers, principals, school superintendents, State boards of education and State legislatures, trustees, and faculties of private institutions.

Because of the national security interest in the quality and scope of our educational system in the years immediately ahead, however, the Federal Government must also undertake to play an emergency role. The administration is therefore recommending certain emergency Federal actions to encourage and assist greater effort in specific areas of national concern. These recommendations place principal emphasis on our national security requirements.

Our immediate national security aims—to continue to strengthen our Armed Forces and improve the weapons at their command—can be furthered only by the efforts of individuals whose training is already far advanced. But if we are to maintain our position of leadership, we must see to it that today's young people are prepared to contribute the maximum to our future progress. Because of the growing importance of science and technology, we must necessarily give special—but by no means exclusive—attention to education in science and engineering.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the National Science Foundation have recommended to me a comprehensive and interrelated program to deal with this problem. Such program contemplates a major expansion of the education activities now carried on by the National Science Foundation, and the establishment of new programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have approved their recommendations, and commend them to the Congress as the administration program in the field of education. This is a temporary program and should not be considered as a permanent Federal responsibility.

PROGRAMS OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE
FOUNDATION

The programs of the National Science Foundation designed to foster science education were developed in cooperation with the scientific community under the guidance of the distinguished members of the National Science Board. They have come to be recognized by the educational and scientific communities as among the most significant contributions currently being made to the improvement of science education in the United States.

The administration has recommended a fivefold increase in appropriations for the scientific education activities of the

National Science Foundation. These increased appropriations will enable the Foundation, through its various programs, to assist in laying a firmer base for the education of our future scientists. More immediately, these programs will help supply additional highly competent scientists and engineers vitally needed by the country at this time.

1. Improvement of the subject-matter knowledge of science and mathematics teachers: First, the administration is recommending an increase in funds to support institutes sponsored by the Foundation for the supplementary training of science and mathematics teachers and a somewhat larger increase to support teacher fellowships. This will provide additional study opportunities to enable more science and mathematics teachers in our schools and colleges to improve their fundamental knowledge and, through improved teaching techniques, stimulate the interest and imagination of more students in these important subjects.

2. Improvement of course content: Second, the administration is recommending an increase in funds to enable the Foundation to stimulate the improvement of the content of science courses at all levels of our educational system. The efforts of even the most dedicated and competent teachers will not be effective if the curricula and materials with which they work are out-of-date or poorly conceived.

3. Encouragement of science as a career: Third, the administration is proposing an expansion of the Foundation's programs for encouraging able students to consider science as a career. Good teaching and properly designed courses are important factors in this regard, but there are other ways in which interest in these fields may be awakened and nurtured. The Foundation has already developed a series of programs directly focused on the problem of interesting individual students in science careers, and these programs should be expanded.

4. Graduate fellowships: Fourth, the administration is recommending an increase in the Foundation's graduate fellowship program. The enlarged program will make it possible for additional competent students to obtain better training for productive and creative scientific effort.

5. Expansion of other programs: The administration is recommending that funds be provided to enable the Foundation to initiate several new programs which will provide fellowship support for secondary school science teachers (during the summer months), for graduate students who serve during the school year as teaching assistants, and for individuals who wish to obtain additional education so that they may become high school science and mathematics teachers.

PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The education programs of the National Science Foundation deal exclusively with science education and operate mainly through scientific societies and science departments of colleges and universities. There is, however, an

emergency and temporary need for certain additional Federal programs to strengthen general education, and also for certain Federal programs to strengthen science education in our State and local school systems. The administration is recommending legislation authorizing these additional programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a 4-year period only.

1. Reducing the waste of talent: High-quality professional personnel in science, engineering, teaching, languages, and other critical fields are necessary to our national security effort. Each year, nevertheless, many young people drop out of high school before graduation. Many able high-school graduates do not go on to college. This represents a waste of needed talent. Much of this waste could be avoided if the aptitudes of these young people were identified and they were encouraged toward the fullest development of their abilities.

The administration proposes, therefore, that the Congress authorize:

(a) Matching grants to the States to encourage improved State and local testing programs to identify the potential abilities of students at an early stage in their education.

(b) Matching grants to the States to encourage the strengthening of local counseling and guidance services, so that more able students will be encouraged to stay in high school, to put more effort into their academic work, and to prepare for higher education. The program also would provide for grants of funds to colleges and universities to permit them to establish training institutes to improve the qualifications of counseling and guidance personnel.

(c) A program of Federal scholarships for able high-school graduates who lack adequate financial means to go to college. The administration recommends approximately 10,000 new scholarships annually, reaching a total of 40,000 in the fourth year, to be closely coordinated with the testing and counseling programs. Scholarships should be allotted among the States on an equitable basis and awarded by State agencies on the basis of ability and need. Although it should not be compulsory for students to pursue a specific course of study in order to qualify, reasonable preference should be given to students with good preparation or high aptitude in science or mathematics.

2. Strengthening the teaching of science and mathematics: National security requires that prompt action be taken to improve and expand the teaching of science and mathematics. Federal matching funds can help to stimulate the organization of programs to advance the teaching of these subjects in the public schools.

The administration therefore recommends that the Congress authorize Federal grants to the States, on a matching basis, for this purpose. These funds would be used, in the discretion of the States and the local school systems, either to help employ additional qualified science and mathematics teachers, to help purchase laboratory equipment and other materials, to supplement salaries

of qualified science and mathematics teachers, or for other related programs.

3. Increasing the supply of college teachers: To help assure a more adequate supply of trained college teachers, so crucial in the development of tomorrow's leaders, the administration recommends that the Congress authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide:

(a) Graduate fellowships to encourage more students to prepare for college-teaching careers. Fellows would be nominated by higher educational institutions.

(b) Federal grants, on a matching basis, to institutions of higher education to assist in expanding their graduate school capacity. Funds would be used, in the discretion of the institution itself, either for salaries or teaching materials.

4. Improving foreign language teaching: Knowledge of foreign languages is particularly important today in the light of America's responsibilities of leadership in the Free World. And yet the American people generally are deficient in foreign languages, particularly those of the emerging nations in Asia, Africa, and the Near East. It is important to our national security that such deficiencies be promptly overcome. The administration, therefore, recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be authorized to provide a 4-year program for:

(a) Support of special centers in colleges and universities to provide instruction in foreign languages which are important today but which are not now commonly taught in the United States.

(b) Support of institutes for those who are already teaching foreign languages in our schools and colleges. These institutes would give training to improve the quality and effectiveness of foreign language teaching.

5. Strengthening the Office of Education: More information about our educational system on a national basis is essential to the progress of American education. The United States Office of Education is the principal source of such data.

Much of the information compiled by the Office of Education must originate with State educational agencies. The administration therefore recommends that the Office of Education be authorized to make grants to State educational agencies for improving the collection of statistical data about the status and progress of education.

This emergency program stems from national need, and its fruits will bear directly on national security. The method of accomplishment is sound: The keystone is State, local, and private effort; the Federal role is to assist—not to control or supplant—those efforts.

The administration urges prompt enactment of these recommendations in the essential interest of national security.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 27, 1958.

WITHDRAWALS OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5538) to provide that

withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, BARING, ASPINALL, SAYLOR, and DAWSON of Utah.

POLLUTION OF AMERICAN STREAMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message delivered in this Chamber last week made a number of points that disturb me. One that especially concerns me is his recommendation that Federal grants to combat pollution of our streams and rivers be dropped at the end of fiscal 1959.

This program that the President would bludgeon was passed by Congress and took effect in July 1956 as Public Law 660. This law provided for grants amounting to \$500 million—but not to exceed \$50 million in any 1 year—over a 10-year period to help State and local governments battle against the destruction of the Nation's most precious natural resource—water. This destruction results from the dumping into our streams and rivers of ever-increasing amounts of raw human and industrial wastes.

We have turned too many of our water courses into cesspools. But Public Law 660, authored by the farseeing gentleman from Minnesota [JOHN BLATNIK] has been the impetus for increased construction of sewage treatment plants and research in the complex problem of water pollution.

Even so, we have a \$2 billion backlog in treatment facilities and our industrial expansion and population boom are making the situation worse. Yet, the President would have us halt this vital program.

The President's recommendation that the Federal antipollution program be halted stems from the report of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, created last summer at his behest. The committee concluded, and I quote, "that local waste-treatment facilities are primarily a local concern."

This conclusion bears no relation to reality in many of our river and stream basins. We are now aware that untreated wastes spilling into the upper reaches of a river affect the quality of the water supply of communities all the way downstream. Out of this realization that the problem is frequently an interstate matter such organizations as the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission have been formed. In the

first year of United States Public Health Service grants under Public Law 660, 30 Ohio Valley municipalities with a total population of 1,492,150 were approved for grants amounting to \$3,763,118. The estimated cost in dollars of these projects was \$16,943,150, so you can see that for every \$1 of Federal money, local and State governments put up over \$4.

The Joint Action Committee reported that the annual dollar volume of waste-treatment plant construction in recent years has been rising. In 1952, \$176 million was spent; in 1953, \$238 million; in 1954, \$282 million, and in 1955, \$249 million. It is significant to note, however, that in 1956—the year the program got under way—the expenditure volume jumped to \$393 million, and in 1957, the first full year of program activity, the volume was estimated at \$475 million.

It can be appreciated that the grant program—which between July 1, 1956, and December 31, 1957, offered \$69.1 million to States and local governments—has been the vital spark that touched off the critically needed expansion of local sewage-treatment facilities. These grants generated over \$300 million in construction projects.

It is important to also note that of the 828 projects for which grant offers have been made, 92 percent were for facilities in cities of under 125,000 population. Indeed, these communities had an average population of 9,077.

Without help, these small cities might have found it impossible to build treatment plants. They are caught in a vicious cycle. Many lack the necessary tax base to permit major capital construction. They want to bring in new industry to expand that tax base. But they cannot attract industry which requires a supply of pure water because of a lack of treatment installations.

The Joint Action Committee would have certain tax revenues now coming to the Federal Government go to State governments. With this revenue, the State governments would be able to carry on such essential projects as sewage treatment, according to the committee.

But the record shows that the States and local governments have not kept pace with the need. The only period in which construction of sewage-treatment facilities kept abreast with need was in 1933-39—the period of PWA and WPA. And our population and industry are vastly larger now than they were then.

History gives us no assurance that State legislatures would use new revenue to meet this responsibility.

How critical is this problem of water pollution? Last spring, D. R. Woodward, of the Department of the Interior, surveyed the Nation's water resource situation, looking ahead to conditions in 1980, in a thesis for the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

He emphasized the regional aspect of the pollution problem—a squandering of a resource because it limits the number of times water can be reused.

Of the New England States, Mr. Woodward says: "Pollution abatement is needed." In the Chesapeake Bay area, "Pollution abatement is a growing problem in this area." "Pollution control is absolutely essential to protect the

Great Lakes supply," he reported. On the west coast, in the South Pacific area, he forecasts: "As full scale development takes place, pollution problems will become increasingly serious."

"We shall be forced in the future to be much more concerned with this problem than we are today," Mr. Woodward concluded.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to sound a warning that there are interests that would like to see this program, this crusade for clean streams, throttled. But not content with the President's recommendation that it be killed off at the end of the next fiscal year, they would prefer that Congress slash appropriations for the program for fiscal 1959.

If we do this, we will be defaulting on a pledge to the States and local communities of 10 years of Federal support—the support the record demonstrates was so essential. We will have turned back from the forward path we only recently began taking after a half century of watching our rivers and streams become open sewers.

THE CHAPLAIN, REV. DR. BERNARD BRASKAMP

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been the subject of much favorable comment by my colleagues, and among many who watch from the galleries, that our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp, now prefaces each of his prayers at the opening of our sessions with some brief words of Scripture. In doing so he is following the custom of Edward Everett Hale, who was the distinguished Chaplain of the other body 54 years ago. Dr. Braskamp's prayers, delivered so eloquently and with such fervent sincerity, always are a source of great spiritual strength to us, and I am sure all my colleagues wish him to know our approval and appreciation of his revival of the custom of more than half a century ago of the renowned Edward Everett Hale.

LEGISLATION TO INCREASE AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREST HIGHWAYS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Federal Highway Act as it relates to forest highways.

My bill will increase the authorization from \$30 million annually to \$50 million for fiscal years 1960 and 1961.

The Bureau of Public Roads estimates forest highway needs for the next 30

years is about \$2.7 billion. At the current rate of progress, it will take 90 years to complete this 30-year program. In addition, the Bureau estimates now in use are out of date. All available information indicates an increase in road costs in the past several years. Even if the old estimates are correct, the authorization increase I propose will not bring the program up to its proper level in 30 years.

In addition, I am convinced that an up-to-date study of forest highways is needed badly. So my bill provides for such a study during the next 2 years.

Another provision of my bill is designed to correct a terrible situation. On November 5, 1957, while the Congress was in recess, the Department of Commerce, acting in concert with the Department of Agriculture, revised the forest highway formula which had been in use for 35 years to distribute these funds.

This action was taken without consultation with either the Congress or the affected States. For 35 years, 50 percent of the funds were distributed on the basis of the percentage of the value of the national forest in each State and 50 percent on the basis of the area.

However, the Department of Agriculture had reappraised our forests, increasing the value from \$2.2 billion to \$7.6 billion. The increase was not uniform among the several States. And if the old formula had been retained, use of the new evaluation would have done great damage to many States.

In order to minimize the loss to the individual States, the Departments revised the distribution formula, to one giving 75 percent weight to national forest area and 25 percent to value. This revision did tend to reduce the loss to some States; but 20 States still suffered cuts, while 22 received increases.

The following table shows the loss experienced by the listed States from fiscal 1958 to fiscal 1959:

Colorado.....	\$312,256
California.....	194,171
Idaho.....	171,587
Wyoming.....	158,692
Arizona.....	148,868
Montana.....	142,978
South Dakota.....	66,388
New Mexico.....	56,633
New Hampshire.....	41,046
Minnesota.....	34,254
Vermont.....	13,167
Pennsylvania.....	7,469
Puerto Rico.....	3,523
Maine.....	3,090
Indiana.....	2,818
Illinois.....	1,916
Nebraska.....	724
Iowa.....	310
Ohio.....	304
North Dakota.....	20

As you will note, Montana—with more than 16½ million acres in national forests—is scheduled to receive \$142,978 less for forest highways next year than this. But our need for these highways has not decreased, it has increased. Not only do we have forest highways in need of improvement, but we also have hundreds of miles of roads which should be included in the forest highway system.

We are being discriminated against because of the recent and unrealistic evaluation of the worth of our forests. They were appraised as if they were be-

ing offered for sale as standing boards. The evaluation did not include such intangibles as the value of watershed protection. I remind my colleagues that the First District of Montana straddles the watershed of the Missouri River and of important Columbia River tributaries—that what we do with our national forests in Montana will be felt in New Orleans, La., and Astoria, Oreg.

The value of Montana's forests was reduced because in many areas we do not have roads on which to move timber to market. Inaccessible timber is worth less than timber which can readily be moved to market.

So Montana is to get less money for roads because we need roads. This, I assume, is also the case in other States.

The adjoining State of Idaho will get \$171,587 less in 1959 than it got this year. One project alone in Idaho which is of great consequence to Montana is completion of the Lewis and Clark Highway. The cost to finish this one job is \$8.25 million. How can we expect the early

completion of this vital highway if Idaho must accept such a cut?

I submit that there is no reason why these 20 States should receive less money. Instead, I believe that if, as the Department of Agriculture maintains, use of the new evaluation would have had a far worse effect, Congress should have had a chance to review the matter.

I am asking for such a review. Pending its completion, I ask that the 1958 apportionment be retained for fiscal 1959. With the increase provided by my bill, the 22 States scheduled for increases will get them and more beginning with fiscal 1960. And the 20 States slated to be cut in fiscal 1959 will have their funds restored for that year. Beginning in fiscal 1960, they, too, will receive an increase.

This is demonstrated in the following tables. Table I lists the 10 States slated for the deepest cuts in fiscal 1959 and table II the States scheduled for the biggest increases. The column headed "Apportioned 1958" is also the amount proposed for fiscal 1959 by my bill.

TABLE I

	Apportioned 1958 and proposed for 1959 by bill	Apportioned 1959	Gain or loss 1959	Proposed by bill for 1960 and 1961
Arizona.....	\$1,688,566	\$1,539,728	-\$148,868	\$2,814,300
California.....	4,206,368	4,102,197	-194,171	7,160,700
Colorado.....	2,154,398	1,842,142	-312,256	3,590,650
Idaho.....	3,054,441	2,882,854	-171,587	5,090,700
Minnesota.....	414,879	380,625	-34,254	691,450
Montana.....	2,391,346	2,248,368	-142,978	3,985,600
New Hampshire.....	160,310	110,264	-41,046	267,180
New Mexico.....	1,202,119	1,145,486	-56,633	2,003,500
South Dakota.....	235,032	168,644	-66,388	391,700
Wyoming.....	1,279,738	1,121,046	-158,692	2,132,900

TABLE II

	Apportioned 1958 and proposed for 1959 by bill	Apportioned 1959	Gain or loss 1959	Proposed by bill for 1960 and 1961
Washington.....	\$2,085,098	\$2,498,417	+\$413,319	\$3,475,163
Oregon.....	4,132,640	4,305,115	+172,475	6,887,734
Nevada.....	538,155	649,044	+110,889	896,925
Mississippi.....	141,519	229,774	+88,255	235,865
Texas.....	94,966	181,980	+87,014	158,277
Arkansas.....	407,824	483,398	+75,574	679,707
Michigan.....	321,916	370,668	+48,752	536,527
Wisconsin.....	167,768	211,954	+44,186	279,613
Alabama.....	85,906	124,403	+38,497	143,176
Alaska.....	2,614,976	2,651,993	+37,017	4,358,293

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], chairman of House Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, has introduced H. R. 9821, to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and has scheduled hearings beginning January 28. I look forward to working with the subcommittee to bring the important forest-highway program up to date.

MORE SANITY IN FEDERAL HANDLING OF DEFENDANTS WHO CLAIM THEY ARE INSANE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the major responsibilities of Congress is that of constantly studying and improving the laws of the land. We are, in a sense, the Nation's Ministry of Justice.

The people look to Congress for corrective measures whenever it appears the laws are unwise, unjust, inadequate, or outmoded. And it is our duty to respond to these demands with constructive action when the need is shown.

Mr. Speaker, no area of the law today cries more for action by Congress than that dealing with the handling of the criminally insane. This is, of course, a most complex field, and one which requires both deep study and wide understanding. The tremendous advances in the fields of psychology and psychiatry, linked with new knowledge of basic causes of criminality and abnormal behavior must be matched by advances in our statutes. Unfortunately, the law has not completely managed to keep pace.

In recent years, we have witnessed a growing confusion among lawyers, criminologists, law-enforcement officials, psychiatrists, and the general public as to what happens or should happen when a person charged with a crime may be insane. The District of Columbia has recently become the nub of misunderstanding in this field.

Within the past week it was revealed that under the existing law it was impossible to retain in custody a man whom psychiatrists stated might commit homicide if released. This man, Dallas O. Williams, a resident of the District of Columbia, has a long criminal record. It includes convictions for manslaughter, assault with intent to kill, shooting with intent to kill, carrying deadly weapons, and threats with a pistol.

He is now at large, set free by a series of court decisions based on technicalities in the law. His freedom jeopardizes the safety of the whole community. It now appears the police and the psychiatrists are powerless to do anything unless or until this man again commits a crime. One wonders what explanation we can give to his next victim as to why such known lawbreakers—with acknowledged dangerous tendencies—are allowed to roam the streets of the city.

While the Williams case happens to affect the District specifically, other jurisdictions all over the country are also encountering problems in delineating this area of criminal responsibility. Other Federal courts, though they have not followed the lead of the District of Columbia bench, have nonetheless run into quandries in the application of the older rule of criminal insanity. The resulting turmoil demands the immediate attention of Congress.

It has long been obvious that a great—and I fear, growing—chasm exists between the science of law and the science of psychiatry. Our laws are based on the assumption of free will and individual responsibility. Psychiatry, in general, adopts a fatalistic attitude toward mankind and embraces a deterministic explanation of all human action. If we attempt to bridge this chasm without reconciling these conflicting assumptions, we may get a hodgepodge of law and psychiatry which is illogical under either discipline. It is of vital importance, therefore, that we understand the vocabulary of the law and psychiatry before we express any general conclusions about what must be done.

The situation which confronts us requires an immediate and comprehensive study by the House Judiciary Committee of the Federal criminal laws and procedures for handling insane defendants. I shall offer a resolution in the committee tomorrow to establish a special subcommittee to look into this or to have it done by one of the standing subcommittees. I first proposed such a study last December 22. The recent Williams and Leach cases and others make such hearings doubly imperative today.

Such an overall legislative inquiry would supply the basic data needed for intelligent consideration of all aspects of

this many faceted problem. In my opinion the issues in this field are moral and social as well as medical and legal. We should explore in hearings the philosophical insights of criminologists, the practical viewpoints of prosecutors and defense lawyers, the experiences of prison wardens, psychiatrists, probation officers and some of the defendants themselves. We will want to examine the day-to-day application of the laws. With such a study as a basis for broad legislative action, we can avoid the inconsistencies and mistakes of the piecemeal approach.

A defendant's mental condition raises special problems at almost every stage of a criminal proceeding from the time of arrest until the moment of release, and thereafter in connection with parole or probation. Of course, the problem which has received most attention is the test which should be followed in the Federal courts in determining the criminal responsibility of a defendant suffering from mental illness.

Today, nearly all of the Federal and State courts still adhere to the right-wrong test announced in the M'Naughten case more than a century ago. Simply stated, it bases determination of responsibility on whether the defendant knew he was doing wrong in committing the alleged crime.

The Federal court in the District of Columbia is the only one which has substantially departed from the right-wrong test. In the District, under the Durham decision, a defendant must now be acquitted by reason of insanity if his crime was the product of a mental disease or defect, even if he knew what he was doing and that it was wrong. This decision has been the center of much litigation and controversy. Its ramifications should be closely scrutinized in the course of our study of the general subject.

While the test of criminal responsibility is important, it is only one of the many questions which deserves attention. Under present Federal law, for example, examination of a defendant believed to be insane is required only after a formal proceeding in court. Often the order for examination is delayed so long that psychiatrists are unable to determine the defendant's mental condition at the time of the offense. Provision for the prompt and automatic examination of defendants charged with serious crimes might well improve this situation.

We should also consider the desirability of mandatory commitment for defendants acquitted by reason of insanity. Whether these people are sent to hospitals or jails, the community must be safeguarded against a repetition of their offenses.

Effective rehabilitation is another problem. Our sense of social justice demands that we do all we can to assure maximum rehabilitation. In recent years doctors have experimented with surgery, the use of tranquilizing drugs, shock treatments, and blood chemistry analyses. It should be determined whether these new techniques are being adequately employed in our prisons as well as in our hospitals.

The District of Columbia's experience demonstrates the dangers of a case-by-case revision of the law in this field. These recent cases have made it painfully clear how widespread has been the confusion in the application of the new tests and procedures. In several cases retrials have been necessary because of the alleged errors in the trial judge's instruction to the jury. In more than one case the process of trial and retrial took so long that the court finally ordered the charges dismissed because the defendants were being denied their constitutional rights to a speedy trial.

The case-by-case approach to this subject thus introduces elements of uncertainty and hardship in the enforcement of the criminal law. Unfortunately, the victims of an offense are forcibly reminded of their ordeal at each retrial and defendants tend to become guinea pigs as the law gropes for solutions.

In some cases the instinctive sense of justice of the community is offended by the acquittal of persons whose only abnormality is a morbid propensity for crime. In a recent case in the District of Columbia, a defendant with a so-called antisocial (sociopathic) personality was acquitted by reason of insanity and committed to a mental institution. This same institution, as is the case with many of our mental hospitals, is so overcrowded that it is forced to turn away many law-abiding citizens with much more serious mental conditions.

Moreover, whatever the merits of the tests and procedures devised by the District of Columbia court, the fact is that no other court has chosen to follow its lead. The resulting situation raises a serious question as to whether justice is being administered in the Federal courts with an even hand. There is little justification for different tests and procedures in different Federal jurisdictions. Justice requires that defendants charged with Federal crimes be tried under the same standards and procedures in all Federal jurisdictions.

A comprehensive study of all of these aspects of the problem may disclose that our difficulties are largely practical and that what we need is better facilities or larger staffs for the care and the control of the mentally abnormal criminal. Or we may discover that the present laws are simply inadequate to deal with the complex and dynamic problems with which we are confronted. I suspect that we will find room for improvement in both our laws and their administration.

I further feel that the proposed committee study can do much to clear the air by establishing greater rapport among lawyers, psychiatrists, and the police. Their disagreements as to the meaning of the law today pose one of the main stumbling blocks to its proper enforcement. A meeting of the minds by means of these hearings can achieve much good.

Mr. Speaker, the price of crime is an expense the Nation can ill afford. A major portion of crime involves repeaters—criminals whose offenses have been detected but whose lawless instincts have not been curbed. Despite recent medical advances, there may be a need for more intensive research into the

basic causes of crime. The expense of such a program on the part of the Federal Government would be more than offset by the savings to the Nation from any major discoveries which would reduce crime.

It is my firm conviction that it should be Congress which should undertake this vital study of crime and insanity. This conviction is based not only on our responsibility to make sure that the laws are kept up to date to meet the demands of the citizenry, but also because of the urgency of the situation.

Men with known homicidal tendencies are today walking the streets because of legal technicalities and the confused state of the law. We must clear that law up as rapidly as possible.

Yet, at the same time, we should not try to change the law without thorough study and without hearing the views of all sides. Complete hearings, participated in by leaders in all the fields concerned, can supply the information needed to evaluate the state of the law. They can supply the knowledge and recommendations which the committee can sift to determine how—and if—and in what way, the laws must be changed.

Such an inquiry could, of course, be undertaken by some sort of a commission embracing medical, legal, and law-enforcement personnel. And various groups around the country, particularly in the legal profession, have done and are doing excellent work in this field.

But all such groups must, in the end, resort to Congress to actually put their ideas into statutory form. Thus, although the work which could be done by other groups would, is, and has been helpful, the House Judiciary Subcommittee can act directly to translate the work into laws.

The more expeditious—and equally thorough job—can and must be done by Congress. The study I propose can draw together the findings of all these other groups and translate them as rapidly as possible into the laws we need to bring order out of the confusion surrounding the question of criminal responsibility in the Federal courts.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that the response to my original suggestion for this study over a month ago has been most favorable. The Congressional study idea has received widespread endorsement from many respected experts in the field.

Chief Judge John Biggs, Jr., of the third circuit, the author of a book on the subject of insanity and criminal law, expressed the hope that Congress will be induced to undertake a thorough study of this entire subject.

Rufus King, chairman of the section of criminal law of the American Bar Association, an outstanding leader in the criminal law field, has stated that "when the study gets underway, I am confident that we shall be able to cooperate and participate."

Prof. Herbert Wechsler, of Columbia University, chairman of an American Law Institute committee on the subject, wrote:

The matter seems to me one that is highly appropriate for legislative consideration and

I am delighted to learn of your proposal to deal with it in these comprehensive terms.

Prof. David Curtiss, of the Cornell Law School, who is participating in a similar study of the laws in New York State, stated:

I am hopeful that your proposed study will materialize for I am confident that it could make a significant contribution to the administration of justice in this country.

Dr. Winfred Overholser, superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, a pioneer in the field of psychiatry and the law, has written:

It seems to me that a study of Federal criminal laws and procedures relative to insane defendants would be helpful.

I am confident that this study will pave the way for a modernizing and humanizing of the law in this field without undermining the administration of justice and without jarring the fundamental concepts of the community.

ADDRESS BY HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an address.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I include the following address made by me at the American Legion testimonial dinner in honor of Harry J. Crosson, manager, Veterans' Administration, of Philadelphia, Saturday, January 25, 1958, at the Sheraton Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Crosson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, those of you who know me well will certainly understand when I say to you it is difficult for me to adequately express my very great pleasure in being here for this unusual occasion. It is an honor to have this opportunity not only to pay tribute but to be one of those to express appreciation and thanks to a great veteran, a fine gentleman, and a distinguished citizen.

As many of you are probably aware, always I have considered it an honor to be invited to any function or celebration involving the veterans of the United States. I suppose over the years and over these United States I have attended thousands of veterans' affairs. This occasion tonight, however, is unique. It is unique because the purpose is to pay our respects and extend our tributes not only to a very gallant veteran but to a man who has devoted his life not only to the veterans of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania but to the veterans of America wherever they may be. I am proud to be here and grateful that I can be.

It is not at all necessary for me to try to tell the distinguished audience of the great work of Mr. Crosson. You know it well. You know of the countless achievements he has accomplished for the veterans. You know of his fine reputation and of the high respect in which he is held by the people of this Commonwealth. On other occasions you have shown examples of this respect in the honors you have given to him. His character, his understanding, his fairness, his friendliness, and his work always will stand as an inspiration in the field of human relationships and Government administration.

Leadership like that of Mr. Crosson's is constantly needed all over our country. For many years now we have been living in a time of crisis. National and international crises have been so numerous during this time that as a people we have come to accept them in our daily lives. At this moment, however, the leadership of our Nation is faced with making far-reaching decisions, not only to completely protect our national security, but also to make certain that freedom will continue as a way of life on this earth. Right decisions are moulded from wisdom and experience.

Once General MacArthur said, "In war there is no substitute for victory." Mr. Crosson and every veteran here tonight and every veteran in the United States know the soundness of this statement of wisdom. The only way to make victory unnecessary is to make war unnecessary. The only way to prevent millions of American sons and daughters from becoming future veterans is to prevent war. In fact, in this nuclear age, the prevention of war is the only way to save this civilization.

To prevent war is not an easy task. It requires the marshaling of all of our skills into a completely cooperative effort. Statesmanship, diplomacy, science, military strategy, industrial capacity and power, transportation and communication, all must be carefully and adequately fitted together into a unified cooperative working system.

In this our time on this earth, no battle was ever won by one man. No battle was ever won by one weapon. No battle was ever won by one single strategic plan. Every horse on the team had to pull his share of the load. The prevention of war is the prevention of many, many battles. The prevention of war is the only way to prevent a tremendous increase of disabled veterans. To emphasize again this noble objective can only be accomplished by a unified country, by a greater joining together into a gigantic cooperative effort of all of our skills and energies.

Since sputnik I and II, all of us have observed many criticisms, not only of our military capabilities, but of our military organization. Based upon their own private information, self-established authorities in and out of Government would lead you to believe our defenses are inadequate, our military striking power is obsolete, our statesmanship is bungling, our scientific abilities are insufficient, in fact that this Nation stands on the brink of disaster. These self-established authorities will tell you that Russia is way ahead of our country in science, nuclear know-how, and military capability. They will have you believe that this great America of ours, which completely defeated two powerful enemies, one on each side of the globe, in World War II, is about to be squashed under the heel of Communist Russia's scientific military might. To every father and mother throughout these United States, to every young man and woman in this great country, to every single American, I tell you in all frankness, this just is not true.

We see headlines disclosing the views of some, demanding the setting up of a super-military dictator in the form of a Chief of Staff and a general staff military system. They proclaim, let one superman make all the decisions. We see statements that our Navy is no longer of any use, that there is no longer any need for our great Army. This, they proclaim, is the missile age and that the entire security of this Nation is wholly dependent upon missiles. With missiles, we do not need an Army and a Navy, according to their persuasion. Now I know, and I believe you know, this just is not true. It is very fuzzy thinking.

Our military organization, without a doubt, can be improved. Never in history has one been set up that could not be

improved. A supermilitary czar, having direction and control over our entire military forces, not only is unnecessary but unconstitutional. Under the Constitution of the United States the military leadership of the Nation is vested in the President, as the Commander in Chief. This power cannot be delegated without an amendment to the Constitution.

We need an army, a great army, possessed of the finest weapons for use in the air and on the land, to make it capable of successfully meeting any challenge. We are going to keep our Army and see that it is the finest in the world.

Never before in the history of this country or in the history of naval strategy has the sea, constituting seven-tenths of the earth's surface, been more important than it is at this hour, and will be in the years ahead. The vast oceans are of strategic importance now because of the tremendous significance of mobility in our defense and striking power. Because of this fact America must have control of the seas. This means the United States Navy is more necessary than ever before.

With the security of the Nation involved, we cannot depend upon foreign governments for missile bases, and regardless of the fact, if we could, I question very much the advisability of stationary fixed missile bases subject to one-shot annihilation. Compared to a mobile base, a fixed base can be easily destroyed. It is my view our missile bases should be mobile. We should be able to move these bases rapidly and quickly so that they can be in a position to strike anywhere in the world where striking is necessary. The great undersea and surface ships of the United States Navy make this mobility possible. In the possession of this mobility, our country possesses a power not possessed by Russia or any other country on earth. This power is a deterrent to war.

Now we hear a great deal about interservice rivalry. It is my view that this criticism is of very minor importance and is, in fact, very easily corrected. I am not speaking of service competition which, generally speaking, is beneficial. I refer only to interservice rivalry. As American people, we are concerned with only one thing at this time—it is our national security. Of utmost importance is the security of the United States of America, not the security of the Air Force, not the security of the Navy, and not the security of the Army. We are concerned with the security of this Nation. To achieve this security, it is the duty of our military leaders to use all the means necessary to achieve it regardless of whether the great volume of the military burden because of necessity falls in the area of one particular service. The professional members of our military forces owe their allegiance to the United States of America and not to any particular service. So I say to you, service rivalry to the extent it interferes with military capability of our Nation can be, and must be, stopped and ended.

If war is to come, and I pray it never does, of this we are certain: The sons and daughters of America that must fight that war must be equipped with finer, greater, and more efficient weapons than the enemy. As a Nation, we must never send any American out to meet the challenge of the enemy with an inferior weapon. There is no man or woman anywhere in the world who possesses a greater courage or greater bravery than does an American. But with courage and bravery must go the tools to do the job.

Since war, however, now represents possible annihilation for everyone concerned, our objective must be to prevent war. The formula for accomplishing this, I believe, is quite obvious. No nation in the world today is afraid of a war of aggression being started by the United States of America. On the other hand, every nation in this world fears

the aggression of Communist Russia. In view of this situation, America must not make the mistake of trying to match Soviet Russia weapon for weapon in an arms race. On the other hand, America must produce that military capability which will be ready and in a position to destroy Communist Russia the moment Communist Russia begins an attack. Through the tremendous development of mobile air and missile bases, both undersea and on the surface of the oceans, this capability of annihilating any enemy can be accomplished. Again I say to you that never before in the history of warfare has the United States Navy been so important. This mobile capability of the United States is becoming greater and stronger every year.

No nation will start a war, not even Communist Russia, if in doing so it will suffer immediate devastating annihilation. Possessing the great mobile power capable of delivering such a dreadful blow, America can prevent the occurrence of total war.

In conclusion, I submit that the distinguished gentleman we honor tonight, as well as myself and other officials of the Government are deeply grateful for the supreme accomplishments of the American veterans. We are proud of them and grateful to them. As time goes on, however, it is our duty to take every necessary step to prevent the sons and daughters of today from being veterans of tomorrow. We must take every necessary step to preserve civilization and our free way of life. I believe our country is taking these necessary steps. With a unified country I say to you America cannot now be defeated.

Mr. Crosson, I salute you and your great work for the veterans of our country. As long as there are dedicated leaders in veterans' affairs like Mr. Crosson, our Government will meet its responsibilities to them. The grateful people of America will never permit their Government to forget those responsibilities.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, for many years on January 29 we have set aside a certain time to show respect to one of America's greatest men, William McKinley. I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, as soon as convenient to the Speaker after the opening ceremonies, we may have 15 minutes to do that.

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

There was no objection.

WINNING THE RACE FOR SCIENTIFIC SUPREMACY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Vannevar Bush, of MIT, said some time ago that he was not optimistic about the United States winning the race for scientific supremacy, but that he would be, if the American people were sufficiently aroused to the danger of their situation.

The people of America are sufficiently aroused now to go along with the President's determination to win this race for scientific supremacy and, in my opinion, they would go even further than the

President suggests in his six recommendations and budget. These recommendations are: First, improve the subject matter knowledge of science and math teachers; second, improve course content; third, encourage teaching of science as a career; fourth, increase graduate fellowships; fifth, give more support to the National Science Foundation; and, sixth, reduce waste of talent of American youth.

In addition to his recommendations I strongly support his position that "Education best fulfills its high purpose when responsibility for education is kept close to the people it serves" and that the bond between the home and the community, and private resources must be strengthened not weakened. His message affords little, if any, concern about Federal control.

In today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have been privileged to enclose a study made by my son, David R. Dixon, entitled "Congress and Student Aid." While this is a detailed study of the need for further assistance in Utah, where possibly that need is less than most any other State, it does provide the type of factual data that Congressmen need to have available.

FUTURES TRADING IN IRISH POTATOES

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit futures trading in Irish potatoes.

Mr. Speaker, futures trading in potatoes was initiated by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange in January 1931, and by the New York Mercantile Exchange in December 1941. Virtually all of the trading in potatoes is done on the New York Exchange and is concerned primarily with Maine potatoes. The Chicago Mercantile Exchange has a futures contract for Idaho potatoes which has seen very little activity in recent years.

Potatoes were included in those commodities subject to the jurisdiction of the Commodity Exchange Authority in the general revision of the Commodity Exchange Act in 1936, and trading in potato futures has been under the scrutiny and regulation of the Commodity Exchange Authority since that time.

Since 1941, when the New York Mercantile Exchange initiated trading in potatoes, until December of 1957, 771,633 carlots of potatoes have been traded on this exchange. It is interesting to note that for the years 1955 and 1956, the volume has been 123,781 and 140,333 carlots, respectively, 1956 revealing an approximate increase of 12 percent over the trading in 1955. For the first 7 months of the trading period in 1957 the volume was 37,689, and the calculations for the other 5 months that normally carry the heaviest impact of trading are not available.

The Commodity Exchange Authority made one of its periodic surveys of the positions of all traders in potato futures on the New York Mercantile Exchange on October 31, 1957. This survey provides detailed information on the size and composition of the futures market for Maine potatoes at the close of the harvesting season, just prior to the maturity of the 1957 November futures—the first delivery month for potato futures in the 1957–58 marketing season. The following information represents an extract from this October 31, 1957, report, and it vividly points up the dynamic role played by speculator in futures trading on potatoes. I quote:

Of the 871 traders in the market on the survey date, 673, or 77.3 percent, were reported as speculators; and 198, or 22.7 percent, as hedgers. In the survey 1 year earlier, the proportion of traders classified as speculators was 62 percent, and hedgers 38 percent.

Speculators held the bulk of the long side of the market at the end of October 1957; there aggregate long positions amounting to 3,303 carlots, or 70.6 percent of the total open contracts. Speculators' total short positions were 1,991 carlots, or 42.6 percent of the total open contracts.

Positions classified as hedging accounted for the larger part of the short side of the market, amounting to 2,686 carlots, or 57.4 percent of the total commitments. Long positions reported as hedging totaled 1,374 carlots, or 29.4 percent of the long side.

The market composition thus reflected—speculators holding most of the long side, hedgers most of the short side—is fairly typical of futures markets. This pattern is particularly common in the early part of the marketing season when short hedging commitments against supplies are seasonally large, and speculators not infrequently carry the greater part of the long side of the market.

In the October 1957 survey, the relative proportion of the short side carried by speculators and hedgers, respectively, was similar to that shown by the comparable surveys in the 2 preceding years, being fairly close to 70 percent hedging and 40 percent speculative for each of the 3 years. On the long side, the distribution was roughly 30 percent hedging and 70 percent speculative in both 1955 and 1957, with 1956 showing a substantially larger proportion (52.8 percent) classified as hedging.

Potato producers have, for a long time, been concerned about the degree of influence which mercantile exchange activities—in New York and Chicago, but particularly New York—exert on the market price of the commodity they produce. These industry groups have, on many occasions, gathered together in well-attended meetings to express their concern and to explore the possibility of laying it to rest. This concern became so intensified in the State of Maine that, on May 5, 1955, I received a joint resolution from the State of Maine's Legislature, memorializing the Congress to effect an investigation of mercantile exchange operations.

In the interests of such concern, I, under date of May 12, 1955, directed a memorandum to the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, recommending that an investigation be instituted to determine the extent to which mercan-

tile exchange activities influenced the market prices of Irish potatoes and onions.

On October 27, 1955, Chairman COOLEY appointed a Subcommittee on Futures Trading in Perishable Commodities. The chairman instructed this committee that it was not to devote its attention solely to the investigation of any alleged manipulation of the futures markets but, rather, to carry out a constructive study of the effect of futures trading on the supplies and prices of onions and potatoes.

The especially selected subcommittee conducted hearings at Presque Isle, Maine, on December 6 and 7, 1955; at Chicago, Ill., March 24, 1956; and in Washington, D. C., on May 16, 17, 18, and 22, 1956.

In its report of September 24, 1956, the subcommittee made the following recommendations:

First. That the mercantile exchanges and others primarily interested in the futures trading of these commodities move speedily and as effectively as is within their power to make such improvements in the operation of the futures markets as will demonstrate that futures trading in these commodities can be carried on without harm or detriment to the producers and handlers thereof.

Second. That the information which has been and is currently being accumulated by the Commodity Exchange Authority relating to the operations of the futures markets for perishable commodities, with particular emphasis on onions, be studied to determine the basic question of suitability of these commodities for futures trading.

Third. That producer organizations, marketing associations, and all others interested in the matter observe and consider current operations in, and use being made of, these futures markets in order to be of assistance to both the Congress and the Commodity Exchange Authority by making constructive recommendations and furnishing factual and objective material concerning both the beneficial and the harmful aspects of these markets.

Fourth. That in the absence of cooperative action on the part of the mercantile exchanges to effect adjustments which would make futures trading an indisputably constructive trade vehicle for onion and potato producers, and in the event any enhanced regulatory power of the Commodity Exchange Authority fails to promote clearly constructive futures market activity, the Committee on Agriculture should promptly consider legislation prohibiting futures trading in potatoes and onions.

It should be noted that since the conclusion of hearings on futures trading, the New York Mercantile Exchange has endeavored to restrict speculative activities in that market for Maine potatoes. As a most recent development this exchange imposed some significant restrictive provisions as related to the November 1958 contract: First, a provision for delivery of Maine potatoes at Boston, Mass., rather than at the Harlem River

yards, New York. This is, in effect, an effort to discourage the accumulation of undesirable quantities and types of potatoes at the New York market; second, a provision that trading in the November 1958 contract shall cease at the close of the seventh business day of that month—this is an attempt to curtail the trading period in potatoes, for in other trading months, trading is permitted for approximately two-thirds of the month; third, a provision that no delivery notices shall be issued on the November 1958 contract until after trading therein has ceased. This would eliminate a practice on the New York Mercantile Exchange popularly known as getting behind the line, a maneuver wherein speculators avoid getting delivery on actual potatoes.

But a substantial number of potato producers are not convinced that such adjustments will entirely eliminate what is considered the basic evil of futures trading—market gyrations. In fact, at its November 1957 meeting, the National Potato Council—representing United States potato producers—endorsed the concept of prohibiting futures trading in potatoes with a vote reflecting a substantial majority.

The following represent some of the reasons why many potato producers recommend the prohibition of futures trading in Irish potatoes:

First. Dynamic fluctuations of the futures market have, in many instances, a detrimental effect on the cash price of potatoes, thereby causing injury to the producers of this commodity.

Second. Speculators' efforts are many times directed toward driving the price of potatoes down, making commodity prices show up in a dismal light.

Third. The highly perishable nature of potatoes militates against storage, prompting a constant supply situation that exerts uneven pressures on the market. The high rate of deterioration in this commodity performs as an ideal instrument for manipulators in the futures market.

Fourth. The record proves that a relatively small percentage of potato producers use the futures market for hedging operations; that the bulk of the trading in this commodity is of a speculative nature, being engaged in by persons who are neither producers nor consumers of the commodity.

Fifth. No matter how exchange officials endeavor to create rules for trading that would have the consideration of the potato grower, there can be no elimination of the speculative features which are so much a part of futures trading on highly perishable commodities and so detrimental to producers.

Sixth. The Commodity Exchange Authority, under existing law, is limited to disciplinary action with regard to market manipulation, being more spectacular in what it does not govern than in what it governs; hence, the exchanges are left with broad authority over their operations, and are permitted to make arbitrary determinations as to their operations which do not always contribute to the benefit of potato producers.

CRIME IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, called attention to the fact that the courts have been turning loose a large number of criminals to prey on the citizens of Washington. The individuals to whom I refer have been several times convicted by juries, some of them later released because of technicalities to which appellate courts have called attention.

Earlier today I noted that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], was on the floor. I do not see him at the present time. However, I wish to join in the request of the ranking minority member that that committee bring out some legislation.

It is apparent, and we cannot get around it, that men who are guilty of crime and who have been convicted of crime are by order of some court day after day turned loose to prey on citizens here. Somewhat similar conditions exist to a lesser degree in other places. Whether the situation is due to the ignorance of the United States attorneys, who do not know how to present cases or, if that is not the trouble, whether it is due to the decisions of the Supreme Court or the lack of legal knowledge and commonsense on the part of the judges of the United States court of appeals, or a lack of information or just plain indifference or negligence on the part of the Congress, it is difficult to understand.

One thing is sure: The citizens of the District of Columbia are not receiving the protection to which they are entitled. Day after day, or, at least, night after night, people are being assaulted and robbed on some of the well-traveled streets of the city, and by individuals who have a well-established record of criminality, by individuals who do not—at least, on some occasions—deny their participation in the charged crime. What these individuals and their lawyers say is that they have not been convicted in accordance with the most technical rules laid down by the courts.

The circuit court of appeals on January 20, 1955, in *Everett D. Green v. United States of America* (218 Fed. 2d, p. 856 et seq.), said that, aside from the arson charge, Green, if guilty of any other offense, was guilty of first-degree murder:

The first-degree murder section of the District of Columbia Code, set forth at length in footnote 2, supra, enlarges the common-law definition of that crime by adding thereto, *inter alia*, the unpurposed killing of another in perpetrating arson. So when the evidence at a trial tends to show the defendant committed arson and that the fire was the sole cause of the victim's death, the defendant is either guilty of murder in the first degree or he is not guilty.

When the case went back to the district court for a second trial, the jury agreed with what the circuit court of appeals had just said and convicted Green of first-degree murder. Then, when the case again went to the circuit court of appeals, 6 of the 9 judges on June 28, 1957, agreed with the jury and affirmed the conviction—236 Fed. (2d), page 708.

Then, when the case went to the United States Supreme Court, five of the Justices held, on December 16, 1957, that Green was entitled to a discharge because "a second trial of Green for first degree murder was contrary to both the letter and the spirit of the fifth amendment, which provides that no man should be twice put in jeopardy for the same offense."

Justice Frankfurter, writing the dissenting opinion, said that the approach of the majority opinion "misconceives the purpose of the double jeopardy provision, and without warrant from the Constitution makes an absolute of the interests of the accused in disregard of the interests of society."

The net result of recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court is that that Court insists that the right of the individual to what the Court conceives to be a fair trial under the Constitution—not under previous decisions of the Court—is absolute—over and above the constitutional right of the citizen to be protected in his person, to be secure in his right of property, which the Constitution states shall not be taken from him without due process of law.

As the Supreme Court has said, time and time again, there is under the Constitution no absolute right of the individual to do what he wishes—always every individual right is circumscribed and limited by the rights of others—by the right of the people generally to be secure in the rights granted them by the Constitution.

The citizen has a constitutional right to walk the streets of Washington and to carry with him funds for his current needs. The women of Washington have the right, a constitutional right, to use the streets and the public places in Washington, and on those streets and in those places to be secure in their person, to be free from assault or robbery. They have the right to carry with them and retain their pocketbooks. From a practical standpoint that right is not now theirs.

It is long past the time when, the courts not giving effective protection to those rights or needed assistance to law-enforcing officials—the police and the public prosecutors—the Committee on the Judiciary, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], should bring forth legislation protecting the constitutional rights of the average citizen, as well as protecting the constitutional rights of the criminal or the accused.

The Committee on the Judiciary does not need to hold further hearings. Its chairman, its ranking minority members, yes, every member on the committee, knows the situation here in Washington, for ample publicity has been given to it by the press.

What is the committee waiting for? Does it want citizens to arm themselves in violation of the law and so protect themselves from the vicious criminals who make the use of our streets hazardous?

It is just possible that, if members of the judiciary who have been giving such a liberal interpretation to the constitutional provisions, or members of the Committee on the Judiciary should—and we all hope that will not occur—have an assault or a robbery of some member of their own family, we would get a little more prompt action. We are all inclined to give quick relief when it affects us personally. What are we waiting for? For some Member or a member of a Member's family to be robbed or assaulted?

A DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY AND RESEARCH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to combine all research and all supply functions in the Department of Defense into one department subject to the authority, control, and direction of the Secretary of Defense. This Department will be known as the Department of Supply and Research. The head of this Department will be appointed from civilian life by the President with the consent of the Senate and shall have status and compensation the same as the heads of other military departments. This Department will provide for purchase, inventory control, storage, and distribution to the military departments in the United States and overseas. It will carry on all research for military departments and will administer such further responsibilities and activities as the Department of Defense may delegate to it from time to time.

My reason for doing this is that in a budget of some \$40 billion for military matters the American people are not getting full value for dollars spent. There is overlapping, there is waste, there is muddling, and confusion compounded.

This problem of efficient, expeditious procurement is complicated by an almost bottomless morass of redtape and reports to a number of competing Federal agencies. This was characterized the other day before a Senate committee by Donald W. Douglass, Sr., chairman of the board of Douglass Aircraft, in his statement where he said the most formidable obstacle to getting things done swiftly and efficiently is the time-consuming, agonizing process of waiting for official decisions. He further said that it took his firm alone over 400,000 man-hours a year of just filling out these complex reports for Government agencies. He was also quoted as saying:

Another problem is the tedious time-wasting emphasis on monitoring. We estimate that increased technical manpower of 30 percent is needed to cope with these paperwork Government requirements.

What does this mean to the American people? It means this, that our vital missile programs are slowed by redtape, by competition between services, and by a tremendous number of competing agencies.

By combining this competition we could get our missile program into high gear at considerably less cost to the taxpayers. Another thing cited by Mr. Douglass was the case of the Nike-Zeus missile, which he said is now completely feasible. He added:

All we need now is the go-ahead signal to bring it to the same status that we have brought the (Thor) intermediate range ballistic missile. Nearly 2 years ago we felt this weapon was sufficiently feasible to warrant a go ahead but, so far, only a small fraction of the necessary funds has been made available.

To further exemplify this problem he said Thor production "can be accelerated to almost any degree which might be necessary."

Rear Adm. F. S. Withington, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ordnance, said in Detroit on January 15 that his biggest problem "is not money, but control of the money. Sometimes I don't think I am Chief of Ordnance but rather that some clerk in the Budget is. You can quote me on that." He said that holding up of money in the Bureau of the Budget interfered with the continuity of the missile program. In some cases money appropriated by Congress was held up by the Budget Bureau until the last day of the fiscal year, which is obviously most wasteful and inefficient.

My bill is consistent with the recommendations of the recent Rockefeller report, wherein the following language appeared:

The Secretary of Defense should be given authority over all research, development, and procurement.

One of the great difficulties besetting the administration in this present period of trouble is the lack of understanding between the basic relationship of strategy, technology, and supply. It is most probable that the next war will be lost in laboratories and on the drawing boards. Until the Secretary of Defense has maximum control over the direction of research, development, and procurement his role will be, in the language of the Rockefeller report:

Essentially passive one of arbitrating disputes formulated elsewhere.

Where so much depends on keeping up and staying ahead in the technological race it is essential that our weapons development reflect a clear sense of direction and not a series of compromises.

I recently introduced legislation to do away with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and in their place to establish one single Chief of Staff to have the responsibilities presently held by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This was to do away with the battling, muddling, and confusion that has reigned so long in the Department of Defense. This bill has the same purpose. It is my intent in offering this bill to do away with the vast confusion which exists in the departments of supply. For instance, I would like to cite certain things which have come to my

attention with regard to the Department of Defense's procurement policies.

The Air Force canceled a contract for C-132 jet prop planes after \$70 million was spent on it.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force all have separate carpenter squares; the Navy's costs \$2; the Army's carpenter square costs \$1.90; the Signal Corps, \$2.10; the Army engineer's, \$1.48; the Quartermaster Corps, 65 cents; and the Air Force, \$1.40.

The situation got so bad that Congress passed a law requiring the Army, Navy, and Air Force to compile one catalog from which they would all order, instead of competing against each other and using separate catalogs. The law was passed July 1, 1952. The Defense Department had 300 people working full time in Washington, plus 3,000 working part-time in the field to compile a joint armed services catalog. Finally, after spending \$87 million they produced the first edition, on food only, which is 40 pages long. At that rate it will take billions to complete the entire catalog. It is interesting to note that the Navy ordered 14,500 copies of this new catalog, the Army only 50 copies, and the Air Force none.

Navy jets in Korea were so bad that they were not put into operation where they would come into contact with the Russian Migs.

The Navy has enough anchors on hand to last it until the year 2005. The Army has enough of certain front axle parts for jeeps to last it until the year 2055. The Air Force paid 12 cents a pound for 10-penny nails, while the Navy paid 6 cents for exactly the same nails.

The Marines buy a combat boot for \$16.80, the Navy buys exactly the same boot for \$24.65. The Air Force dress shoe costs \$7.19. An almost identical Navy dress shoe costs \$6.08. The only real difference between these two shoes is the stitching on the heel. The Air Force bought 1,700,000 of these dress shoes on which it could have saved over \$1,700,000 if it had bought the Navy shoe. The medical services paid \$21.75 each for blankets, the Air Force, \$14.15 and the Navy, \$19.57.

On June 30, 1953, 37,000 assorted dry cell batteries which cost the Government \$75,843.33 were sold by the Army for exactly \$130. These batteries were left over from winter exercises of the previous 2 years. A House Government Operations Subcommittee said:

The subcommittee was amused to learn of the laxness in computing requirements for the winter exercise.

In Exercise Snowfall, \$311,835 worth of batteries were shipped to Camp Drum. Only 39 percent of this amount was consumed. For 2 winter exercises \$1,186,799 worth of batteries were shipped in, 42 percent were used, 50 percent were returned to the system, 8 percent were disposed of by sales. Poor storage conditions resulted in tremendous loss to these batteries.

The Navy, in 1951, bought scores of thousands of dollars worth of forklift trucks from a company which had no previous experience in the manufacturing of this type of equipment. The equip-

ment was useless and withdrawn from service.

The Army bought overcoats in 1946 to prevent appropriated funds from reverting to the Treasury at a time when there was no need for the coats. They later were found to be unsuitable, necessitating remodeling at a cost of \$1 million.

The Air Force procured chain link fencing under defense priority, 60 percent of which was still unused 2 years later. Adm. S. E. Edson, Director of Procurement, Office of Naval Materiel, had this to say before a Government Operations Subcommittee:

I am simply astounded and amazed at the series of bad procurements that have been brought out in this testimony. It is simply not understandable to me how with all the checks and balances the Navy has that the matter has gone along and the complete consummation of procurement has taken place without the knowledge of higher authority. Now, whether there have been human failures, or the system, or both, certainly we, the Navy, are going to investigate and take corrective action.

The Air Force, on 1 occasion, built in excess of 200 three-story dormitories costing \$400,000 each, over and above its need for structures of this sort. It was found that these structures would have no use in the foreseeable future.

The Navy bought millions of dollars' worth of Demon fighters which were found to be entirely unsuitable for military purposes.

A recent report of the House Committee on Government Operations gives a summary of the progress of the cataloging system which is going on in the Department of Defense at this time. No one knows how much it costs and apparently it is not going very well. Completion of the process now under way is expected by December 1958. The total number of conversions of nomenclature to a standard Federal system is 3,487,238; 3,128,613 separate items are identified in the military supply system; about 600,000 are thought to be different, new items which will be submitted by the military services for identification this year. Cataloging may reduce these to approximately 250,000 to 300,000 actually different items to which new stock numbers will be assigned. The different services are being assigned separate spheres of endeavor in standardization, and there is even squabbling as to who will standardize what.

Here is what Rear Adm. John E. Clark, Director of Guided Missiles in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, had to say in the February 25, 1957, issue of Aviation Week magazine:

Missile programs have failed completely in the area of dollar cost. Unit costs have risen even after the missiles have been placed in mass production, and this has never happened before.

Part of the blame—

Clark said—

was the military's outdated specifications and standards; delay in decisions, insistence on changes conspired to increase the cost.

The Navy has its Polaris missile, the Army now wants to develop a similar solid-fuel missile and will, no doubt, spend substantial amounts of the taxpayers' money in doing so, instead of

using the basic elements of the Polaris' mechanism.

The Navy now wants to move into the development of the atom powered aircraft in competition with the military. No doubt, again expensive duplications will occur which will cost the taxpayers millions of dollars and which will cost this country priceless time in our technological race with Russia.

It was recently found that the military department has tremendous stocks of both canned hamburger and catsup, far in excess of its needs in the foreseeable future.

Military land procurement and use is the most wasteful and shameful hogging and squandering of a priceless national resource. This was commented on extensively by the House Interior Committee last year when the committee found that the Army, Navy, and Air Force were competing to seize new areas at the rate of around 1,000 acres each hour every day. An example of competition in land use by the services was the Nellis-Tonopah Range that covers 3.5 million acres in southern Nevada. In 1953 and 1955 the Navy asked the Air Force to let it share the use of the range for bombing and gunnery runs by its test pilots. The Air Force refused both requests and testified before the House Interior Committee that the whole area, equal to a 1-mile belt from New York to Los Angeles, was overcrowded with Air Force planes and would be needed indefinitely. The committee directed the Air Force to produce a report showing how many planes used the range and on how many days a year. Redfaced Air Force witnesses came back with a new report, over half the vast range was no longer needed at all, and that by 1960 testing requirements of the new planes would make the entire area useless to the Air Force. When Congressmen called in the Navy to inform them that this range would be available to them, they found that the admirals no longer wanted it. The Navy now has spent \$16 million on other and presently uncontaminated public lands 180 miles away, and informs Congress that the money will go down the drain if they are not allowed to use and contaminate 2.8 million acres more of the public domain. An interesting fact is that the Navy spent \$10 million of this money on the new site prior to the 1953 refusal of the Air Force to let them use Nellis-Tonopah.

The Navy came to Congress saying that they wanted 639,000 acres near Fallon, Nev., to be seized by eminent domain, declaring that it contained only sagebrush and rock. A formal Interior Department survey showed the area encompassed 35 ranches that grazed 22,400 cattle and 14,000 sheep. It included over 17,000 mining claims in the finest Nevada habitat for antelope, mule deer, sagehens, and partridge.

Actually, the Defense Department does not even know what acreage it does own. It started an inventory of lands but last summer informed the House Interior Committee that this inventory was only 22 percent complete. The Air Force has the Wendover Bombing Range in Utah, which it has owned since 1942 but has never used. This area is 1,400,-

000 acres in extent. When asked why the Air Force has never used this land, the Air Force replied that the land was split in two by United States Highway 50, the Union Pacific and two pipelines.

The Air Force explained that it did not occur to them that they could own land under commercial split by a railroad, two pipelines and a main highway. In the midst of this last summer the Air Force, Navy and Army proposed to take on an additional 12,800,000 acres while declaring surplus 5,700,000 acres. The landholdings are presently equal to a belt of land 13 miles wide from coast to coast, to which the Air Force, Army and Navy propose to add an additional belt over 3 miles wide.

These are just a few astounding examples of waste and bureaucracy in the Military Establishment.

It is with great pleasure that I noted the other day that the House passed an amendment to the emergency military authorization bill combining all research facilities in the Department of Defense into one operation. This will reduce considerably the problems which exist in the Department of Defense insofar as duplication, overlapping and competition in the research field. However, unless research can be coupled to an intelligent, enlightened procurement system, this will only cure a part of the real difficulty and waste in the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that this bill will find early and favorable consideration. It will help us get missiles and antimissile missiles of the kind we require in the quantity needed as cheaply and as quickly as it can be done.

LAWRENCE H. SMITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, again it becomes my very painful duty to record the passing, on Wednesday last, January 22, of yet another of our colleagues, the fourth already to leave us during the brief days of this session.

Lawrence Henry Smith, who represented the First District of his native State, Wisconsin, was born in Racine on September 15, 1892. Educated in the public schools of that city, he was graduated from the State Teachers College at Milwaukee; obtained his degree from the Marquette University Law School in 1923, and was admitted to the Wisconsin bar the same year. Meanwhile, during World War I he served as first lieutenant of Infantry in the 32d Division, and in the years following the war served as commander in the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion; national executive committeeman of the Legion, and national child welfare chairman of that body.

After the war and his admission to the bar, he commenced the practice of law in Racine. His eventual election as president of the Racine Bar Association

testifies to the esteem in which he came to be held by the members of his profession. But he did not confine himself to professional duties alone. As a director of the YMCA, president of the Lions Club, and a Mason, he displayed that broad and philanthropic interest in the life of the community which we look for in the highest type of citizen.

The time came at last to make his entrance on the national scene when he was chosen at a special election, held in August 1941, as Representative of the 1st Wisconsin District in the 77th Congress. From then on until the end he served in our midst, becoming eventually a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. A firm opponent of governmental extension into domestic and overseas fields which he deemed foreign alike to our national traditions and our constitutional system, he won the respect of all no less for his consistency than for his inflexible honesty in defense of principles which were, to him, sacred and immutable. To his widow and the three children he left behind him, this House will join with me, I know, in extending our profound and heartfelt sympathy.

Long ago Theodore Roosevelt wrote:

Clean politics is simply one form of applied good citizenship. No man can be a really good citizen unless he takes a lively interest in politics from a high standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind, Lawrence H. Smith nobly exemplified that ideal held up by a great leader of his party. Let that be his epitaph as we bid him farewell.

To his loved ones left behind I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

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

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, President Eisenhower, in his press conference, spoke of our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, as the "wisest, most dedicated man I know" and as one who has greater knowledge in the field of foreign affairs than any other man. In view of the storm of criticism that has been leveled at Mr. Dulles during the past few weeks, in view of the fact that he has been described as the second most unpopular member of the President's Cabinet, I feel that some of these charges should be viewed in their true perspective. That is my purpose in addressing the House this afternoon.

I understand that three of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from Arizona, and the gentleman from California, have special orders this afternoon, following mine, to discuss foreign-policy matters as well. I expect those Members of the House who are able to remain during that time will not only spend an interesting afternoon but will, I hope, be given every opportunity to participate in the debate. I certainly concur with the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin the other day when he indicated that we in the House should not leave it entirely to the other

body to discuss the broad, overall aspects of foreign policy.

When the foreign policy of the administration is attacked, whether at home or abroad, these attacks are obviously directed against the Secretary of State as much as any other man. Let us recall for a moment the background qualifications of this man who, I am told, has had a lifelong ambition to attain his present position. Let us remember that, ever since the Hague Peace Conference of 1907, over 50 years ago, his entire life has been centered around the study of and participation in international affairs and foreign policy.

He was an adviser to President Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, he was a member of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference on International Organizations in 1945, he has been a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly four times under previous administrations, he served as adviser to the Secretary of State four times at meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers at London, Moscow, and Paris. He also negotiated and signed the Japanese Peace Treaty in 1951. It is clearly evident, therefore, that when John Foster Dulles took the oath of office as Secretary of State 5 years ago last Tuesday, his previous service to this Government, almost entirely under Democratic administrations, more than qualified him for his present high position. Not only has he more experience in the field of foreign policy than any other major-power statesman now active but he has also had more experience in negotiating with representatives of the Soviet Union. It is important to keep this fact in mind.

I do not hesitate in saying that I have not agreed with all aspects of our foreign policy at all times. But, if certain persons ever wish to make a partisan question out of the foreign policy of our present administration, I am more than ready to meet them on their own ground. I might remind the House that I resigned from the United States Foreign Service 8 years ago, largely over basic disagreements with the way our foreign policy was being conducted at that time. Were I in a similar position today, such basic disagreements would no longer exist.

Just a week ago, Mr. Dulles' immediate predecessor, Mr. Dean Gooderham Acheson, charged that the present world crisis "is due as much to the inaction of this administration as to Soviet actions." Now Mr. Acheson is a foreign policy adviser to the Democratic Party, whether self-appointed or not, I do not know. I should be grateful to my Democratic colleagues who are following me this afternoon if they could straighten me out on this point. In other words, is Mr. Acheson speaking as a private individual, is he speaking for the Democratic Party, or just for whom is he talking?

In that connection I would like to read a brief letter which I received this morning in the mail from John A. Stewart, of Saginaw, Mich., dated January 24, 1958:

I think it is nauseating to hear Dean Acheson criticizing the President's foreign policy. If there was anybody who had no foreign

policy, it was Acheson and little Harry, and I think of Acheson as the meat grinder. He and Harry got us into the Korean war and then kept us from winning it and sent our men over there to be thrown into a stalemate where they weren't permitted to advance or do anything to protect themselves, were just there until they were blown up by the Commies and I still think of it as Operation Meat Grinder and Acheson the grandest grinder of all. He's got the blood of many thousands of fine young American boys on his hands and I would think he would hide his head in shame the rest of his life instead of criticizing anybody else's policy, especially one who stopped the senseless war that he and his pal, little Harry, started.

This may sound very vituperative but it is the way I feel every time his name is mentioned.

JOHN A. STEWART.

But, in any event, it seems strange for Mr. Acheson to accuse the administration and Mr. Dulles of inaction. The House will no doubt recall that, with regard to China, he himself advocated a policy of inaction, of letting the dust settle before doing anything about it. Talk of inaction comes with poor grace from one under whose tenure of office and that of his democratic predecessors we lost all of Eastern Europe as well as China to the Communists. The only positive actions during that time which enabled us to save Western Europe were enacted by the Republican-controlled 80th Congress.

On the contrary, since Mr. Dulles has been Secretary of State, what positive accomplishments in the cold war does the present administration have to its credit—this administration which Mr. Acheson says has been so inactive? We did the best we could with a bad job which we inherited in Korea and saved half of that country for the free world. Likewise we inherited a situation in Indochina where the entire country was swarming with Communists and today we find Vietnam firmly on our side, Laos and Cambodia likewise adopting an anti-Communist attitude and the Communists confined to the north and east parts of what was Indochina. Elsewhere in the Far East the Communists have not advanced a step further into free world territory and, specifically as at Formosa, have been prevented from doing so by bold and positive joint action on the part of the administration and the Congress.

In the Middle East, the present hot spot of world affairs, we took positive action to keep the Reds out of Iran. The Eisenhower doctrine which was proclaimed a year ago has not only reduced the menace of Communist penetration in that area but has given the anti-Communist Arab nations real support in their efforts to preserve the freedom and independence of their own countries. The Soviet Union has concentrated its own efforts on this part of the world but so far has only gained any advantage in Syria and Egypt.

Even in these two countries there are positive and encouraging signs that the moderate elements are beginning a program of resistance to further Communist gains. The final story in Syria and Egypt has certainly not as yet been written.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that just before the session started this noon, I read on the news ticker that these two countries are very close to a union with each other. My personal opinion is that this union will go far to keep both Syria and Egypt from further Communist infiltration and Communist domination, by permitting them to operate under one government. Whether it is a good thing or not for the entire Middle East is another question, but I think it will be a real deterrent to further Communist penetration of this area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the Suez Canal episode of some 15 months ago. The action which our Government took on that occasion must certainly have represented one of the most difficult foreign policy decisions which the President and Mr. Dulles have been called upon to make since they have been in office.

It was a hard and painful thing to do to oppose three good friends of ours such as the United Kingdom, France and Israel in the United Nations. But we are a government and we are a people pledged to the settlement of disputes by peaceful methods, whenever and wherever possible. We have to admit that the joint British-French-Israeli action at Suez was in violation of both international morality and justice. No matter how close our friendship, we could not condone their invasion of Egypt at the same time we were condemning the Russians for their brutal aggression against Hungary. To have done other than we did would have been to share with the Soviets the label of the greatest international hypocrites of the 20th century. It is only by a firm and undeviating adherence to the standards of international morality that we continue to merit the leadership of the free world in our struggle against imperialist Communist aggression.

While I am on the subject of morality, let me refer once again to the much-maligned Mr. Dulles. In addition to his superb diplomatic background, the Secretary has always been prominent in religious matters and in 1940, for example, served as chairman of the Federal Council of Protestant Churches. For a man like Mr. Dulles, whose entire life has been imbued with deep convictions in the highest traditions of our Christian religion, it is only to be expected that he should adhere to such standards in the conduct of foreign affairs and should demand the adherence to such standards on the part of other countries. I cannot understand those, either at home or abroad, who criticize him for excessive moralizing. I am sure that no Member of the House would demand that we adopt different rules for the conduct of the foreign policy of this country.

In this connection, I should refer to a letter dated last November 22 addressed to the President by six Members of the House, all belonging to that party presently in control. This letter made certain suggestions in the field of foreign affairs with a purpose of relaxing tension and mitigating hostility as well as increasing our strength. Speaking of the necessity for achieving unity within

the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the letter said:

We must overcome the doubts about our desire for peace aroused by the rigidity of our foreign policy and its tendency to antagonize our friends by its moralistic preachments.

I challenge any of the gentlemen who signed this letter or any other Member of the House on the other side of the aisle to say here and now that he believes that the United States policy toward its Western European allies should be marked by a departure from the standards of morality and should instead adopt an amoral line.

Communist moral standards are self-confessedly governed by the ends of their own foreign policy. Otherwise international morality has no place in the Soviet Russian lexicon. I do not believe that any of the gentlemen who attacked our administration's foreign policy for its moral preachments would suggest a deviation by this administration from a firm and unwavering adherence to what we know to be in accordance with the highest standards of truth and righteousness. I can safely predict that, as long as Mr. Dulles remains our Secretary of State, our foreign policy will continue to be conducted on the highest moral plane and if anyone on the other side of the aisle wants to make a partisan issue of this fact he is more than welcome to do so.

The House has also noted that the letter signed by some of my colleagues on the other side criticized "the rigidity of our foreign policy." Presumably, this refers to the position of our Government in respect to possible negotiation with the Soviet leaders and specifically concerning the so-called summit meeting. At this time, I think I should read Secretary Dulles' answer to such criticism directly and I refer and quote below certain paragraphs taken from his address before the National Press Club here in Washington on January 16:

Given the intensive nature of the present struggle, what place is there for negotiation? First of all, let me say emphatically that there is a place for negotiation. Negotiation is one of the major tools of diplomacy. It would be the height of folly to renounce the use of this tool. This administration has not done that in the past and does not intend to do it for the future.

We must, on the basis of past experience, assume that negotiation with the Communists, if it is to bring acceptable results, will be a long, hard task. I have often engaged in that work and have spent many days personally participating in high level face-to-face negotiations with the Soviets. I have had considerable education as to their methods. . . .

I believe that there should be, and will be, further negotiations with the Soviet Union. There are many areas where there could be dependable agreement in the common interest. Also I believe that the Soviet rulers, and I know that we, do not want our two nations to drift so far apart that there is increased danger that the cold war will turn into a hot war. . . .

President Eisenhower's letter to Chairman Bulganin should dissipate once and for all any impression that the United States does not want to negotiate, or is afraid to negotiate with the Soviet rulers. The truth is quite the contrary. We do want a sum-

mit meeting, provided the proper conditions obtain.

We do not, however, want a summit meeting which merely represents another episode in the cold war, and which would be held under circumstances that would carry great peril to the free world.

There are, I know, many who feel that the cold war could be ended and the need for sacrificial effort removed by a stroke of a pen at the summit. That is the kind of illusion that has plagued mankind for a long time. Actually, peace is never achieved in that way, and nothing could be more folly for us than to put on the belief that all our danger could be ended by peaceful platitudes proclaimed from the summit by heads of government.

The expansionist goals of the Communist parties, and the exploitation of the subject peoples for military and economic aggressive purposes, will not be altered by one iota by generalities uttered at a summit conference. But with the free peoples it is different. Their governments cannot make the necessary efforts except as the people themselves feel the need to work and sacrifice for the security of their nations and of their ideals. A summit conference which diverted the free nations from doing what is necessary for their security, without any comparable change in the Sino-Soviet bloc, could be a great, indeed, a fatal, disaster.

Equally, it could be a disaster if the Free-World leaders at such a conference felt that, to avoid the danger inherent in a platitudinous declaration of peace, they had to go to the other extreme and break off in an atmosphere of hostility. That could intensify the cold war and make more likely that it would turn into a hot war.

For these reasons, it is essential, as President Eisenhower pointed out, and as Mr. Khrushchev once himself agreed, that any summit meeting should be well prepared. There should be assurance that significant topics will be discussed, and that there is a good prospect of arriving at significant agreements which will be fulfilled.

The way to such a meeting was clearly pointed out by President Eisenhower in his last week's message to Chairman Bulganin. It is now for the Soviet rulers to make clear whether or not they want a summit conference which will genuinely promote the cause of peace and justice in the world. We do.

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

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and also for the constructive thing he is doing this afternoon in exposing some current issues of foreign policy and giving Members on both sides a chance to join in.

I rise at this time because the gentleman, I think, did not quite understand the meaning of a 2-word phrase used by myself and 5 of my colleagues on this side in our letter of November 22, 1957, to the President, which the gentleman from Michigan just referred to. We, it is true, criticized Secretary Dulles in that letter for what we called moralistic preachments. Surely the gentleman recognizes the broad and basic difference between moral action, between keeping one's word, between dealing fairly with people, between dealing with people on the basis of sympathy and understanding, the difference between such moral action and moralistic preachment.

As examples of moralistic preachment, which I think we can do without in our foreign policy, as opposed to moral speech and moral action, were such

things as Secretary Dulles' statement in days gone by that we should liberate the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe by such devices as air drops. I think that kind of preachment is moralistic because it raised hopes among the enslaved people of Hungary and other nations which we had neither the ability nor, I fear, the intention of filling. I think, too, we should consider the statement of Secretary Dulles that we must engage in an agonizing reappraisal of whether our allies are worth the alliance at a time when France was struggling with the question of whether it should join with the European Defense Community. I suggest that the more we emphasize true moral action in our foreign policy and the more we forget about moralistic preachment, the nearer we will be to our goals of foreign policy.

On the second subject mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan, in connection with the letter of myself and my colleagues on the question of Mr. Dulles' rigidity, we did, indeed, make that criticism, I thought, constructively in our letter of November 22, and no one is happier than I that President Eisenhower, in his recent letter to Bulganin, and Mr. Dulles at the Press Club talk to which the gentleman from Michigan has just alluded, displayed, I thought, a good deal less rigidity and a good deal more flexibility, which I consider a forward step, and if our words had something to do with that, I, for one, would be very proud.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. Surely. I will be happy to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Now we have heard a definition of what is meant by "moralistic," which was never heard of before on land or sea or heaven or earth. We all know what the criticism means when foreign officials talk about Dulles' moralistic views. They mean that when the clutch comes, to be willing to "rise above principle" and to sacrifice principle for expediency. Everybody knows that. We know what they mean abroad and what many of our friends at home mean by talking about the rigidity of our Secretary of State. That means that he has been stubborn and steadfast in many situations when they were ready for appeasement. Now, we have in this country those of the opposing party who criticize him for inaction and then those who claim that he travels too much. We have those who say he talks too much and then those who claim he does not say enough, that there is too much secrecy. Then we have those at home and abroad who criticize his rigidity. But in a world where many leaders in other governments are confused and scared and wobbling, and when we have some people like that here in our home ranks, it seems to me that the position of our Secretary of State, with apologies to Kipling, might be described this way:

If you can keep your head when those about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you,

If you can keep your faith when small men doubt you and make allowance for their doubting, too.

Then your name is Foster Dulles. If devotion to commonsense and moral principles is rigidity, then thank God for Foster Dulles' rigidity.

If the gentleman will indulge me another moment, I have been studying the Rockefeller report on the problems of the United States defense. In the foreword by the overall panel is this statement. Speaking of the period of change and difficulty in which we now live they say this:

Our problems, therefore, require for their solution not only great effort and skill, but even more importantly, steadfast conviction.

If there is anyone in our country who combines great effort, great skill, and steadfast conviction more than our Secretary of State, I do not know who he is. And if that is rigidity I say again, thank God for that kind of rigidity in our great Secretary of State.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contribution of my good friend from Ohio.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe we in the United States should continue to encourage the people behind the Iron Curtain, not only in Russia but in the satellites. I am sorry there is any inference here from the other side that we should not be by our words encouraging the various people in the satellites toward liberation and freedom. There is a place where action is very difficult, but in the meantime any one of us who stands for principles certainly stands for the freedom of these various peoples; and just to stop talking, for us to stop pressing at the United Nations level, for our Secretary of State and our good President to stop saying that we in the United States are for that liberation, it seems to me would be a great disaster.

So I hope the administration stands firm on that question, and stands firm and rigid in saying that these people behind the Iron Curtain must be liberated.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield briefly; but I should like to remind the gentleman that he and others of his colleagues have quite a bit of time set aside for them, so I hope he will not take too long at this time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I shall try to make my comments very brief.

I simply want to point out that while I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], I think he will perhaps also agree with me that if we misled people into taking actions which unfortunately were proven to be ill considered and which cost a great many lives and which they took in the mistaken belief that we would affirmatively come to their assistance, because of some things that were said on an official and semiofficial basis, then I think it is time to recognize that we must be very careful in urging liberation. We must be very sure that we do not have people risking their lives unless we are com-

mitted to a policy of doing something about it. Unfortunately, in the case of Hungary I think history will show that we misled those behind the Iron Curtain, and unfortunately it cost so many human lives.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield so that I may reply to the gentleman from California?

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman that we in the United States both officially and as private citizens must see that we in no way mislead these people behind the Iron Curtain so that they might take action to their detriment and thereby cause many deaths; but I might say to the gentleman that under the leadership of the Honorable EDNA KELLY, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe made a special trip to Europe early this year and checked that program right straight through.

I for one was interested to see whether Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America, or any of our stations in any way had led the Hungarian people to feel that we in America would come with armies, with military force, to their defense.

I was unable from any testimony taken to find that there was in any way any affirmative misleading by the United States, either the Government or any official or even Radio Free Europe or the Voice of America, in encouraging the Hungarian people to take action in the belief that we, the United States, or our allies would immediately respond with arms.

May I finish on this, that we were very careful to check through, and we found there were many stations operating without license and surreptitiously, many of them unidentified, that were encouraging those people at that time. I want to say to my good friend from California that there was that encouragement, but none of it could our committee trace to the United States Government agencies, Radio Free Europe, or the Voice of America.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In regard to the gentleman's defense of Secretary Dulles, as far as the Secretary is concerned there would not be much difference between the gentleman's state of mind and mine. As I said a week ago last Sunday on a television program, I think the Secretary is correct in our policy in relation to a summit meeting, that negotiations should be carried on through the Ambassadors first and the Foreign Ministers before the President meets with any of the top leaders of the Soviet Union, so that there would be a reasonable assurance of success and it would not be propaganda used by the Soviet Union. I also at that time expressed my respect for Secretary Dulles because I am firmly convinced that he has as profound a knowledge of the evilness of the Communist mind as anyone in the administration. If it were not for him we would

probably be much further advanced along the line of recognizing Red China than we are and probably we would be tied up with some disarmament program that we would find a year or two from now would be to the disadvantage of our country.

For a long while I have been of the impression that there has been an attempt by certain groups to undercut him, and I said so on the floor of the House some months ago. So on the question of Secretary Dulles, I may not agree in complete detail with the gentleman's remarks, but with the substance of them I personally agree. I am speaking only for myself.

The gentleman referred to the Suez Canal and rather severely criticized our allies, Britain, France, and Israel. Again, I am a lonely fellow, and I have a habit of expressing my views. Frequently through the years I find on many occasions that I am rather alone. As the gentleman knows, on two occasions in the House when the Suez situation arose I stated that I thought Britain, France, and Israel did the right thing. I am sorry they were not successful, because we would then have been able to negotiate from a position of strength rather than a position of weakness. In the gentleman's criticism of Britain, France, and Israel, does he condone or approve of the action of Nasser in violating the international agreement, which was the origin and the cause of the situation that later arose?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman answers that, will he yield to me for just a second?

Mr. BENTLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 60 minutes. On the other side they have 2 hours. Are we going to hear the gentleman from Michigan talk, or not?

Mr. FULTON. We will get the gentleman some more time.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Michigan will yield to me, I do not recognize the ability or the power of the other gentleman from Michigan to rebuke me when the gentleman from Michigan who has the floor has yielded to me. He knows that unlike my friend from Michigan, he and I think very closely together on foreign affairs.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the distinguished majority leader, and preface my remarks by saying that for him I have always had the deepest respect and indeed admiration. I should like to go further and say that both in his official and personal capacity he has been very kind and helpful to me many times on subjects of foreign policy in which we find ourselves in deep and close agreement.

Now, on this question of the Suez Canal, of course I do not condone the action of Nasser in seizing the canal. That was a clear violation of international law. But I am wondering if my friend would say that we in the United Nations should not have taken the position we did in condemning the attack on Egypt which, though it may have been the best thing to do from a practical point of view, nevertheless was not in accord with the policy of settling disputes by peaceful

means, which the United Nations have undertaken to preserve.

I wonder if the gentleman would think we would have been before the eyes of the world in a stronger position to condemn Soviet aggression in Hungary if we had condoned the tri-power aggression against Egypt.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am frank in stating I think we made a mistake in being on the side of the Soviet Union in connection with condemning Britain, France, and Israel. Even if our Government did not agree with what they did, the relation of friendship ought to have prompted our Government to at least remain silent rather than going out and publicly repudiating three nations that are friendly to us. The gentleman asked me the question so I am responding to the gentleman's question. Instead of publicly repudiating three of our friendly nations and destroying the influence of two of them in the Middle East, namely, Britain and France, as a result of which we had to step in in that area with the Eisenhower doctrine that this Congress passed—the gentleman will not deny that that was a probably natural result, because we could not leave that important area of the world completely devoid of any Western influence so that the Soviet Union might take over any area as a result of nonresistance. So, as a result of what we did, we had to follow it up with the Eisenhower doctrine in our own national interest. I think, first, we made a mistake in going in there. And, secondly, if the present administration felt that Britain and France should not have moved, the least they could have done is to have acted in accordance with the close relationship of friendship and not repudiated them openly and publicly.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, because the distinguished majority leader has mentioned the attitude of the Secretary of State with respect to Red China—

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that I am only expressing my own views.

Mr. ADAIR. I understand that.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I say, I am only expressing my own views and not the views of all of my colleagues on this side.

Mr. ADAIR. I will say then to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think this ought to be brought to the attention of the House because it is such a basically important aspect of our foreign policy that repeatedly, through the years, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has taken a position against the recognition of Red China. It is important, it seems to me, to recall that our position is in agreement with the position of the Secretary of State in that respect.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the people of America are pretty unanimously in accord with that position. Now may I ask one question about Vietnam?

Mr. BENTLEY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, had confined himself to discussing Secretary Dulles. My friend indicated that the action with reference to South Vietnam

had been a Republican action. In the first place, it was an American action. The gentleman will remember a couple of years ago when General Collins came back for the purpose of removing Ngo Dinh Diem as head of the South Vietnam Government. The gentleman remembers that; does he not? And it was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House both Democrats and Republicans strongly conveyed to him and to others that we vigorously opposed it. I was there at the time and I was very proud of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs both Republicans and Democrats, on that occasion because I think it was the turning point which resulted in Diem continuing as head of the South Vietnamese Government. Will the gentleman sharply disagree with that statement?

Mr. BENTLEY. No, of course I would not disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, when he makes that statement. I would point out that when the Republican administration took over in 1953, the Communists were all over Indochina—north, south, east, and west, and today, 5 years later, the Communists are confined in the northern and eastern part of the country in North Vietnam and the rest of the country is strongly on the side of the Free World, which I say is a positive accomplishment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I am sorry I must decline to yield. I would like to go on. I will try to yield to the gentleman later, but I would like to make a few more remarks if I may.

We were talking, of course, about the question of the summit meeting. I think it appropriate to quote here a couple of paragraphs from the President's letter to Bulganin which officially sets forth the administration position concerning the summit meeting:

I have noted your conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that you attach great importance to personal contact between statesmen and that you for your part would be prepared to come to an agreement on a personal meeting of state leaders to discuss both the problems mentioned in your letter and other problems.

I to believe that such personal contacts can be of value. I showed that by coming to Geneva in the summer of 1955. I have repeatedly stated that there is nothing I would not do to advance the cause of a just and durable peace.

But meetings between us do not automatically produce good results. Preparatory work, with good will on both sides, is a prerequisite to success. High level meetings, in which we both participate, create great expectations and for that reason involve a danger of disillusionment, dejection and increased distrust if in fact the meetings are ill-prepared, if they evade the root causes of danger, if they are used primarily for propaganda, or if agreements arrived at are not fulfilled.

Consequently, M. Chairman, this is my proposal:

I am ready to meet with the Soviet leaders to discuss the proposals mentioned in your letter and the proposals which I make, with the attendance as appropriate of leaders of other states which have recognized responsibilities in relation to one or another of the subjects we are to discuss. It would be essential that prior to such a meeting these complex matters should be worked on in advance through diplomatic channels and by

our Foreign Ministers, so that the issues can be presented in form suitable for our decision and so that it can be ascertained that such a top-level meeting would, in fact, hold good hope of advancing the cause of peace and justice in the world. Arrangements should also be made for the appropriate inclusion, in the preparatory work, of other governments to which I allude.

In this question of meeting with the Soviet leaders, about which the administration has been accused of having taken too stubborn and unyielding a position, let us return for a moment to the Geneva Conference in 1955, the only such occasion during our present administration. Under previous administrations, we had many prior conferences with representatives of the Soviet Union. It is fair to say that at some of these conferences we were woefully unprepared and there were others in which our negotiators either displayed unjustified overconfidence in their personal power of persuasiveness or they were inadequately briefed for discussion with their Communist opposite numbers.

Since the Eisenhower Republican administration has been in office we have met once with the top Soviet Russians—in the summer of 1955. At that conference certain agreements were reached with the Soviets which have not been kept by them. But at least we came away from Geneva without having negotiated agreements concerning third countries behind their backs. At Geneva we did not dispose of other peoples' territory without their consent. Most important of all, from the standpoint of our own national security, we came home from Geneva with our shirts and pants, to say nothing of our self-respect, still intact.

Reviewing the entire history of our previous agreements with the Soviet Union, we have finally learned that such agreements are only kept by the Communists when it is to their own advantage to do so or when they have been forced by ourselves or other countries to keep them. The Korean armistice agreement is one of the most recent examples of such duplicity. The Communists have remained on their side of the armistice line because of our and allied military power in that area. Other portions of the agreement, however, which related to the equipping of troops in both North and South Korea have been violated by them so many times we have finally denounced those parts of the agreement ourselves. Personally, I would feel that this would give us ample precedent to take similar action on those earlier agreements which have been likewise violated by the Russians again and again.

Referring to one of the most famous of those earlier agreements, the Yalta Pact, there has been, and probably will continue to be, a great deal of discussion as to whether or not it was a sound agreement and only had unfortunate results because of Soviet treachery. So far as I am concerned any agreement that disposes of the territory of other peoples without their knowledge, participation, and consent is both unconscionable and dishonest, and this would apply to both Poland and China insofar

as their countries were affected by the Yalta Pact.

I now want to say a final word about another basis for the criticism of Mr. Dulles. He is criticized on the grounds of his so-called unpopularity in other countries. I was just furnished the text of a television program of yesterday in which a Member of the other body, not still of course in the Senate, is quoted as making this statement about Mr. Dulles:

I think, frankly, that Mr. Dulles, however good he may be, is not going to help our foreign policy. I think the people in many countries have lost confidence in him; I would like to see him replaced.

I think we can honestly say that a good deal of hysteria both in the United Kingdom and France arose over that unfortunate incident.

I would like again to remind the House that Mr. Dulles made the following statement when he appeared before the National Press Club recently, and I quote:

We do not run the foreign policy of the United States with a view to winning a popularity contest. And we have to do things which we know are not going to be popular. But we have not done, in my opinion, anything for which we are not respected, and I prefer being respected to being popular.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country might have just cause to be more concerned about a Secretary of State who is too popular abroad. After all, the Secretary of State works for the best interest of our own people, first and foremost, as well as striving to secure and maintain a just and lasting peace. Where the best interest of this country coincides with the best interest of our friends and allies we, of course, are popular and deservedly so.

Going back to Mr. Acheson, and his charge of inaction against this administration, our record of positive accomplishments is too long to be enumerated here but I would be remiss if I did not refer to the President's recent letter to Bulganin and his proposals to, first, abandon the use of the veto power in the Security Council for the pacific settlement of disputes; second, proceed vigorously to bring about the reunification of Germany by free elections and to foster conditions under which the peoples of Eastern Europe could exercise the right of free choice of the form of government under which they would live; and third, dedicate outer space to the peaceful uses of mankind and deny it to the purposes of war. Those are positive offers of accomplishments which we are willing to make jointly with the Soviet Union and to abide by them in good faith, provided that the Communists would agree to do likewise. With those proposals, which I regard individually and collectively as masterpieces in the twin fields of diplomacy and propaganda, I consider that this administration has certainly regained the initiative which we may have lost temporarily to the Soviet sputniks.

It should, of course, be realized, Mr. Speaker, by all of us that to the average American citizen the details of foreign policy are essentially of a somewhat vague and remote concept. I have said it before and I say it again, for the aver-

age citizen of this country who is not versed in foreign affairs the foreign policy of his Government is tested on only one count: Does it bring war or peace? On that basis, there is no question that the foreign policy of this administration compared with the foreign policy of others must be judged successful by an overwhelming number of the American people.

In concluding my remarks about Mr. Dulles, I am aware that some who now approve of him will claim that he has changed, that he is, for example, much more willing to negotiate with the Communists now than he was earlier. Perhaps he has set down his conditions for a summit conference in more detail than was the case earlier. But I insist that Secretary Dulles' basic views with regard to international communism, with regard to the conduct of the cold war by this Government and its allies, and most of all his insistence upon the highest principles of international morality and justice are the same views and standards which he possessed and displayed when he took over the conduct of our foreign policy 5 years ago.

Now I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

I am quite interested to know why in the course of the gentleman's remarks he refers to things he thinks some of us are going to say later, and why his remarks are so defensive.

I would like to point out that before the President went to Geneva he had the support of a large group from this side of the aisle for which he thanked us, and I am a proud possessor of a personal letter from the President thanking me for joining with Senator WILEY, a Republican, in suggesting the expansion of the agenda at Geneva to consider person-to-person exchanges. I think the gentleman will agree that that is one positive thing we came back with in our pants pockets. I am proud to be the coauthor with Senator HUMPHREY, of the Humphrey-Thompson Act which makes permanent a great program that has been initiated under President Eisenhower—the President's Emergency Fund for Cultural Exchange. I think, however, without being vindictive or casting false accusations, that there is always an area for criticism in connection with foreign policy. If the gentleman will listen to the remarks which I hope to make later, I have things to say commending the administration's exchange programs and aid programs. As long as the gentleman's attitude seems to be that we will have certain tests to determine who supports who, let us wait and see where most of the votes come from for the President's reciprocal trade program and for his other programs.

I will address one specific question, if I am not intruding on the gentleman's time. The gentleman criticizes the Democrats for the loss of China, then he criticizes the Democrats for the Korean war and said it was immoral or wrong to lose China and that the Korean war was a mess. Yet he seems to take some pride in the fact that only half of Indo-

nesia was given away. I would like to have him explain that.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Our Government did not join in the agreement at Geneva where half of Vietnam was given away. One of the reasons was the so-called moralistic stand of our Secretary of State and of our Government that we were not going to be a party to the division of Vietnam.

Mr. BENTLEY. I would like to add one thing more. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from New Jersey and his remarks. I have not had the benefit of knowing what remarks he and his colleagues are going to make today, but I appreciate the contribution he has made in the past on foreign policy on a bi-partisan basis. The gentleman will not deny that he was one of the six Members who signed the letter of November 22d in which our foreign policy was criticized in several respects. It is as to those criticisms I have been addressing myself this afternoon.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. If the gentleman will yield, I will not deny that, but I might call attention to the fact that anyone who is interested in this subject knows that the greatest supporters among the leading columnists in the United States have been saying for a long time that our policy is too rigid and has been too moralistic, in the context that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] explained and that the appearance of Mr. Dulles at the National Press Club was an indication that he is becoming less rigid.

Mr. BENTLEY. I strongly feel that the action of Secretary Dulles and what he determines as to our foreign policy is not based on what columnists may say in the newspapers.

Mr. VORYS. It is perfectly clear that the object of the Secretary of State in his Press Club speech was to remind them where he had been standing all along.

Mr. BENTLEY. That is exactly right. Let me conclude.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the question of the conduct of our foreign policy and the actions of Secretary Dulles will not be made a partisan issue during this Congressional session and ensuing political campaigns. I sincerely believe that all of us should endeavor to work in harmony for the best interest of our country in the field of national security and international peace. I should add that whenever proclaimed spokesmen of the opposition party, such as Mr. Acheson, or any of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, attack the administration or the Secretary of State on these grounds which have been mentioned this afternoon, I can say positively that they can be answered, they should be answered and they will be answered.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. First of all, I should like to commend the gentle-

man from Michigan for a very forthright, dignified, and able presentation of a very vital subject. I think the discussion we will have here today demonstrates once again the potential danger if we should inject too great a degree of partisanship in foreign policy matters.

I, myself, feel very strongly that Secretary of State Dulles has done a job of inestimable value to this country. I regret very much any tendency on the part of individuals in this country to respond to what foreign nations may feel about him and thereby try to make Mr. Dulles a scapegoat. It seems obvious to me, as the gentleman from Michigan has pointed out, that the national security of this country depends on how ably our foreign policy is carried out. Secretary Dulles is doing a fine job and deserves the support of both political parties.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his fine presentation this afternoon on this very important subject. I, too, have been concerned about the attacks that have been made on our Secretary of State, particularly by some of the foreign press. I believe that a true test of a successful foreign policy is whether it keeps peace or results in war for this country, and I think that the test over the 5-year period since Secretary Dulles has been Secretary of State clearly indicates that it has kept the peace for the United States, and I certainly feel that he should be commended, and I am grateful to the gentleman from Michigan for his fine review of the Dulles record.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his able and constructive address this afternoon. He has brought together some things that need to be said and repeated again and again about our foreign policy and about our Secretary of State. I particularly want to commend him on what he has said about a summit conference. I was one of those who opposed having our President go to the Geneva Summit Conference in 1955, because I remembered so vividly the disastrous effects of the Yalta Summit Conference and the Potsdam Conference. However, I am in accord with the proposal for a summit conference which is now made because it means that we will have no summit conference except on terms and under conditions that absolutely bar the possibility of our sacrificing security for promises that can be broken with impunity. The gentleman has hammered home that the position of our Government, and our Secretary of State will be rigid and inflexible in the terms and conditions that are necessary before any other summit conference is held. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the gentleman for the scholarly job that he has done in presenting this matter to the House today. I think some of us, particularly those on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, are aware of one aspect of the work of the Secretary of State; and that it is his desire to keep that committee—and I presume also the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate—closely advised as to things he has done and conferences he has held. It seems to me that this speaks well for the attitude of the Secretary and bespeaks further his desire to have the executive and the legislative branches of our Federal Government work closely together. That is one thing, particularly, in which the Secretary has been outstanding.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank my friend from Indiana.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his very fine remarks this afternoon. I was particularly impressed with one statement in his remarks when he said that we can judge our foreign policy solely by its results.

The average citizen of the United States certainly cannot be fully aware of all the intricacies that are involved in dealing with foreign-policy affairs. But certainly they are directly affected by the results of these policies. We, as Republicans, I believe, may certainly stand up and say that the results of the policies as set forth by the Secretary of State have been very, very fruitful to date.

Permit me to say this further. I have listened to and read in the papers remarks of the former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson. I believe it would be much more helpful to the people of the United States if he were a little bit more concrete in his specifications, as to what he would do if he were presently the Secretary of State. It is another thing to use foreign affairs for partisan purposes, and it appears very emphatically that is what he is doing. It seems to me that those who will follow the gentleman from Michigan today should come up with some very concrete, some very definite proposals as to what they would have done in like situations.

I want to say also that I recall a recent article by David Lawrence in which he set forth the fact that if you have to have enemies, you ought to have John Foster Dulles' enemies. As far as I am concerned, I believe he has done a tremendous job as Secretary of State. We ought to keep this on a nonpartisan plane, but whether it is or not, the Republican record is clear.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word of commendation of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] for the fine statement which he has made, I agree with him thoroughly when he said that perhaps it is a good thing that the Secretary of State of the United States does have certain enemies. We certainly might have cause for worry if everybody loved our Secretary of State because that might mean he was doing a fine job for the rest of the world but perhaps not such a fine job in our own interests.

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Michigan on his scholarly dissertation this afternoon and for emphasizing and recalling to our minds that we must judge the success of the Secretary of State in the job he is doing and the success of the foreign policy of the country by whether we are at war or at peace. As the gentleman from Michigan has stated, in the conduct of our foreign policy the Secretary of State is not engaged in a popularity contest but is representing the United States and often we have had to do things which he knows are not going to be popular in other parts of the world but in doing those things, we have not done anything for which we are not respected and between the two it is preferable to be respected rather than popular.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

GETTING OUR FOREIGN POLICY OFF DEAD CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UDALL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I shall make and that similar permission be granted to those to whom I may yield during my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleague from Michigan, Mr. BENTLEY, will listen for a few moments. Unfortunately, I was not able to participate in the debate today. I did hear a few remarks after coming to the floor which I should like to have corrected, if possible. I should like to know if anyone on this side of the aisle criticized our Secretary of State or the President of the United States—I mean personally. Were there any remarks by anyone on this side of the aisle?

Mr. BENTLEY. I will say to my friend from New York that this letter of November 22 criticized our policy on

the ground, as I have said, of its rigidity and its moralistic preachments. Although the letter is addressed to the President, I would assume the criticism of the policy must inevitably refer to both the President and the Secretary of State.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. But personally there was no mention of the Secretary and the President?

Mr. BENTLEY. Not in the specific letter, no.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Or today on this floor. I just wanted that corrected.

Mr. BENTLEY. I would have to read the record, I may say to the gentleman woman from New York, but my impression was that there has been some criticism of the Secretary for what he did in the past with respect to this excessive moralizing and excessive moralistic preachments.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I accept that. Now, can the gentleman answer another question? One of our colleagues, I understand, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], referred, and again I am only quoting secondhand, to our committee when we were in Europe last spring, referring to the fact that there was no evidence that the United States in any way aided or gave hope to the Hungarian revolution. Is that correct? There was mention of it.

May I say that as far as I am concerned it was probably not intentional, but that as a result of broadcasts out of Austria or out of Paris words were picked up which at that time were being said in the United Nations and which, taken out of context, did give hope to the people in Hungary. Am I correct?

Mr. BENTLEY. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania made some such statement. Again, I would have to see the record, because I was a member of the study commission in Germany and would not know about specifically investigating that question. As far as any fault for encouraging the Hungarian people to revolt against hopeless odds is concerned, I think the blame is on both sides of the aisle. I have read the platforms of both political parties. I have read speeches by members of both political parties in the past. I would say the encouragement has certainly not been all on one or the other side of the aisle. I think it has spread across.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman. It is unfortunate that many of our remarks here on this floor and many of the articles that are written, much that has been written in the press, are misunderstood in the other countries and, therefore, words are taken out of context, both at the time debate is going on in the United Nations and words appearing in articles. I refer to one in particular, in the Saturday Evening Post. In that article words were written to the effect that we would come to their aid, and then the context was taken from the debate in the United Nations. So I do not believe we should have any Member say there is not a little degree of responsibility.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman woman.

May I say in this connection that I have heard from many free Hungarians that remarks of Mr. Dulles about "liberation by air drop" did add to the feeling on the part of those people in Hungary behind the Iron Curtain that this country would take some affirmative action if revolt were to start. I can remember that just a year ago that very courageous free Hungarian, that gallant lady, Mrs. Anna Kethly, told me right here in the Nation's Capital that the remarks made by high administration figures in the years following 1953 had contributed to the state of mind in Hungary that this Nation would do something on the great day when liberation might start.

However, my main purpose, Mr. Speaker, in being here this afternoon is to present some constructive ideas for the future of our foreign policy. I thought that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] made a most interesting and lively address. However, it is not my purpose, and I am sure it is not the purpose of my colleagues here today, to castigate Mr. Dulles or the administration in any partisan political sense. So, I think, to a degree, the gentleman flees when no man pursueth.

I am going now to try to answer the suggestion of the other gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG]. We here on this side are presenting a few constructive proposals so that we may talk about them here and subject them to the clash of debate.

Russia's technological advance, translated into military strength, political aggressiveness, and economic rambunctiousness, is having its impact upon us. Our defenses are receiving the concentrated attention of the appropriate committees of Congress, and are being acted upon with speed. This Congress has made it clear that we want to go ahead with an accelerated rearmament program.

In contrast, our foreign policy remains on dead-center. It is well to prepare for the worst, but it is necessary to work toward the best with equal zeal. In the quest for peace, every Member of Congress has a deep responsibility.

It is well to remember that we probably will not be involved in large scale warfare during the years that lie immediately ahead, but that we shall be hard pressed by the Russians in many other ways. We must be prepared to hold our own in the competition, or we shall see large parts of the world gobbled up by the Communist offensives in trade, diplomacy, and technology.

Congress will be called upon at this session to legislate on many aspects of our foreign policy. We will be asked to redefine the methods by which we share our scientific and military secrets with our allies. We will be asked to vote upon a \$3-billion program of military assistance, and thus indirectly to evaluate our alliances. We will be asked to consider a program of economic and technical assistance, and thus to give purpose and direction to our foreign policy.

I hope that each of these pieces of legislation, when they reach the floor,

will be subjected to the fullest possible debate. Meanwhile, it has seemed to many of us a useful thing to explore where we are going in the world in broad terms, unrelated to any specific legislation. Some of my colleagues and I intend this afternoon to discuss some of the major problems of our foreign policy and to offer, in all humility, some possible solutions to our problems.

I shall concentrate on three major questions:

First. As we strengthen our armaments in Europe, can we not at the same time evolve a stance for the West which offers some hope of peaceful disengagement?

Second. Does our emphasis on military assistance tend to make it an end rather than a means, and what can we do about it?

Third. Are we wise in downgrading the technical assistance side of foreign aid?

1. DISENGAGEMENT IN EUROPE

At the NATO Conference last December, the administration offered our European allies a much expanded shopping list of American secrets, missiles and even nuclear weapons. In working toward an adequate ground defense in Europe, the administration at last seems to realize that massive retaliation is not the complete answer to the problem of deterring Communist aggression. Now that the Soviets have the power to destroy Washington, our threat to bomb Moscow in retaliation for some local aggression in the Middle East or Asia may not be taken seriously. Adequate ground strength is necessary in order to constitute a real deterrent to Russian aggression.

Necessary though it may be to share our atomic secrets and weapons with our allies, without adequate precautions such a move will have two fateful consequences. Still another step away from conventional weapons increases the chances that any war at all in Europe will be a nuclear war. The yawning chasm that divides Europe will therefore become deeper. The goal of relaxing the tensions between East and West will be pushed even further out of reach. Secondly, placing the atomic weapon in the hands of more countries increases the number of those who can eventually trigger the atomic war we seek to avoid.

Because the proposal to share atomic secrets and weapons marks a great divide, it must be considered not in isolation but in the context of the whole of our foreign and military policy. As we rush onward with the arms race, we must try equally to relax the tensions in Europe which make the arms race necessary.

What is needed is a policy for the NATO allies which will demonstrate that while we are preparing for the worst, we shall never cease hoping and working for the best.

I believe that such an alternative possibility lies in the disengagement of Soviet and NATO troops which now confront each other from opposite sides of the Iron Curtain through the heart of Europe. The possibilities of such a disengagement proposal have been discussed here many times before. On

March 16, 1955, 16 other Democratic Members and I spoke of the advantages which might ensue to the Western cause if President Eisenhower were to say to the people of Europe and to all the world:

West German rearmament is underway, because Russia leaves the West no alternative. But if you agree, and if Russia will carry out her part of the bargain by withdrawing to her historic borders, we will welcome a unified and independent Germany; a free Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States, each independent but part of a larger central European community based upon a respect for human rights; and all without the capacity to make aggressive war.

Again, in December 1956, shortly after the Hungarian revolt had shown how shaky was the Soviet hold on the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe, 12 Democratic Members of this body—HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, CHARLES A. BOYLE, JOHN D. DINGELL, TORBERT H. MACDONALD, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, HENRY S. REUSS, GEORGE M. RHODES, PETER W. RODINO, JR., JAMES ROOSEVELT, B. F. SISK, FRANK THOMPSON, JR.—wrote the President suggesting some concrete goals for United States policy in revolution-torn middle Europe based on our own revolutionary ideals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

1. Life: To bring an end to the threat of war in central and eastern Europe. A road toward that goal: creation of a demilitarized area, without the capacity to make aggressive war, for 1,000 miles from the Rhine to Russia's historic boundaries, with the demilitarization and the security of the area guaranteed by the East and West.

2. Liberty: To free the peoples of central and eastern Europe from foreign occupation or domination; to confirm their right to free elections, free speech, free worship, the civil liberties, protection for minorities; and at the same time to guard against the rebirth of totalitarianism from any quarter. A road toward that goal: embedding these human rights in the constitutions of the liberated states, with an international guaranty of their preservation.

3. The pursuit of happiness: To hasten the economic and social progress of the liberated areas, and to provide an alternative to the old nationalistic rivalries for territory and resources. A road toward that goal: encouraging (by such steps as economic aid under international auspices) regional federation and economic integration in central and eastern Europe.

If accepted by the Russians, an offer to withdraw troops and create a demilitarized zone between the Rhine and Russia would greatly increase the chances of peace by widening the area where a mistake could be made without the catastrophe of all-out nuclear war. To those who say that Russia would reject such a proposal, I would answer that the scientific and administrative minds which sent sputnik into orbit should also be able to grasp that such a proposal could be Russia's best assurance against the military threat of a rearmament central Europe. Only by making such an offer can the West encourage such new thoughts to enter the Kremlin's monolithic structure. Moreover, making some such disengagement proposal, even though the Russians reject it, is, I believe, necessary if the NATO alliance is to go forward toward rearmament with any kind of unity.

I believe that a proposal along these general lines would be useful. In making it, I am speaking only for myself. Likewise, those who have joined with me from time to time in making the proposal are speaking only for themselves. We are certainly not suggesting that these ideas are held by everybody but Secretary Dulles, or even that they are held by all Democrats.

Such a disengagement differs, for example, from the stimulating proposals recently made by Mr. George F. Kennan. He talks of the withdrawal of British and United States Armed Forces from the continent of Europe, and the separation of Germany from NATO, in consideration for a Russian troop withdrawal.

I believe, on the contrary, that our forces are needed on the continent, particularly in France and the low countries, to thicken the western European defense on the ground, and as a pledge of our solidarity with our NATO allies. I also believe that there is nothing inconsistent in a reunited Germany, with a self-imposed limitation on its armed forces, remaining a member of NATO.

The proposal I have been making is likewise unacceptable, apparently, to another leading Democrat, though for different reasons. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, like present Secretary Dulles, flatly opposes the West's attempting to secure German reunification and liberation of the enslaved nations by a demilitarization agreement.

Now, I yield to no one in my admiration for Mr. Acheson and Mr. Kennan. They are, both of them, brilliant men, able men, patriotic men, men of vast experience in foreign affairs. Yet I cannot help but feel that both Mr. Kennan and Mr. Acheson have put themselves on record a bit too firmly and inflexibly. I suggest that we in the Congress are lucky enough to have something that Mr. Acheson and Mr. Kennan do not—the opportunity for full debate on the floor of the House, debate where all of us can throw out our ideas to be examined, torn apart, reconstructed, shaped, sharpened and polished by dialog with our colleagues.

If Mr. Kennan were a Member from Pennsylvania, as he might have been, and Mr. Acheson a Representative of the District of Columbia in this body—and who would be a better one when home rule for the District comes true?—the marvelous vehicle of debate would, I am sure, with all of us participating, narrow the differences between them, and between us and each of them, and produce a stream of new ideas that no one person had in the beginning. Because we debate, we have an advantage. We should do more of it. The collective ideas expressed here represent the considered thinking of many. They can form the basis for a new approach to foreign policy with more certainty than can the views of any one person.

Those of us who have been advocating the idea of a fresh diplomatic initiative from the West have until very recently had no encouragement from the administration. Secretary Dulles, citing the long record of broken Russian promises, has opposed any such proposal, in plain disregard of the fact that the proposal

calls not for mere paper promises but for observable physical action. But now, happily, our ideas—or at least somebody's ideas—appear to have borne fruit. In his letter this month to Premier Bulganin, President Eisenhower has apparently overruled Mr. Dulles and has offered in essence the above proposal. After stressing the need for reunification of Germany by free elections, and for self-government for the countries of Eastern Europe, the President said:

The United States is prepared, along with others, to negotiate specific arrangements regarding force levels and deployments and broad treaty undertakings, not merely against aggression but assuring positive reaction should aggression occur in Europe.

To this the President, in my opinion rightly, added the thought that a summit conference would be useful when, and only when, the West had arrived at an agreed point of view on such a proposal, and negotiations forecast some possibility of success.

If these words mean anything, and I hope that they do, they mean that the United States will urge its NATO allies, including West Germany, to prepare with us a Western position regarding the demilitarization of middle Europe as a means to reunify Germany and to bring freedom to the enslaved nations. Here at last is at least a hint of American leadership. Let us pray that the President will assign to the task of carrying it out men who believe in it.

Let us now proceed to the second point.

MR. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point, or would he prefer to wait until he has finished his prepared statement?

MR. REUSS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

MR. RHODES of Arizona. Before the gentleman leaves the first point I would like to ask my colleague from Wisconsin a question. He, incidentally, is making a fine contribution I think to the legislation which we must carry on here through the fact that he has taken this time and allowed us to join in with him in debating this very important subject. As to the peaceful disengagement part of the plan, does the gentleman have any idea, first, as to the likelihood that the Russians might accept such a thing; and second, as to the sanctions which might be employed if such a plan should be put into effect to make sure that the Russians did not cheat on us? The gentleman said, and I think it is true, that there have been many agreements the Russians have made which have been broken. We have no way I know of of making sure this agreement, if made, would not be broken, that across the line there might be divisions—they might be guided missiles, and so forth—ready to remilitarize this particular zone at any given time. I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten us on some of the practical means of accomplishing the things he suggests.

MR. REUSS. Yes. As to the first question asked by the gentleman from Arizona, would Russia buy this? No one can tell. It is true that in November 1956, no doubt frightened by the

realization that Hungarian guns could point east as well as west, Bulganin did write the President a letter in which he stated that he would like to talk about this sort of thing. However, the point is not whether the Kremlin at this moment would be prepared seriously to consider such a proposal, which I consider advantageous to the West as well as in Russia's true national interest, but whether the making of such a proposal would not gird up the lagging spirit of the NATO alliance, so that we could go forward sure that while we are arming to the teeth, we also have left no stone unturned in our effort to see whether it is not possible to turn aside the arms race which seems to be leading nowhere.

Secondly, I think it is very important that we have a proposal in being so that everybody in the world can paste in his hat some sense of where the West is going. Ultimately we might lead people in Russia who are ambitious for power and have a little truer concept of where the real interests of Soviet Russia lie to get their word in. There is such a thing as public opinion in Russia, though it is not the same kind of public opinion we have. The gentleman from Arizona, who has had the advantage of visiting Soviet Russia, would tell us, I am sure, that the Russians are people, they are subject to the same emotions and drives as the rest of mankind. If the West demonstrates its willingness to offer a proposal which is fair and just, it might be that ultimately some force in Russia would come into being that would consider such a proposal.

Let me get to the second point raised by the gentleman, and if I have not answered him I will yield again.

The second question was, in effect, What about the Russian record of broken promises? How can you trust the Russians? To that I would say if we were talking about a paper pact, the sort of mutual nonaggression pact which Prime Minister Macmillan proposed the other day, I would agree that such a pact would not be worth the paper it was written on because it has no enforcement provisions, it has no sanctions wrapped up in it.

What I am proposing here today, and what has been proposed earlier on the floor of the House by myself and some of my colleagues, is that Russian troops withdraw to Russia's historic borders, leaving Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and the other occupied countries; that an international system of inspection be set up in that whole vast area; that the armaments of those countries be confined to what is necessary for border defense, domestic policing, and so forth, and not be such as to be capable of aggressive warfare. This is a proposal susceptible of real down-to-earth finite inspection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to point out that the President of the United States has asked the Russians any number of times to enter into a scheme for disarmament and for policing of atomic weapons by the use of inspection methods. Thus far the Russians have been completely unwilling to do any such thing. Does the gentleman

have any reason to believe in the satellite areas there would be any more willingness on the part of the Russians to enter into such a scheme as there would be in the other schemes offered?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. The previous disarmament discussions have centered on degrees of disarmament in Russia itself by the Russian armed forces and within this country by our own Armed Forces.

While not suggesting for a moment that those discussions are not profitable and were not sincerely undertaken by our administration, nevertheless they differ vastly in kind from a proposal that there be a degree of demilitarization in these areas of central and eastern Europe where Russia now has found to its cost that she is not in complete control and only by military repression can she maintain her sway. I therefore think this is a vastly different matter.

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

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

Mr. TEWES. This matter of discussing our present policy always seems to come back, particularly from the other side of the aisle, as some proposals which are so much better than those that are being followed at the present time, and yet when we begin to analyze those proposals they almost generally come back to what we are doing now.

Mr. REUSS. I could not agree with the gentleman more. I think that it is a happy augury that after 3 years of sounding off in the wilderness on this side, just 2 weeks ago, on January 10th, in his letter to Premier Bulganin, President Eisenhower, in the passage just quoted, seems to have seized the essence of what we are suggesting. I, for one, will promise my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, that I will give the President full and unstinted support in his efforts to carry out that suggestion. And, if my remarks are construed as an endorsement of that passage, and as approval of the President for what he has done, that is exactly the truth. We rejoice that the President said that.

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

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

Mr. BOYLE. Permit me to go on record as favoring the proposals delineated and outlined by the great Congressman from Wisconsin, HENRY REUSS, who has been in the forefront of the fight requesting a program seeking a positive approach to foreign affairs. When our group early in 1955, took the floor of the House some 3 years ago, we were hoping that in the area of foreign affairs we might be able to locate common ground that admitted at least a limited agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. The approach to finding areas of agreement in the delicate field of foreign affairs is a lot like trying a lawsuit. When the judge at the threshold of a case calls in the respective sides he does not try to litigate all of the issues, but rather explores the issues that are both germane and that admit of agreement and stipulation.

In the total picture, if we are going to adopt a foreign policy that is clear, concise, consistent, and courageous, generally speaking any number of nations will have certain areas wherein common ground exists for compromise, association and agreement. It is not necessary to go back and review what our statements were 3 years ago. They were directed toward exploring the possibility of finding a peaceful solution in the arms race. Today the substantial evidence of the alleged recent shift in the two-nation comparison of military capital would almost seem to indicate a continued need along this line in American foreign policy. The threat of immediate retaliation from nearby air bases was one thing when only the United States had the A-bomb or when we had a wide margin of superiority in thermonuclear weapons. It is something different when the Soviet Union appears to have intermediate missiles to knock out all our forward bases in the case of a hypothetical surprise attack. In the light of nuclear developments, conventional warfare is synonymous with total annihilation.

Due to the fact that my Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations is now wrestling with the military budget I cannot stay for all of this debate. Nothing that we are doing here indicates that we are not going to continue to make America strong and continue to have her recognize her role as the number one nation in the world.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin in again shouldering the responsibility of bringing this to the attention of the Congress. Today we are not arguing the philosophies of individuals apart from Dulles or Acheson. I rise merely to inquire if there is not some common area or some common agreement that points the way to future opportunities and future hopes for all mankind, because today the hope is that somewhere the United States will bring into play new American initiatives for peace which are plainly and unmistakably the requirement, the demand, and the essence of foreign policy.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

2. DEEMPHASIZING MILITARY AID

Let me now turn to a second great question: Does our emphasis on the military security of the underdeveloped countries, rather than on their economic, political and social development, advance or retard our national interest?

Our aid program should aim primarily at helping people to develop their agriculture and industry, so that their rising expectations may be at least in part fulfilled. Then, as they get hope for the future, they are more likely to develop an attachment to free institutions. As best we can, we want to project to them an image of America that is generous and understanding—the America of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln.

This image of America simply isn't coming through to the people of Asia and the Middle East. More than three-fourths of our aid program for the last few years has been in military hardware and in "defense support". In the Presi-

dent's budget message this month, of the total request of \$3.9 billion, \$2.7 billion was for military aid.

Now, I believe that military aid is a necessity for many countries along the Communist perimeter. They need arms as a deterrent to open Communist aggression, and to protect against subversion at home. Military aid should be a shield behind which countries can develop themselves.

Instead, however, military aid has all too often become an end in itself.

I know that many Members feel, as I do, that Congress every year has been voting billions for military assistance without the benefit of full and open Congressional debate. As you know, the administration every year classifies as "secret" all the important details of military assistance—this three-fourths of our foreign-aid program. Thus the important policy questions each year—how much individual countries get, why they get it, and what they do with it—are never debated at all.

Let us look at some of the questions that are never even debated here. Is it true that our military have overloaded certain countries with military equipment which they are unable to use? Is it true that this military hardware is lying around instead of being recaptured and redistributed to other countries? Is it true that the huge size of some of the armed forces we are supplying is based on political motivation rather than on military considerations? These are the sober findings of the Comptroller General of the United States in his report of September 23, 1957. Yet we cannot debate these matters fully, because the administration pulls the veil of secrecy over them.

Or let us go a little further. Is the 600,000-man army of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek needed for the defense of Formosa, with a population of 10 million? Are the hundreds of millions of dollars we spend every year keeping 80,000 Chinese Nationalist troops on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu a sensible expenditure of funds? Would not the money better be spent on our own missile program? Is supporting the army of Laos, a country which recently took the Communist opposition into its government, a good bet? Does it make sense to maintain an army of 150,000 men in Vietnam, with a population of 12 million and an average annual income of only \$116, at the expense of a native program of land reform? Who is the Pakistani navy, supported by this country, supposed to frighten—the rulers of the Kremlin, or the Government of India? Is it wise to send rifles to King Saud of Saudi Arabia to be used against our British allies in neighboring Oman? Or to send American planes to Spain to be used against the Arabs of Morocco?

I don't know the answer to all these questions. And the reason I don't know is that we in Congress are never allowed to debate them. Nine-tenths of the "secret" classification which the administration puts on its military assistance program is as silly as its continued classification of a World War II report on the bow and arrow as secret. I notice that the administration has retained Mr. Eric

Johnston to popularize its aid program. I suggest as a first step that the administration stop kidding Congress, the American press, and the American people, and let us see what we are voting on. Let the administration this year, for the first time, tell every word of the military aid story that can be told without violating genuine security precautions. If it does, nine-tenths of its classified material can be declassified. And this House, for the first time, will be able to place military aid in its proper perspective.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is dealing with an important and very perplexing problem. That is, how much secrecy there should be in legislation dealing with military questions. As the gentleman knows, the entire Manhattan project was voted for by Congressmen who did not know it was going on. Since that time we have heard from the small group who knew about it. What a dreadful responsibility they carried when there was a question as to whether the whole thing might not fail and we might have wasted billions of dollars devoted secretly to that project. Yet I think the gentleman would probably agree we have had a justified measure of secrecy.

Mr. REUSS. I agree entirely on that.

Mr. VORYS. Now, in the field of military aid, the gentleman says that nine-tenths of the information could be made public. I presume that that is not meant to be a figure given with mathematical precision.

Mr. REUSS. It is my judgment, from having seen the secrets and having, after the fact, felt that about nine-tenths could be made public. As the gentleman knows, much of this material is subsequently declassified and it is not due to any special privilege that I get to see it.

Mr. VORYS. I believe the substance of what the gentleman said, and I want to be correct, is that all military information should be revealed except that which is required to be kept secret by military considerations. The idea of the fellows over in the Pentagon as to what this exception is differs from the gentleman's idea of it and differs repeatedly from mine. However, I wish the gentleman would comment on this: In order to bridge this gap, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has hammered away insisting that as much information as possible be made in full. There was one year in which we were able to give the amounts that were to go to the European countries, to make them public in our reports. But this past year we have had the secret books here at the committee table throughout the days of debate and repeatedly announced that any Member of Congress was welcome to see those books. The gentleman says that, although he is not on our committee, he has seen these figures, as he has had a right to. I am sure he has not disclosed any information that would be of value to our enemies. But does not the gentleman feel that, if we make available to all Members of Congress this information but do attempt to preserve the sort of secrecy the military people feel should be

preserved, that is just about the best we can do about it?

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman for asking his clarifying question. My answer is, "No," sir. I do not think it is the best we can do about it. I do not think we should always accept as gospel the classification which the military gives a given article of information, because so often supposed political considerations color their judgment.

As to anything of the character of the Manhattan type of project, anything that has to do with weapons or major strategy, anything which could give the slightest possible aid or comfort to our enemy, as the gentleman well knows I yield to no man in my insistence on secrecy. However, we have gotten into the habit of accepting the military's value judgment as to what is classified and what is not. It is not enough that any Member may go and read the books containing the arcana, which are lying readily available. I myself have done that and found myself many times fairly bursting with a question to ask involving those matters, but have not been able to ask it. Thus the clash of debate on the floor, which incidentally right now as we talk is producing an interchange which may clarify our ideas, has no opportunity to operate. I ask the administration, and I would ask it were it a Democratic administration, to review some of these examples of what I call excessive classification, classification that has no real bearing on military matters but which I strongly suspect is sometimes designed to keep the people of this country from finding out what is going on.

I might add one more thought, that there is a weapon in the Congressional armory that might conceivably be used. Under rule 29, as the gentleman well knows, the House sitting as the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, may proceed in executive session. If the administration does not take a more realistic view of what are the real secrets which ought to be kept and what are the political and economic judgments which ought to be debated on the floor, I think it may well be that some of the Members may have to consider whether it would not be worthwhile to invoke rule 29, so that the whole House may see how silly and untenable some of these classifications are.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Will the gentleman indulge me a question further because he is touching on a problem that we face constantly—he is touching on a problem that representatives of free governments face all over the world, and that is: How are you going to preserve necessary secrecy and, yet, give the people and the people's representatives sufficient information so that they can debate and decide intelligently. But one of the reasons for secrecy in these military programs, and at times in the other aid programs is the jealousy between some of our dear allies. That if country A knows that country B is getting more jets than country A, we are in a

hot diplomatic situation—not with prospective enemies—but we are in a three-cornered argument between two of our dear friends and our Government. Now, that, the gentleman may well say, is a political consideration—

Mr. REUSS. I do say that.

Mr. VORYS. But would not the gentleman agree that it is a valid consideration which we must consider? When I say we, I mean not only the Department of State and not only the Pentagon, but Members of Congress.

Mr. REUSS. No, I would not agree. I think the public interest in full and fair debate outweighs the marginal and questionable political considerations involved. I think it may be a useful thing if at the beginning of a full, fair and open debate, all the Members of Congress made it very clear that anything that was to be said about a specific allotment to a country was not binding; and that no countries should have their duck dinner before the duck was shot. Before the debate was concluded, I think it could be made clear that we were not making any final determinations.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would like to make some observations. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that we have too much secrecy. Some 3 or 4 years ago, when I was meeting with the atomic scientists at the University of Chicago, I said: "Now, suppose you all took a plane and you went to see Joe Stalin and you told him everything that you know, would you be giving him any information that he does not already possess?" They said, "Well, Dr. Urey is not here. Shall we take him along?" I said, "Yes, take him along and take Dr. Allison, the head of the nuclear studies at the university."

Then, they said, "No, there might be a few little details, but in general, there would be no information that we possess now that he does not possess." I think we do have too much secrecy.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is on another subject that I wish to address myself. This debate today, I believe, serves a very useful service. I think it would be well if we had more of these debates on the matter of foreign policy. But, with reference to the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that there is to be such a full debate in this Chamber so that any Member of this body could ask questions on any one of these points, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is losing sight of the fact that we are operating in a body of 435 Members. All of us have to keep ourselves restrained. If we all asked questions, if we all sought to participate in the debate, our sessions would never end. So, I think we all feel that when there is a matter under discussion in this Chamber, unless we feel that we have some information that will render a contribution to the debate, we should remain silent unless we are especially prepared on the subject. In other words, we operate, as we all know, through committees.

On the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I have been a member for only a brief period, I try to conduct myself as I

have, as a new member, in listening rather than talking. But on that committee are members of every line of thought. I think matters are pretty well gone into in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as I am sure they are on all of the other committees. So if there are questions that should be asked and answers given to them, they should be given to the House that we might be able to work out some little better way where those who have questions to ask might feel that they would be answered.

I know the gentleman does not wish his remarks to be interpreted as trying to keep certain things secret. We have a large membership, and I am sure that on all of these matters we do the best we can.

I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] for having this special order today. I hope he will have other special orders as we go along so that we may have hearings where we have time and opportunity for a full discussion and the answering on the floor of any questions that are in the minds of Members.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. TEWES. Is the gentleman not overlooking an important fact in his discussion of the advisability of secrecy concerning these matters? I share with him the same ideals concerning security and the desirability of avoiding as much as possible disclosing secrets. However, I think the gentleman started the discussion by asking some questions, and said he did not know the answers. Is it not possible he does not know the answers because he, like myself, is not a military expert? He is not qualified to answer those questions. Only military people are able to answer those questions, and they desire, on account of strategic situations, to keep the information secret. So that if it were made available to the gentleman and to me, we would not be able to give an intelligent and professional decision.

Mr. REUSS. I cannot agree with the gentleman there. While I admit that my military experience was at a very low level, consisting largely of holding the general's horse, I still was close enough to the high military to realize that they are not always infallible. In a civilian society I think it is important that the basic power of decision be vested where the Constitution vested it, and that is right here in the Congress.

Now I must decline to yield for a moment or else I will not be able to take up my third point.

The last point that I want to talk about this afternoon has to do with technical assistance to underdeveloped areas.

3. UPGRADING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The point 4 program was proudly proclaimed 8 years ago. Because of inadequate support, it has never really gotten off the ground. Today, in all of Asia and the Middle East there are only 712 United States "shirtless ambassadors" at work.

I firmly believe that our point 4 program can be the most effective thing that

we do. It is America working toward village democracy, toward social progress, toward expanding productivity. It takes place out in the countryside, not in the nations' capitals. It engages the support of Americans who want to learn the country's language and know its people. Because point 4 activities depend upon the consent of village people, they are not the kinds of things that totalitarians do very well. Technical cooperation rather than military hardware or even grandiose political-economic projects is the one kind of program which we do best and the Communists do worst.

The American people would get a great lift if they could see some of their short-sleeved ambassadors in action. In Cambodia possibly the best-loved foreigners in the country are the American schoolteachers who are training the Cambodians to open village schools. In Formosa American technicians are helping put into effect a land-reform program that is a model for other parts of Asia. In Vietnam, where the departing French failed to leave behind a civil service, point 4 technicians from Michigan State University are patiently creating a cadre of trained native civil servants. In the Philippines American technicians are working hard at the barrio program to train villagers in the rudiments of democratic organization—how to dig a community well, built a school, or treat a malarial swamp.

You would have thought that the administration's reaction to sputnik and to the vastly accelerated Communist foreign-aid program would have been an upgrading of the point 4 approach. Instead, the International Cooperation Administration has just announced that it wants to cut the number of American technicians abroad to the minimum. And whereas last year the administration requested, and Congress authorized, \$151 million for United States technical assistance, this year the administration has reduced its request to \$142 million.

This is going straight in the wrong direction. There may well be plenty of places to cut in the military aid program, if the administration would only let Congress debate it. If there are too many official Americans in the capitals of these countries, it is because the military assistance program and its defense support has mushroomed. The administration is firing on the wrong target.

What we need is an expansion, not a contraction, of the point 4 program. What we need is not misguided threats to cut down the number of American point 4 technicians, such as the administration has been making, but a recruitment program which will inspire young Americans to serve their country in far-off places as shirtless ambassadors.

These, then, are some concrete suggestions for getting our foreign policy off dead center. Let us end the paralysis in NATO by accepting the suggestion of Chancellor Adenauer that we must both "arm and negotiate." Let us end unnecessary secrecy in the multi-billion dollar military assistance program, and let it stand up to debate on the floor. Let us do our best to see that point 4, crushed to earth, can rise again.

You will notice that I have not called for the resignation of Secretary Dulles. The President has just gotten through telling us all that he thinks the Secretary is the wisest man he has ever met. All we ask is that the Secretary apply his wisdom, and develop some creative ideas for meeting the problems that confront us.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, there are several questions I wish to ask my friend and colleague from Wisconsin; the first has to do with his opening statement in which he seemed to imply that there has been a marked change in the position of the State Department as regards a summit conference with the Russians.

Mr. REUSS. I did not make any such implication.

Mr. LAIRD. Has there been any change in the recent Bulganin letter?

The position of the Secretary of State as regards a summit meeting has not been recently changed to my knowledge.

Mr. REUSS. Thou sayest.

Mr. LAIRD. And that has been his position for a good many months.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman must have a pipeline to the Secretary that is not open to the ordinary citizen.

Mr. TEWES. How about the blue sky proposal?

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman has no pipeline. In connection with the statement made by the gentlemen that the foreign aid military budget is not openly and freely debated, I do not know what the situation is in the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I can tell the gentleman that on the Appropriations Committee the requests are freely and openly debated country by country, defense project by defense project, weapons, munitions, all the way down the line. They are freely and openly debated in our committee.

Mr. REUSS. I appreciate that.

Mr. LAIRD. I am sure if we conducted all that debate on the floor of the House, the bidding between countries would cost the American taxpayers many millions of dollars; and I certainly think that we cannot afford this type of bidding in our foreign assistance program at the present time.

Mr. REUSS. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in economy in our Government.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman's comments on technical assistance interested me, not because of my disagreement with what he said but because of a misunderstanding as to the amounts involved. The request this year is for \$164 million of which, looking at the budget docket, they say:

This increase will help to broaden the scope of multilateral cooperation through a new program for regional surveys of resources and for regional training institutes approved last December by the United Nations General Assembly.

So that we are to have more technical assistance and it is proposed that more of it be by general multilateral rather than bilateral.

Mr. REUSS. If I may interrupt the gentleman right there, because I really must ask for a little definition of that which is subsummed under the \$164 million technical assistance request. If that \$164 million is all for technical assistance, it is technical assistance on a most Pickwickian basis. If you read the fine print, you will find that a lot of this is for U. N. regional surveys. I am for regional surveys, but they are not shirt-sleeved Americans out there in the rice paddies, they are not American school-teachers, they are not American county agents helping backward people to develop themselves. I will stand or fall on my analysis of the current budget: that whereas last year the administration asked for \$151 million of United States technical assistance, this year they have reduced that to \$142 million. I think it is a crying shame that is so in view of this sputnik challenge.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. COFFIN. On the point of this technical assistance, I commend the gentleman for his emphasis in that department. I think the gentleman from Ohio is not against this kind of assistance. But I do want to call to the gentleman's attention the fact that in the U. N. it was our country that made the proposal through our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] that we increase the fund from \$30 million to \$100 million and that he would be willing to recommend to this body that we increase our percentage from 33 percent to 40 percent.

Mr. REUSS. I am heartily back of him in that.

Mr. COFFIN. If that happens, it is my understanding—I may be mistaken—that this additional money will come out of the \$154 million that the gentleman from Ohio talked about. I may be in error but it is my understanding increased multination technical assistance will reduce—perhaps a more substantial reduction—2 or 3 times our contribution here last year, so that our unilateral programs will be cut severely and I understand our own people in that department are very unhappy about the prospects.

Mr. REUSS. Let us try to reduce their unhappiness.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. May I say at the outset that this discussion today is a healthy one and I may say it is healthy whether you are on the Committee on Foreign Affairs or not. I happen to be a member of that committee. We talk about moralistic preachments. It seems to me the gentleman's first proposition for peaceful disengagement is just that, a moralistic preachment. As a practical matter it is quite impossible.

Mr. REUSS. What is impossible about it?

Mr. CEDERBERG. We cannot get the Russians to agree.

Mr. REUSS. If it is such a good proposal and so much to our advantage, as the gentleman suggests, that the Rus-

sians will surely reject it, then it cannot possibly hurt for us to go along with the deeply held beliefs of many of our allied peoples.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I find nothing wrong in making the proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, may I first commend those who have taken time to speak today and have entered into this debate. I am happy to see that it is generally recognized that it is a contribution to the understanding of those Members of the Congress who feel that they must have as much information as possible before they vote on the foreign policy programs that will be before us shortly. I would particularly like to thank the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], for being here and for giving us the benefit of his comments as we have proceeded in the debate. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] made a very valuable contribution, also. Not in the sense of contention I think it is well to point out that there are some things which perhaps are misunderstood and need a little bit of clarification. For instance, those of us who signed the letter to which the gentleman referred, I think were referring to some very specific things. For instance, we were referring to the fact that we wondered where our country was at the time that Egypt was building up on the Sinai desert a large accumulation of Russian-fed, Communist-trained men and weapons to be used, as the documents have well proved, in an aggressive campaign against Israel. There seemed to be no comment from us at that time, although we were not slow to join in condemning retaliatory measures taken by Israel, taken against those who were conducting the Fedayeen raids against Israel. I think, too, we were referring to the policy of accepting from the King of Saudi Arabia a condition which would deny some of the people of certain religious faiths in our country the right to serve in the American Armed Forces overseas where they directly came into contact with Saudi Arabia. That, it seems to me, violates every moral principle and something on which we should have in the first place stood our ground and refused to give 1 inch in accepting.

In talking about partisanship on our question of foreign policy, I think it is well for us to point out that we, who are Democrats, as far as the executive branch of the Government is concerned, have the responsibility to try to make constructive criticisms to improve the foreign policy of our country. I think it is important to note that there have been times in our history, such as in World War II, when a Democratic administration took into the Cabinet of

the President, two leading Republicans in order to give it a nonpartisan aspect. Such has not been deemed necessary at the present time, by the present administration, and I am not blaming them. I think they have their right to that decision, but I do think it emphasizes the fact that we do have a duty and a responsibility to our country, if we believe that our foreign policy can be improved, both as a party and as individuals to make that position known.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. It seems to me that calling in Senator George and our former colleague from South Carolina, the beloved chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Richards, and the recent candidate of the Democrat Party, Mr. Stevenson, all of those being examples of where Democrats have been called in to advise and serve within the past year, is a fairly good record.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, I think that the recent excursion into the administration of the former Democratic candidate for President was hardly bringing him into the inner councils. I admit he was allowed to nibble on the edge, but he was definitely excluded from anything but nibbling, and that was, incidentally, why he felt he could not go to NATO.

Mr. VORYS. The other two certainly were in the inner councils and had the rank of ambassador under this administration. It seems to me that is a good example of what the gentleman suggests.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If I may suggest, I think the record should be kept straight. Our former colleague was invited in to sell a policy of the administration in the Middle East, which he dutifully went and did. And after having not made policy, but simply carried out a policy, he was allowed to go on his way. He was not invited to remain and to continue to advise on policy matters.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, when I had the previous special order some time ago I asked some questions and I do not know whether they were answered because I had to be absent through most of the special order of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss]. But the question in which I was very much interested and very anxious to have an answer to was, when a week ago the former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, was speaking and criticizing the administration, whom is Mr. Acheson speaking for? Is he speaking for the Democratic National Committee? Is he speaking for the Democratic Policy Committee? Is he speaking as an individual or just whom is he representing? I wonder if the gentleman can give me any light on that?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I cannot give the gentleman any light on that. I suggest that if the gentleman wrote a letter to Mr. Acheson, I am sure he would be glad to tell him whom he is representing.

Mr. BENTLEY. The gentleman does not think he is representing his party in any sense of the word?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. So far as I am concerned, he was not representing me. He did not ask me what my views were, and so far as I know, none of my colleagues. But I think he is entitled to speak. I think the gentleman will agree that he has a degree of background which would entitle him to give his opinion to the American people.

Mr. BENTLEY. I notice that he gave his remarks in a press conference following a meeting of the Democratic Advisory Committee or the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am afraid I do not know exactly when he made his comments.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] in who is speaking for whom, it might be advisable for him to tell us whom Sherman Adams was speaking for in Minneapolis a few days ago when he charged that the Democratic Party was responsible for the Korean war and for the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to say, in that particular respect, I do not know how many people Governor Adams was speaking for, but he was speaking for me.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Did I understand the gentleman from Michigan takes the position that the Democratic Party is responsible for Pearl Harbor and for Korea?

Mr. BENTLEY. If the gentleman would like me to elucidate that point on the time of the gentleman from California, I should be happy to.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman said that he agreed with Governor Adams. I should think he would be glad to say yes or no to my question.

Mr. BENTLEY. I did.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I want very briefly to try to sum up some of the feelings which I gathered during a recent visit in the Middle East. Primarily I think that those who have been there will agree with me when I say that we have the definite impression that the prestige of the United States has never been lower than it has recently been in the Middle East. I think this is reflected not only on the part of those who are there in an official capacity, but also those who are there in business capacities. There must be a reason for it, and the reason I think is because of the inconsistency of our foreign policy in the Middle East. In the Middle East we take the position of neutralism. We are unwilling to offend those on the side of the questions that are debated between Israel and the Arab States for

fear of offending one side or the other but especially the Arabs. All this does not square with our insistence in the rest of the world that there can be no neutralism, that you must either be against communism or you must be for communism. We lose no opportunity to urge all nations to join the battle on one side or the other.

I think, too, that the other reason for bewilderment and loss of prestige of the people of the Middle East toward our country is largely because we talk about freedom and we are talking to people about defending a free world, when in actuality that is an empty platitude to these people who have never enjoyed the blessing of freedom and who have no incentive to rise up in its defense.

Our policy in the Middle East, it would seem to me, has been largely built around military necessity. We believe that the idea of having military bases there is more important than the fundamental proposition of winning the hearts and the minds of the people so that they may join us from conviction and not just from military necessity.

I think it cannot be gainsaid that we have not had in the Middle East a bold program around which perhaps all of the people in that area could rally and instead of that they have seen us give arms and give encouragement to rulers in an area where there can be no question that the rulers have not been operating for the fundamental benefit of the people over whom they rule.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I should like to ask the gentleman one question along this line as long as we are discussing the Middle East, and it has to do again with our good friend, Mr. Acheson. When he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs about a year ago in connection with our hearings on the Eisenhower doctrine he indicated in his prepared statement grave and serious doubt in his own mind as to the wisdom of this Government's having participated in the establishment of Israel as an independent nation. I was so interested that I questioned him when it came my turn to make sure that was what he meant. At greater length he repeated that there was doubt in his own mind as to the wisdom of whether we should ever have been responsible for the creation of Israel in the Middle East. I should like to ask my friend from California to join with me in my 100-percent disagreement with Mr. Acheson's statement at that time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I most certainly join in disagreement with it. I believe in recognizing Israel, being the first nation to do so, in helping in the United Nations to pass the United Nations Resolution, which of course was passed by an overwhelming majority of the nations of the world, that we did strike a blow for democracy and freedom, and that we did the right thing and the just thing. I hope that our present policy, which seems to indicate that perhaps we have a little doubt as to whether we did the right thing, is also wrong, and that

the time has come to drop that neutralism and to come out and support what I think is our best ally by all odds in the Middle East. I hope the gentleman will agree with me in that statement.

Mr. BENTLEY. I certainly do, and I do not think the present administration has expressed the doubt that Acheson had.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I call the attention of the gentleman to this unfortunate speech which was made on December 11 in my home State of California, published in the Department of State's Bulletin on January 20, which gives it, of course, added emphasis, because this is a publication which gives the aura of authority and respectability. In the speech, Mr. Edward M. J. Kretzmann, Public Affairs Adviser in the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, declared categorically, and I am going to quote it:

The official United States attitude toward the Arab-Israel dispute is one of sympathetic impartiality, which means we are neutral.

I hope the gentleman will join me in urging the Department of State not to let officials of our Government make those statements and then print them in the Bulletin of the Department of State where they get official recognition all over the world.

May I go on from there and simply say that I think if we would perhaps in this session of Congress urge that the whole question of military aid and non-military aid in the Middle East be separate and that we get a good look at the issues there and have it very carefully explained, perhaps we would come up with a more realistic and a much more fundamental foreign policy in the Middle East.

I am sure that many Members of this House will agree that there can be no certainty when we ship arms to any country in the Middle East that those arms will not be used for purposes which are abhorrent to the American people in view of the expressed statements of the rulers of those countries to whom many of these arms are being shipped.

I hope we can find a way to gear, perhaps, our economic aid to a policy which will try, as far as possible, to eliminate all of the arms race in the Middle East and to bear down upon the fact that when we send arms to an area which is obviously torn by dissent, we are only helping to build the possibility of at least a local outbreak of war with the possibility that it might—or with the extreme possibility, perhaps, that it might easily erupt into a world war. I hope then that we will look over that position and, perhaps, decide whether we would be stronger if we were to take a greater direct responsibility against aggression in the Middle East rather than rely on the kind of policy that we have had in the past. I believe such a policy would be doing more to put a damper on any possible aggression whether it be from Russia or whether it be on the part of one country against another country in the Middle East.

I hope that we will go forward with a realistic and forceful examination of

what we can do in the way of eliminating disease and eliminating ignorance, and build the kind of economic program which people can see and feel and which people can know will have a direct bearing upon the future of their children. If we build that kind of program, I have no fear that the penetration of the Russians into the Middle East can be very successful on an economic or social basis of any kind. I would hope that we will see that kind of program coming up from the President in the presentation of foreign policy when it comes before this body.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I am glad that the gentleman from California has suggested that we separate our economic aid and our military aid, particularly in the Middle East. I am concerned about some of our economic aid in the Middle East and in other areas of the world from a little different standpoint. I feel that we are building more multipurpose dams, for instance, in those areas than we are building in our own country. Just last summer before the Congress adjourned, a committee of this House issued a report and it was printed by the committee in which they said:

The military force objectives presently approved for United States support in certain allied countries are not always realistic in terms of the responsibility of the country, manpower, and financial capabilities and are not always mutually acceptable to the countries concerned and are not always motivated by military considerations.

Then the report also said:

In addition, these objectives are fiscally infeasible.

Now, like the gentleman from California, I have always supported foreign aid. I have supported all increases when they have been suggested on the floor of the House, but it becomes very difficult for me to go along with the present program of no new starts in reclamation and no new starts in the development of multipurpose dams, and then to find that some of this economic aid abroad is being given for projects that are fiscally infeasible projects which could not be authorized by a legislative committee of this Congress.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to my good friend, I quite agree with him. I think we must only deal with feasible projects. I also agree with him that charity begins at home. Keeping America strong, is the only way that we are going to be able to fulfill these responsibilities which are thrust upon us in our position of leadership in the world.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly agree with the majority of the things that the gentleman from Montana has said about reclamation. Certainly, it behooves us to do what we can to build up the areas of the West and do it as rapidly as possible. However, I would

like to take issue with the gentleman when he said that there have been no new starts. Perhaps, the gentleman did not mean during this entire administration. I would like to point out the Upper Colorado River project which I am sure the gentleman who has the floor does not sympathize with, and which has been authorized during this administration, as have other projects.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I wonder if I could ask the gentleman to be good enough to postpone that argument since it is a little extraneous to the subject that I want to discuss.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would point out to the gentleman that it was not my argument.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may clarify my statement?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I said that the administration program for this year in the new budget is a program of no new starts in reclamation or multipurpose projects. Of course, the gentleman knows that I supported the Upper Colorado River project.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on one other thing. I am sure those of us who have been in the Middle East and studied it at all, have been distressed by the continued existence of the Arab refugee problem which exists there. Having visited there, I want to emphasize that now is the time, if these roughly 1 million refugees are not going to become the breeding place for saboteurs and for all kinds of terrorism, now is the time for a concerted effort to go forward with a plan that would eliminate the existence of these refugee areas. We must recognize in this country that this cannot be done by "striped pants" diplomacy. We can only get it done if we work without fanfare, if we come forward with a realistic program to provide jobs for those people, which are attractive enough to take them away from the horrible position in which they live. We must recognize that neither the Israelis nor the Arab countries are going to back down in their position that this is not their responsibility or their fault. I think we have proven already, through the operation of some of the projects in Iraq, that the unpublishized program that can be carried out with force and determination is the basis upon which this problem can be dealt with in cooperation with the United Nations. I want to urge my colleagues at every possible opportunity to urge the Department of State to come forward with such a rounded program in cooperation with representatives of the United Nations, that this sore upon humanity may be eliminated, with the obliteration of these refugee camps. I think we will see the day of realistic discussion of peaceful negotiations and resolution of the other issues in the Middle East.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. As the gentleman knows, we have a substantial sum of

money, I think \$65 million that has been authorized for some years for the purpose of settling the refugee question, and we have been unable to spend it because we have never gotten an agreed plan. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the United States should proceed to attempt to solve the whole refugee problem and accede to the proposition that neither the Arabs nor the Israelis are going to accept any responsibility? Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, sir. Let me make clear what I stated. I said that neither the Arabs nor the Israelis are going to sit down and acknowledge that this is their fault that this refugee problem exists. I am sure that a great many of the Arab Nations would be willing to undertake their share in the solution of the problem, but they are not going to stand by and formally admit, in treaty form, that this is the result of their particular action, whether military or economic.

Mr. VORYS. I am glad to have the gentleman's amplification.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is not only our responsibility. We cannot go it alone. But because we probably have the greatest stake in it, we do have the obligation to lead the way. I am simply urging that we change the effort we have made in the past for formal declarations—change that toward informal efforts that will lead to specific programs, tying them in with our economic aid problem, which will bring about results in actually moving those people.

I think the gentleman knows that perhaps 80,000 people went from these refugee camps to Iraq at the time certain projects were undertaken in that area.

It was not done in formal announcements or by formal treaties, and I think it is that kind of program we need today.

Mr. VORYS. I think the gentleman will agree that if such informal activities as the gentleman recommends are now going on and since he recognizes that they are going on without fanfare and undue publicity, whether it would be helpful to call too much attention to them at this moment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, sir; but I want to say to the gentleman that I was dismayed to learn from the UNRA representatives in the Middle East that they had never been approached, that not even a beginning has been made on such a program.

Mr. VORYS. My information is at variance with the gentleman's.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be happy to discuss it with the gentleman and give him such information as I have.

I now yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have prepared some remarks on the question of our economic aid and investment programs in the underdeveloped areas. I ask unanimous consent to extend them at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I would like to say to the gentleman from California that I very heartily endorse his statement here today as to the necessity of stepping up our economic and technical assistance programs in the Middle East and perhaps scaling down some of the military assistance that we have been sending to that part of the world. In this connection I wish to ask our friend from California if he feels that the military aid we have sent to the Middle Eastern states and particularly those along the northern tier would in any way prove to be a deterrent against Soviet military invasion if the Soviets should decide on such a course?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say to the gentleman from South Dakota after talking to military men in the area as well as military men here at home that the agreed upon answer to that question is that the military aid we have sent would not be sufficient to stop any invasion whether it be Russian, Turkish, or any other well-organized military unit. Therefore, in actuality what we have done thus far is more for political purposes, as I believe was brought out earlier in the debate. I come back to what I said earlier, imposition of a real arms embargo in the Middle East would enable those countries that have so much to do for the basic welfare of their people, to spend their time, their money, and their efforts working for the improvement of the people in the area rather, to often unfortunately this military buildup, in effect, only serves to keep a particular ruling party in power and to suppress the great majority of the people.

Mr. McGOVERN. Will not the gentleman agree that it is unrealistic to talk about building a framework of military strength on a foundation of disease, ignorance, and poverty? It seems to me that these are the real problems of the people of the Middle East.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I agree with my friend absolutely. I note that he comes from a somewhat agricultural State. One of the things we can do for betterment of the situation in the Middle East, and in Asia too, is a greater use of our surplus agricultural crops. I believe if we had a real program it would not only build up the strength of the people there but also would be good propaganda for us, propaganda which could be used much more effectively than many things we are now doing. If we do not go forward with a real program to use our agricultural surplus to feed people who are hungry, to give them an opportunity today to build their strength, we will miss one of our best weapons in the effort to wage total peace. If we did that I think we would have demonstrated the real answer to what the Russians so often talk about, but which they also do very little about.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think such a program would go far to prove that the food abundance we enjoy in the United States is not a curse, that it can actually be our greatest weapon in our effort for peace. We will not have met the test of statesmanship until we figure out some plan for using this surplus of food to cancel out some of the surplus of empty stomachs that exists in the world.

There is one other question I would like to direct to the gentleman from California: Has it not been true that in some cases the military assistance we have sent to the northern tier of states, to members of the Baghdad pact, has actually caused some other potential friends in the world to take funds away from economic and technical development and allocate them to military weapons which they felt were necessary in order to counter some of the military aid given to their neighbors?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman and agree with him. I can cite one specific instance, that of Israel where she feels, because of aid given to her neighbors, given in pursuance of a policy of neutralism which still denied arms to Israel, that she has to use an unwarranted proportion of her resources to build up her military strength. We cannot blame them, because we, in effect, at least, are doing something to make that necessary. I think the gentleman's concept of it is correct.

Mr. McGOVERN. Chester Bowles, former Ambassador to India, has reported that American military aid sent to Pakistan in 1956 prompted the Government of India to withdraw \$100 million from its second 5-year plan and allocate it to military orders placed with the French and the British.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is a most important matter of policy. There is much more in my heart and mind to say, but I shall reserve it for a later time. Again let me thank all those who have participated today. We are fulfilling our duty to search for ways to keep America strong, to conserve our resources and use them to the greatest effect in advancing our leadership for peace with justice in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AID AND INVESTMENT IN THE UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

A. THE CHALLENGE OF THE SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today there are extensive Soviet economic aid projects in 2 Middle Eastern countries—Egypt and Syria—and in 7 South Asian countries—India, Burma, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Indonesia, Nepal, and Cambodia. The Soviets are helping to build a steel mill in India,

bridges in Egypt, a cement plant in Afghanistan, a sugar refinery in Ceylon, a tire factory in Indonesia and a hundred other projects designed to raise the living standards in these 9 underdeveloped areas. In the past 2½ years the Soviet Union has extended a total of \$1.5 billions in credits for economic aid, half of which has been obligated and approximately 15 percent actually spent.

The Soviet Union is an Ivan-come-lately to the economic aid idea. The United States has engaged in substantial economic aid since the end of World War II, although it must be said that only a small fraction of our total aid program has been devoted to the economic and technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. The great bulk of the billions we spent before the Korean war was for postwar reconstruction in Europe. After the Korean war most of our aid was defense support, largely in Formosa, South Korea, and Indochina.

In my remarks this afternoon I am concerned only with foreign aid designed to increase the economic capacity of underdeveloped countries and thus raise their living standards.

If one were concerned only with raising living standards, the problem would be much simpler than it is. But economic aid has become a weapon in the global struggle between Communist tyranny and western democracy. All men of good will want to see the peoples of India, Egypt, and Indonesia have a decent living standard. We welcome any genuine efforts from any source to help to erase man's ancient enemies of poverty, disease and illiteracy. We would not object to aid from the Soviet bloc to underdeveloped areas if it were not for the unpleasant fact that her economic offensive is usually, if not always, followed by political penetration or subversion. We have seen this process take place within the past 2 years in both Egypt and Syria.

Consequently the new Soviet economic offensive which includes low-interest loans, technicians, and trade agreements must be viewed with alarm. It is entirely possible that this new program, which utilizes the resources of the entire Soviet bloc, may succeed in winning Asia for international communism. If this dire prospect should come to pass no superiority in missiles or atomic submarines could save us. In short, the Communist economic challenge to the security of the free world is every bit as real as the Soviet military challenge. To fail in either contest would be to invite failure in both.

The entry of Russia into the economic aid picture has had interesting repercussions in American domestic politics. Some of the earlier Republican foes of substantial economic aid, such as Vice President Nixon, are now beating the drums for it. President Eisenhower in his recent state of the Union message castigated aid opponents who call it a giveaway program, and asserted that we "cannot afford to have one of our most essential security programs shot down with a slogan." Secretary Dulles has repeatedly declared that we could lose the struggle with the Communists without a shot being fired.

We can be grateful for the new interest of the administration in economic aid. President Harry Truman saw the significance of aid to the underdeveloped areas 8 years ago, long before the Soviets got into the act. If it took a Soviet sputnik to make some people recognize the necessity for adequate defense, I suppose a dramatic Soviet economic offensive was needed for them to recognize the value of a program which we Democrats have supported all along.

B. OUR PRESENT AID AND INVESTMENT PROGRAM

During the last 2 years there has been in America an increased recognition of the importance of the economically underdeveloped and politically uncommitted nations of Asia and the Middle East. At least this is true among students of world affairs, some political leaders, and the administration itself. At the same time I believe it is correct to say that the popular support for foreign aid has been declining seriously. I will deal with the problem of popular support in a few minutes.

Many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have been among the staunchest supporters of the President's foreign aid program in the past. I find much to praise in the administration's present program and in its proposals for the forthcoming fiscal year.

Our Government today engages in three kinds of aid to underdeveloped areas—direct technical assistance, outright grants, and investment loans. I think each form of assistance has a proper role to play. Our own bilateral point 4 program involves some 700 American technicians. The United States is also providing 50 percent of the budget of \$30 millions for the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance. Last December the UN General Assembly voted to enlarge its technical assistance program to \$100 millions and our Government offered to double its present contribution, raising it to \$30 millions. I am encouraged by this increasing interest in multilateral technical aid. This is not to say that our bilateral effort should be decreased or even maintained at its present modest level. I believe both approaches are necessary.

The new trend toward helping underdeveloped countries primarily by long-term, low-interest loans, rather than by direct grants, has been accelerated by the stepped-up Soviet economic offensive whose major instrument is also loans. The United States is a very active participant in various loans-for-economic-development programs, both bilateral and multilateral. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as of May 1957, had outstanding loans to 32 nations totaling slightly more than \$1.3 billion. Approximately 70 percent of the capital for the bank has come from the United States.

Last year the administration asked Congress to establish a new development loan fund of \$2 billion and requested an initial appropriation of \$500 million and authorization for the second and third years of \$750 million each year. Congress appropriated only \$300 million for the first year and authorized a second appropriation of \$625 million. This year

the administration has decided to ask only for the \$625 million already authorized.

On December 16, 1957, President Eisenhower announced at the Paris NATO meeting that he would ask Congress to add \$2 billion to the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank, a United States loan agency whose loans make an important contribution to economic development abroad. During the past fiscal year the Export-Import Bank had its most active year in its 24-year history. It approved 182 loans totaling over \$1 billion for 36 different countries, some of which were in the underdeveloped category.

Many exponents of development loans have recently criticized our Government for charging interest rates which could not compete with those of Soviet loans. Our rates in the past averaged about half that much. Therefore, I welcome the announcement from the International Cooperation Administration the other day that development fund loans from now on will normally bear an interest rate of 3½ percent. Interest rates on loans made to profitmaking enterprises, the announcement said, will generally be the same as those charged by the Export-Import Bank, which presently range between 5½ to 5¾ percent.

The administration announced earlier this month that it is prepared to lend India approximately \$225 million "from the currently available resources of the United States Export-Import Bank and the development loan fund." Present plans call for the bank to supply \$150 million and the loan fund \$75 million. The State Department added that the United States was "considering, on an urgent basis, further measures to assist India in meeting its present grain shortage." Officials conceded that the unusual step of announcing a loan figure before there was any agreement on specific projects to be financed was prompted by the Soviet economic offensive in India and elsewhere. Credits extended to India by the Soviet Union total \$257.8 million.

C. IS IT TOO LITTLE AND TOO LATE?

The administration's aid program for underdeveloped areas deserves support. But does it go far enough? Does the American response measure up to the Soviet challenge? Perhaps our steps in the right direction are being taken on an escalator of history moving more rapidly in the opposing direction.

I support the administration's program, as far as it goes, but I believe we should launch a bolder and more dynamic program. If we can spend \$40 billion for defense, and this is certainly necessary, we surely have the capacity to outmatch the Soviet economic offensive in Asia and the Middle East. It is strategically wise and morally right that we attempt to relate our wealth to the poverty of peoples in other lands and that we do this in a way that respects their right to chart a genuinely independent course in domestic and foreign policies.

If our aid program is not what it should be the blame must be shared by Congress and the administration. Both

branches of Government have been too timid and unimaginative. Our timidity and lack of courage is one of the main reasons for the general public's disenchantment with the foreign-aid program.

The other day Walter Lippmann said something which every lawmaker and every administrator would do well to ponder. He said that if you want public support for a Government program, make it big, bold, and imaginative—appeal to the public's sense of responsibility and willingness to sacrifice. In attempting to second guess the public, political leaders often sell them short. In a time of crisis the challenge is great and the opportunity is great. This is certainly true of foreign aid. I am convinced that the people back home, as we call them, will gladly support a dynamic and creative program which will serve not only the interests of the underdeveloped countries and of the United States but of international peace and security as well.

D. TOWARD A DYNAMIC AND RESPONSIBLE AID PROGRAM

As we enter into the foreign aid debate in the coming weeks, I would like to submit several ideas and proposals for consideration:

First. The United States Government should take the initiative in promoting the economic development of the uncommitted countries of Asia and the Middle East. Mr. Truman did this in 1949 when he launched his point 4 program. The point 4 idea captured the imagination of millions of people. But it was never given wings. We have responded at last, but only after the Soviet Union goaded us into action. Our lack of leadership was dramatically illustrated last December by the Asian-African People's Solidarity Conference in Cairo which gave the Soviet bloc, at least temporarily, a great propaganda, if not a political, advantage in many countries whose respect we covet. At this Conference the Soviet Union made further promises of economic aid and insisted that no political strings would be attached. We sat back chewing our fingernails while the Communists ran the show. "What we should have done," declared Senator HUMPHREY, "was to have sponsored such meetings ourselves at which we could discuss the mutual benefits to the underdeveloped countries and the West of a comprehensive-aid and development program."

Second. The United States must be prepared to think of foreign aid as a permanent element in its foreign policy. In order to sell foreign aid to Congress the administration in the past has been tempted to pretend that it was an emergency program of short duration. The American people thought of it as such, and were confused when the temporary emergency continued year after year. Both administrators and lawmakers need the candor and courage to tell the public that economic aid will be an essential, indeed vital, aspect of our international policy for the foreseeable future.

In a survey conducted by the Committee for Economic Development, a private American business research group, more than one-third of some 48 author-

ities in this country and abroad said the United States would have to face up to the problem of aiding underdeveloped countries for at least two more decades. The specialists who made this judgment came from many free-world nations and represented diverse economic and political viewpoints—Washington Post, Sunday, December 29, 1957, A1 and A15.

Third. All aid designed for economic development should be separated from military aid or defense support. Military aid is necessary and it must be justified on military and security grounds. Economic aid must be justified both economically and in terms of its contribution to the overall objectives of United States foreign policy. A number of independent studies made of our foreign-aid program last spring recommended that the requests and appropriations for these two types of assistance be separated. This the administration has not done. If the requests to Congress are separated, each program can more easily be considered on its own merits. Congress and the American public are not so immature that they need to have technical assistance hidden like a bitter pill in a spoonful of defense-support jelly.

Even more important is the international impact of having military and technical aid tied together. The recipients of our aid are proud people who recoil at the suggestion of political subordination in their relations with more powerful nations. They do not want aid with political or military strings attached. If one takes Soviet aid offers at face value, they often appear to be more attractive to India and Burma and other neutral countries than our offers. I am convinced that genuine efforts to stimulate economic development will pay off politically, even if there are no implicit or explicit political commitments made. What we want is not unwilling allies pushed prematurely into a military pact, but truly independent countries economically and politically strong enough to stave off Soviet penetration or any other undemocratic threat.

Fourth. Our aid program should be as free from waste and corruption as humanly possible. I have the impression that our program has in the main been efficiently and honestly run. But the recent report of the House Government Operations Committee, suggesting that billions of dollars worth of our aid has been wasted, is disquieting to say the least. It would appear that most of this waste was connected with the military aid program, rather than with technical assistance or development loans. The report charged that military aid was sometimes given for political reasons. Acknowledging that political considerations may be important, the report implied that there could be a more efficient expenditure of funds without denying any legitimate political factors in the country receiving aid—New York Times, January 17, 1958, page 2. Even a little waste or a little corruption is too much. It is wrong in itself and it stigmatizes a basically sound program with a bad name.

Fifth. In addition to Government loans provided through bilateral or multilateral channels, I believe we should

do everything possible to attract more private American investment in underdeveloped areas. This will stimulate our economy and the economy in which investment is made and will encourage healthy trade between the two.

Sixth. Our Government must develop clear priorities in its aid program. America is very wealthy, but we do not have the resources to aid economic development in all countries which need it. Even if we should increase substantially our grants for direct technical aid and contributions to our development loan fund, we still have to turn down many worthy projects in different Asian and Middle Eastern countries. How shall we decide what projects and what countries to support and what to turn down? It seems to me that this answer must be made in the light of our overall foreign policy goals. One of these goals is to strengthen the free world against Soviet penetration and another is to help create an international climate conducive to the growth of democratic government. In many cases these two political goals of the United States mesh in with an economic-political desire of an uncommitted country for industrialization. It would seem, then, that those countries where we can pursue these complimentary goals should receive high priority rating in our program.

If this is true, I believe India merits our most careful attention. China has cast her lot with the Communist world. India is still independent and neutral, but I believe when the chips are down she will stand firmly with the democratic West, that is, if she can remain politically and economically strong enough to withstand Communist penetration. India is crucial in Asia. If India goes down, all Asia may go down. And if Asia is lost, the cause of freedom itself may be lost.

One final word. You may have gathered by this time that I believe in economic aid to the underdeveloped countries. I do indeed. But I want to make it clear that I do not look upon foreign aid as a panacea, a magic key to the solution of all our international problems. Aid is one vital element in our overall foreign policy. It is not a substitute for military assistance, defense alliances, missiles, or atomic submarines. Nor is it a substitute for diplomacy or our information program. If properly used, foreign aid can be a valuable supplement to all the other instruments of a sensitive and responsible foreign policy dedicated to our national security and to international peace.

WORKS OF PEACE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that some of the most able Members of the Congress are devoting their finest energies to the cause of peace. It is, of course, necessary that we should be considering prob-

lems that relate to our material standard of living. But our chief responsibility in this hour is to work for the salvation of our civilization.

Humanity is in deadly peril and time is fast running out.

We have all been shocked by the launching of the Soviet earth satellite. But if we respond only by a frantic effort to build a bigger sputnik, we have missed what could well be our final challenge to save ourselves from destruction.

Given the current context of the cold war, we may find it necessary to accelerate our satellite and missile programs. No man, however, should delude himself with the notion that bigger and better sputniks will insure our survival. If history has any validity at all it literally thunders that the continuing competition for more advanced weapons can only insure that the science of killing will be executed on a grander scale. Since the day when men battled each other with clubs, the alternatives to peace have steadily become more frightful. The survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki know something of the awesome spectacle of modern man's inhumanity to man. But the techniques of death have gone so far beyond the A-bombs of 1945, that no one of us can grasp the catastrophic proportions of warfare today or tomorrow. We all know in our serious moments that the two greatest powers in the world are preparing for the type of war that neither side can possibly win. There can be no victors in any such war—only a few bewildered survivors wondering what happened to civilization just when it had unlocked the secrets to vast new potential blessings for humanity.

The devastating alternatives to peace today demand that we work for world peace with at least as much imagination and sense of urgency as we now bring to the preparation for war. We must literally wage totalitarian peace. We must be willing to examine and re-examine every phase of our foreign policy. There is a crying need for the kind of critical discussion of our foreign aid programs that my colleagues are engaged in this afternoon. We must be flexible, too, in exploring every possible approach to settling our many differences with the Soviet Government. Knowing that the eyes of the world are focused on us, we must make our policies and programs here at home square with the ideals that we most want the world to emulate abroad. We must, in short, utilize all the physical, mental, and spiritual resources at our command both at home and abroad to move the world toward peace rather than war.

Recently the entire world applauded President Eisenhower's eloquent words when he asserted that America's answer to Soviet total cold war must be the waging of total peace. Men everywhere cheered his proposal for works of peace. But one wonders if the President's subsequent request for a \$40 billion arms budget is to be the substance of our total peace effort in this fiscal year. Where are the works of peace?

I believe that the American people are willing to make whatever sacrifice they are called upon to make for peace.

The people will support the President and the Congress in an imaginative works for peace program. Americans have always been eager to share our material and spiritual substance with the world.

Unfortunately, in the post-World War II era, the image of America which the world has seen has not been very close to the American dream. With powerful social revolutions convulsing much of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, we have allowed ourselves to become identified with those who seek to freeze the status quo. To the restless millions of vast areas of the globe, the status quo means the strangling of their hopes for land reform, hospitals, schools, and national integrity.

What irony—that this Nation, born of revolution and dedicated to lifting the lot of the common man, should have been linked in the mind of the world with the same forces against which our own revolution was launched. The world is hungry for the spirit of Tom Paine, Jefferson, and Lincoln, but, somehow, we have held up instead the image of fortress America.

While on a brief study tour of parts of the Middle East last spring, I found more than one sensitive native who told me that American foreign policy seems to be based largely on our desire to arm other nations so that they can defend our military positions abroad. We have been willing, it seems, to prop up governments that ignore the basic needs of their own citizens, if only those governments gave some promise of meeting our short-range military and diplomatic objectives. These impressions are highlighted by the uncomfortable fact that more than 80 percent of our entire foreign assistance program is devoted to military items.

Chester Bowles, former Ambassador to India, has pointed out that our military aid program has, in some cases, heightened international tensions while hampering constructive social and economic developments. For example, in 1956 American arms shipments to Pakistan prompted India to take \$100 million from her second 5-year plan for economic development and place it in military orders with the British and French.

Furthermore, such military alliances as the Baghdad Pact have provided little real military strength. Some of our most qualified observers believe that the Baghdad Pact nations, in spite of American arms, would offer little resistance to Soviet military aggression. It is more likely that the pact has provided an additional incentive to the Russians to accelerate their own efforts to build up military allies in the Middle East. I am convinced that the ensuing arms race between Russia and the United States as they seek to equip their respective allies, is adding considerably to the danger of a war to the death between the Arab States and the State of Israel.

Most of the people of the world are not looking primarily for military hardware. They are hungry, sick, or illiterate. They yearn for better and happier standards of life. It seems to me that any program of foreign assistance by the United States must be tested primarily

on the question of how effectively it enables the people of the undeveloped areas to build up the kind of society where those better standards of life are possible.

The yearning for more food, better medical care and basic education will not be met by sputniks. It will not be satisfied regardless of how many cast-off guns and tanks we send in the name of "aid" to the trouble spots of the world.

Is not the hour at hand for us to offer something deeper and finer than guns and military pacts to the people of the Middle East, Asia, and Africa?

We have in this country the greatest food-producing system in the world. Why could we not propose a world food bank in cooperation with Russia and other nations to use some of our agricultural abundance in relieving world hunger and starvation. The Biblical sage has written: "Cast thy bread upon the waters for thou shalt find it after many days."

Humanity everywhere is afflicted with such diseases as cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, yaws and belharzia. Why not an international effort to wipe out these ancient curses through a greater pooling of medical knowledge, techniques and drugs?

All of us are concerned about the inadequacies of our educational program. Would not the schoolchildren of America and the world profit from a much broader exchange of teachers and students between the nations of the world?

These are just a few of the works of peace that we ought to be implementing with all possible speed.

They must be accompanied by renewed efforts to negotiate our differences with the Soviet Union. All programs for peace depend upon persistent and continuous negotiation efforts by the two great powers. Such efforts will be far more difficult than launching a rocket to the moon. They will not be brought to fruition by a hasty summit conference. But long-suffering, patient efforts to find areas of accommodation with the Soviets offer our only hope of survival. We will never accept basic Russian assumptions about the nature of life and they give no indication of embracing our philosophy of life. But we must learn to live and compete peacefully in this age of the satellite, or else this satellite on which both Russians and Americans live will be transformed into a hell where no man can exist.

FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it has been a most useful occasion this early in the session to have a symposium discussion of foreign policy. It is often commented that the voice of the House on foreign policy matters is a very weak one. As I listened to the remarks this afternoon of colleagues on both sides of the aisle, it occurred to me that—borrowing a line from Julius Caesar—if we are indeed weak "The fault

lies in ourselves, and not our stars," because the House has the capacity to exercise a broad influence in foreign policy. One reason we have not done so is that we have been too reticent and we have not exhibited the quality of thinking that we can display when we address ourselves to a particular problem.

Indeed, I would like to invite our colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, whose special domain this is, to come and debate their problems with us. I think they are too reluctant in that regard. We like to hear from them when foreign-aid bills are on the floor, but also we would be delighted to have them lead us in serious debates at other times as well.

In the discussion of our differences on foreign policy, the comments of our colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] have been both constructive and timely, and I hope they will provoke much thought in our body. It does seem to me that we can, if we will only exert ourselves, exercise a much greater influence within the Congress and the country on these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I have just a few comments to make. I have been here only 3 years, but looking back over that short period it seems to me there have been some profound changes which have occurred foreign-policy-wise, and in the position our country occupies with regard to the rest of the world. Three years ago the common statement that we heard during defense debates was that our military forces were second to none. Although that still is our announced objective, we are quite willing to concede today that we are trying to catch up in certain fields, and the general estimate now is that we are very much nearer a military stalemate than we were 2 or 3 years ago.

Likewise it is plain that we have lost that military predominance which gave us a position of paramount strength in the past. There is the fact, too—as a result of development of the intercontinental ballistic missiles—that our country now is much more of a prime target than was the case a few years ago. And in the field of weaponry, absolute weapons are much more absolute today than they were 2 or 3 years ago.

These facts all have significance and bearing, it seems to me, on our position in the world today and the nature of our basic problems.

There is also the fact—and this has been pointed out—that in some respects time may be working against us instead of for us. Certainly a case can be made out that in the field of overall economic strength, and from the standpoint of the intellectual capacity of our country, we may be growing weaker when we compare our performance against that of the U. S. S. R.

Now, it seems to me, along with our discussion of the lag in the field of missiles we might profitably discuss whether there is a lag in adjusting our thinking to these new realities. In the long run that may be more important than regaining parity in the missile field.

It is my own opinion, that the people are probably ahead of Congress—and a

fortiori they are ahead of Mr. Dulles—in adjusting their outlooks toward these new realities. I think the people have a more balanced and broader attitude toward the problem of peace than we find prevalent in Congress and in Washington. And I think that should give us pause.

When I hear spokesmen in Congress—or our military people—talking about winning a thermonuclear war, I wonder if they are not thinking still in terms of the last war. I recall a comment that someone made recently that if offered the choice he would rather have his country lose a conventional war than win a thermonuclear one. He explained that in the first instance he at least would be alive to endure the defeat, while in the other he would in all probability not have an opportunity to rejoice in the victory.

I also believe that we are bedeviled today by outmoded slogans and postures that may have been appropriate 3 or 4 years ago, but are quite inappropriate today. I have no harsh words today for Mr. Dulles, but I think that one of his troubles is that the slogans he promulgated a few years ago, the postures he took then, are now hopelessly out of date. I think that is the reason our allies seem to find him lagging in leadership capacity today.

Now, I am troubled, too, and wonder at times if we have grasped the primary challenge today to the Congress and the country. The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee issued a report a few days ago concerning our military weapons, and referred to the "race for survival" in the military field. It seems to me we are in danger of misappraising the world situation and, just as some people apparently have ignored some of the reports and warnings of the CIA in recent months, I think our peril is that we might fail to understand the kind of world we live in.

As the President's special message on education was delivered today, I wondered again about this particular problem, because unless I am mistaken the challenge to our society today and to the world is not primarily a military challenge—although none of us underestimate the importance of military matters—but it is a challenge to our total society and to our total capacity as a people. The truth is that the education program submitted by the administration is a retreat from the position taken last year. In 1957 the President did send up a general program of aid to education. The program presented today, however, is not only smaller moneywise, but it is a specialized program. I am disturbed by the fact that we do not have a national policy in the field of education, and that we are facing the challenge to intellectual achievement with peripheral programs and a peripheral response. This, when Dr. Teller and others have been saying to us that over the long haul, in the next 10 or 15 or 25 years, what we do in developing the minds and intellectual capacities of our people may be far more important in the "race for survival" than anything else we undertake.

I also sense in the programs the President has presented a lack of the Spartan note, or a call for sacrifices. We are pretty much going down the same road we have traveled before, with perhaps some extra effort. But if the real challenge, as some of our scientists are telling us, is in the field of intellectual achievement—and we have seen how the Russians used their satellites as an instrument of national policy—I say we had better start adjusting our thinking to the realities of 1958.

There is one other matter I would like to discuss. With all our talk about negotiating, if we are going to get ourselves in a frame of mind to negotiate we must make some adjustments in our basic attitudes. The truth of the matter is that any negotiation worthy of the name always involves give and take. Of course, our diplomats are fond of telling us that we must only negotiate from "positions of strength." As any lawyer knows, the other negotiator always wants the same tactical advantage. And the sad truth is that, if we wait to sit down until each side believes it occupies a position of strength, we may never sit down at all.

Therefore, it seems to me that we must adjust our basic frame of reference and basic attitudes if we expect to negotiate seriously in the months ahead.

I have no illusions about the chances of our sitting down today and working out any general master agreement of settlement with the U. S. S. R. Obviously, that is not feasible, nor is anyone proposing it in this discussion. Yet, in the past, some of our people have held the view that there was an irrepressible conflict, and that we could not live in the same world with these people and could not work out adjustments and accommodations with them. But do not the new realities now dictate that we adjust our thinking and change these attitudes? Because if, indeed, anyone believes there is an irreconcilable or an irrepressible conflict, I think he should advocate a preventive war as the obvious and logical next step.

It seems to me we can learn a good bit on this score from some of our neighbors. We had one a few months ago who won the Nobel prize. Let me read a statement from him. I refer, of course, to Mr. Lester Pearson, of Canada, and quote part of the speech he gave when he accepted the Nobel prize last fall:

The stark and inescapable fact is that today we cannot defend our society by war since total war is total destruction, and if war is used as an instrument of policy eventually we will have total war. Therefore, the best defense of peace is not power, but the removal of the causes of war and international agreements which will put peace on a stronger foundation than the terror of destruction. . . . What is needed is a new and vigorous determination to use every technique of discussion and negotiation that may be available, or, more important, that can be made available, for the solution of the tangled, frightening problems that divide today, in fear and hostility, the two power blocs and thereby endanger peace. We must keep on trying to solve problems, one by one, stage by stage, if not on the basis of confidence and cooperation,

at least on that of mutual toleration and self-interest.

So what do we suggest? The burden of my remarks is not to pose specific solutions. I think my colleagues have adroitly done that. But we can agree, perhaps, that Mr. Dulles may be quite right in suggesting that the Russians are traveling the wrong road when they suggest that meaningful agreements might emerge from a summit conference. We might agree, too, that traditional methods of diplomacy—local agreements to ease local tensions—might offer more hope than a summit conference. Therefore, I think it is incumbent on each of us to help to mold public opinion so that reasonable compromises will be upheld.

We must realize that when we talk about a compromise we necessarily assume that it involves a quid pro quo. Therefore it is probably inevitable that the party that does not control the Executive will criticize what we give, and that the party in power will praise what we gain. But that is part and parcel of it. I think we should try in a mature way to see to it that the people of our country understand this whole process.

I wish to commend again the specific proposals put forward by my colleagues today. And I wish to commend those who have had the patience to sit through this discussion this afternoon and to participate in it. Personally, I believe that these are some of the House's finest moments.

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

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman.

I of course concur not only in his remarks but in the ideas expressed so clearly and sincerely by the preceding speakers.

I should like to paraphrase what that great genius of a man by the name of Dr. Albert Einstein said, a genius who ushered the entire world through the door into the atomic age in which we now live; not just America or Russia but the whole world. This genius was so great in stature, so far beyond the comprehension of most of us ordinary mortals, that it should be the good fortune of each and every one of us merely to be able to say that we lived and walked on the face of the earth at the same time this giant of an intellect was with us. For they do not come once every 100 years or even every 200 years; but perhaps only once in every three or four hundred years. This phenomenal mind, this tremendous intellect, which helped unlock the doors through which passed the whole world into the atomic era, made, in effect, this statement before he passed away not long ago. He said, "Everything in the world has changed except our mode of thinking."

I should like to dwell on that thought for a moment or two and stress this one thing: First of all, before we can discuss this whole problem of defense, security, of how to get along in the world, we must understand what the atomic

age is. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is not 1 out of let us say every 50,000 of our own citizens in America, the best informed, with the finest means of mass communication, of mechanized distribution of knowledge, that knows what the atomic age means. It means the release of a power of unbelievable magnitude. Yet something really understood by so few.

One thing that really gave me a jolt when I was home on a 12 weeks' speaking tour last fall was that in speaking not only to a whole variety of groups, but even to students in high schools, junior colleges, and universities I found out of several thousand students not one who could even guess closely at the magnitude of the destructive capability in a hydrogen bomb. I only dwell on this one single point because I cannot understand why so many know so little about something that has been talked about as much, has been publicized as much and written about as much, and even televised live on television as was the hydrogen bomb test explosion, and the gentleman from California now occupying the chair [Mr. HOLIFIELD] knows far more than any of us who have spoken here this afternoon about the capability of that awful weapon. Let me quickly give you these comparative facts. In World War II—and I operated for some months in heavy bombardment—the biggest bomb you were able to carry was the blockbuster. That came toward the latter part of the war. It weighed 10 tons. There were 10 tons of TNT. It took 1 big 4-engined plane to take it up in the air with 10 men in that airplane. There you had in one bomb 10 tons—of TNT. A few months later in August of 1945 came the first atom bomb, the equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT—1 airplane, 4 engines, and 9 men in the crew—1 bomb. Now, you had in 1 plane 2,000 times the destructive force of the World War II bomb of a few months earlier. Then came the hydrogen bomb. This is what not only astounded me but appalled me—how very few people know or fully realize the fantastic power in one hydrogen bomb. The hydrogen bomb is roughly equal to fifteen and maybe twenty million tons of TNT. It is carried in 1 airplane by 3 men. Possibly, now it may be carried in a missile with no wings, no tail and no men—just the missile. Fifteen to twenty million tons of TNT is equal to several times all the TNT bombs dropped by all the combatants in World War II, friend and foe alike or, in other words, at the bombing rate which prevailed in World War II, if all the air forces of all the combatants, friend and foe alike—Germany, Italy, Japan, America, Britain, France, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa—were to bomb 1 city for 16 years, it would not quite do the damage that 1 blast in 1 searing three-millionths of a second would do. People do not seem to know that. Why do I emphasize that? Because the minute you understand this unbelievable, awesome power, and accept that as a fact; and then take a look at some of our concepts which before the atomic age had validity, you will now realize how many of these concepts are

neither realistic nor applicable in this new era.

Now, suddenly many of our concepts no longer hold. If you think it is easy to give way to old concepts, let me remind you that the Greek philosopher, Aristotle, was one of the great minds of his time. He was a great creative, stimulating and provocative thinker. But when he wandered off into the field of science, he got a little bit lost because he engaged into the field of science not by experimentation but by what is called deductive reasoning. He would point to 2 stones on a table and say, "This stone weighs 2 pounds and the other stone weighs 1 pound. Now, anyone can see that because this 2-pound stone is twice as heavy as the other 1-pound stone, it will fall twice as fast or fall twice as far in the same length of time." That simple statement was accepted as scientific truth by all of the scholars, researchers, professors and learned writers for 1,000 years. Then came a young man named Galileo, climbing up the winding stairs in the Leaning Tower of Pisa, and probably yielding more to whim, but most likely also thinking somewhere along this line in the back of his mind, as they do in basic research, he began as many of us do when we lean over the ledge from the top of a high building or peer down a deep well or mine shaft to drop pebbles, note the silence and then hear the plunk as the pebble hits the ground or plunks into the water. He dropped a larger pebble, then a smaller pebble, and he discovered that they all took the same length of time to reach bottom, regardless of their weight. From then on, a new scientific fact was proven, and the old one, always completely false, but which had prevailed for 1,000 years, was disproven and discarded.

Now, what are some new concepts arising from man's fantastic capacity to destroy which he now has. The big one is that now no one can win a war. It is a fact. Our military leaders, our own President, the Russian leaders have said, in effect, "No one can win a war." This is a simple but startling statement, for never in the history of mankind has there been a time when no one could win a war. As a matter of fact, someone always won the war sooner or later. Winning wars never solved any long-term problems. It usually created more in the long run. Have an all-out war now, and you cannot tell the difference between the victor and the vanquished. There most likely cannot be a "Pearl Harbor." We may be destroyed and yet within hours later the would-be aggressor could also be destroyed from bases outside our continental borders. In this atomic age there can be no neutrals—I mean, being neutral no longer can guarantee them escape from dangerous, radioactive, poisonous fallout. There is no place to hide. You can go into the depths of the darkest jungle in Africa and even there every bit of protoplasm is subject to destruction from radioactive fallout. The gentleman in the chair [Mr. HOLIFIELD] knows that from information which he has made available repeatedly to the Congress and to the

American people, and he has performed a splendid service.

Today there can be no real defense, unless we burrow deep into the ground, and that at best would provide only partial protection for our people. More, bigger, and better missiles cannot give us any defense; it does, however, give us deterrence, which may be a sort of defense for a time, but in case of actual all-out war, the missiles give us offensive or destruction-inflicting capability but cannot defend or protect our own cities from also being destroyed by the enemy. So there is no real defense. We are, therefore, improving our offense, to give us deterrence. I agree we need deterrence as a temporary expedient to deter anyone who may have any notions of destroying us. All we can do is assure them that "we will destroy you if you destroy us." But such mutual deterrence will in itself give us no peace, not even peace of mind; nor does it give us any real security nor insure us against destruction. So while we must keep our deterrent capability at its greatest level of effectiveness, likewise must we realize that this is only a temporary holding action, to hold the line in the military arena of conflict in which we now find ourselves—but then our big challenge is to shift our long-range push into another arena—that of technical assistance, economic aid, and human relationships and understanding, as the only course which can give us hope to bring about relative stability in the troubled, unsettled, and even turbulent areas of the world, and from there to push on toward winning the peace. As I said earlier, wars have always been won by someone or other sooner or later in time; but never before has mankind been able to win the peace. Now, in the atomic age, man for the first time can no longer win a war; but out of this grave threat I see our greatest opportunity, for now man cannot only win the peace for the first time in the history of mankind, but I believe he will have to win the peace if for no other reason than it may be his only recourse to survival itself. I am rather hurriedly and perhaps in too general a manner trying to point out the need for a more realistic appraisal of things in a world now in which everything has changed except our mode of thinking.

We have heard much talk about the need for accelerating the training of more and better scientists. My special love in my student days was science, and I majored in mathematics and chemistry and physics, so I have a little notion of what goes into the making of a scientist.

It seems to me, however, that the most accelerated, the best motivated, and the most active people in our society are the scientists. It seems that the rest of us are the ones who should be accelerated, and I mean really accelerated, A: first to learn a little more about what is going on in the laboratories and the minds of the scientists; and B, to learn not so much about the atom itself as about man himself and human understandings and interrelationships.

How can those of us who live in a democracy harbor prejudice and hatred, build up hatred to the point where one

person personally bludgeons a fellow American citizen with his bare hands, draws blood, and would bash his head in? What is the cause or the source of that violence? If you do not understand what makes it in our own communities, how then can we hope to expect to understand the enraged, frustrated, starving, unreasoning mobs that roam the Middle East and China. Scientists know a lot, it has been said, about what goes on in the heart of the atom, a lot more about that than most of us know about what goes on in the heart of a man which motivates the fierce passions and violent retaliations that peoples inflict upon each other.

Over the weekend the President announced that great strides had been made in controlling hydrogen power. There is no insurmountable problem to that; the scientists will lick that problem sooner or later; there is no trouble about controlling the hydrogen atom; the problem is how to control man.

My friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] mentioned John Foster Dulles. I have great admiration for the gentleman from Michigan.

I will have a great deal more to say on this subject at a future time, for today I have taken too much of the gentleman's time already, but let me say just this about war. There cannot be any victor; war is no answer. The only course we seem to be pursuing now is to prepare for war, a war in which there can be no victor but which can only be mutual suicide.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to speak for 10 additional minutes. I have the last special order, and I do not object.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield to me during that 10 minutes?

Mr. UDALL. It is certainly my intention to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman from Texas and will conclude hastily. He has been most generous with his time. I say that 10 years from now, if we continue at our present rate of spending for arms, we can look back, see what we have spent in the last 10 years, yet we will have less defense, security, and more threat of war than we have now.

The answer is to align ourselves with the hopes and aspirations of the majority of that two-thirds of the world who live in a poverty too abject to describe. In many parts of the world the poverty we are talking about, and a number of us have seen it, in misery and wretchedness, goes beyond description. Scientists will tell you there are more people living in greater misery today than inhabited the earth 2,000 years ago.

In Paris in the last century we saw the great contradiction of stone walls being unable to protect against the needs and the outcries of an abused peasantry. The Bastille fell; and the modern weapons we are forging can no more protect us and save us from destruction than stone walls could save Marie Antoinette. Of all the nonsense when the President of the United States with the experience that President Eisenhower has had abroad, gets up and tells the people of his country, my country, your country, that we have to catch up to the Russians. Since when did the Russians set the criteria up to which we are to catch up, when all we have to do is to turn around and shift from the military area to the economic and to human relationships and say, "All right, Russia, you have done it scientifically. Congratulations. You invested heavily in that project and now you have it. We congratulate you. Now you do something for your people and when you have done that join us in helping two-thirds of the people of the world with deeds." Of course, we can take the lead.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generous time the gentleman from Arizona has allotted me.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for a most sobering and impressive contribution. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered if we might not do the cause of peace a great service if at some future time a hydrogen-bomb test were conducted in the presence of all members of the parliaments of the United Nations countries, and their ministers and executives who deal with human affairs and make international policies. I think under those circumstances perhaps we could get a better quality of negotiating and a more serious approach to the overriding problem of peace.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman. Like other Members of the House, I, too, have enjoyed the inspiring address of the gentleman from Minnesota. I am a little sorry he did not take it on his own time because I think it would be worthy of a separate special order. If he feels inclined to continue his remarks in the future and secures a special order, I will be glad to be here and discuss the merits of Mr. Dulles, our foreign policy, or anything else with him.

I would like to go back to the time when the gentleman from Arizona was speaking and call attention to one thing he said and which I know he would not want to have misinterpreted. That was the point at which he spoke about the necessity for a compromise, or for accommodation or give and take, and I think he even used the word "appeasement." He talked about a future summit conference. I am sure the gentleman from Arizona did not want his remarks to be taken in the sense that in almost any area of negotiation we might be inclined to give and to take, but that there are things like the right of the German people to have their own gov-

ernment, the right of the people of Eastern Europe to have self-government of their own choice, and things like that. I hope he will agree that there can and should be no compromise on issues like that.

Mr. UDALL. I had hoped that my remarks would not receive any broader construction than I intended. I simply expressed the general idea that in any general negotiation, if it has any meaning, unless it is a dictated negotiation, there is give and take. I do not think I used the term "appeasement" nor did I intend to inject it at all. There are certain things that, out of principle, you cannot yield upon; otherwise you may yield so much that the cause of peace itself will be lost.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wanted the gentleman to clarify it because I did not want his remarks to be subject to misinterpretation.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I feel that everybody must admit that the gentleman from Minnesota made a very fine statement and that probably he has come the very closest to what we are trying to aim at and to hope for through the things we have been saying. Half of the world's population today is uncommitted. They do need our help in economic assistance so they can rise above the misery that they now live in, because, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] said, there is no hope of victory. I was inspired and hopeful in one of the President's recent addresses—it was in his state of the Union address—when he threw the gantlet down to the Soviets and said "Let us get together and wipe malaria, heart disease, and cancer off the face of the earth." Four days later the tranquilizer wore off when the budget message came in and not 5 cents in it for malaria research and not 5 cents more in it for cancer and heart research than in last year's budget. And, if by some chance the Soviets accept that challenge and agree to work on it and, as the President said, go beyond that and work on other things, we are going to have to rush back in here with a supplemental appropriation in order to do the thing which the President has challenged the others to do. We have today seen a message go to the Congress on education—100 percent for science, mathematics, but nothing for the humanities. We could achieve technological superiority which is greater than anyone ever imagined, and still, if we do not have people educated to understand human beings, it would be an empty victory. Suppose, for instance, some Soviet biologist comes forward next month with a discovery in biology as startling as was the sputnik breakthrough. Would we then have a message asking us to educate 40,000 biologists in the next few years? We should educate the whole man. I agree as far as the President's education message goes, but it is not bold enough. It is not imaginative enough, and it is not comprehensive enough, be-

cause if we do not educate our people to understand other people, their hopes and their aspirations, then all of the scientists in the world cannot save us.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for the statement he made and just impose to make one remark. The gentleman from Arizona said that this might turn into a matter of our society versus theirs. The gentleman from Wisconsin earlier said that we will fight the Russians in trade and technology, probably not in war, and the gentleman from Minnesota, in his very eloquent speech, came along with about the same idea of "war is useless." I hope that these gentlemen are right. I thoroughly believe that, as far as this world is concerned, war must be a thing of the past. I hope the Russians believe the same way. I am only pleased that we have come so far in our society that we are able now to point to the time when responsible society can no longer accept the idea of a war; that we can point to the probability that the Russian nation, predatory though it be, now feels that it cannot win a war without itself being destroyed.

This is due to two things: First, our deterrent power, even though it has been oft maligned the last few weeks; and, second, the strong allies which our equally oft maligned diplomacy has given us. This is why our society may vie with theirs in leadership, moral and political, in production, and in providing the good things of life to our respective citizenry. We are glad for this state of affairs. In a true struggle such as this, free men will always win.

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

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentlemen from Arizona and Minnesota for their absorbing remarks. I agree implicitly that there is no alternative for peace in the world today. The vast amounts of money which we and other nations are devoting to devising ever-ghastlier means of destroying humankind at best serve only to create a deterrent—a deterrent based upon the fear which all of us share of setting off the total annihilation which is now at our disposal.

This is the avenue to neither peace nor security. Yet, lacking an affirmative policy for true peace and security, it is all that we have.

Mr. Speaker, the impact which recent Soviet technological achievements have had on the American scene continues to be beyond calculation. We are still caught in a backwash of confused reaction with everyone agreed that we must marshal our forces. But we still have no discernible direction or national policy to guide us.

This, of course, is the price of complacency. Instead of being given factual information upon which public

opinion depends, the American people have instead been spoon-fed an assortment of half-truths and distortions, the soothing syrup upon which false hopes are based.

It has often been said that we can lose the cold war without the firing of a shot, and I can think of no greater contributing factor to such a fate than the deliberate and willful withholding of information from a free people.

In the state of the Union message we were told by our President that "we are probably somewhat behind the Soviets in some areas of long-range ballistic development." But the secret Gaither report, the Rockefeller report, and the sworn testimony of many witnesses before Congressional committees indicates that there is no "probably" about it—and that the fact of Soviet superiority goes even beyond long-range ballistic missiles. Unless we understand this fact, we simply will not be able to grasp implications which are every bit as important and are already beginning to cast their ugly shadows.

We must anticipate, as has been suggested earlier, that the phenomenal scientific and technological advances which the Soviets have made will be used as a backdrop for tremendously increased economic and political warfare by the Russians outside of the Communist orbit.

Those who think that sputnik can be answered merely by an increase in our defense expenditures by \$2 billion or \$3 billion are guilty of the most dangerous kind of delusion. It takes no great insight to know that one of the main objectives of the Soviet Union is the establishment of close economic and political ties with non-Communist countries, particularly the underdeveloped countries which today hold a balance of world power.

What I am saying is, of course, that the job of protecting our national security goes much further than the successful development of modern weapons. It requires a readiness on the part of free people to do battle in the political field, the economic field, and even the cultural field—wherever the shadow of imperialistic communism threatens free people. And for lasting security, it requires at the same time a genuine and realistic effort to work toward effective disarmament and peaceful solutions to the global problems which confront us.

I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that our country has the inherent strength to tackle this job successfully. But this strength cannot be dissipated as it has so dangerously been in the past by denying the American people full access to accurate information concerning their national and international affairs. There has never been a time when accurate information has been more essential to the preservation of our democracy.

The attitude of the present administration, I regret to say, fails to recognize the importance of this fact. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a real question as to whether or not our top administration officials are themselves well informed.

I call attention to the front-page story which appeared in the Washington Post

last Thursday over the byline of a reliable staff reporter, Warren Unna. Mr. Unna reported that—

President Eisenhower has ordered the Central Intelligence Agency to append maps and red arrows to its daily digests if CIA expects them to be read.

According to Mr. Unna's sources, CIA Director Allen W. Dulles complained to the President that there was little use of having a large Government Intelligence Agency, devoting its full energies to appraising foreign intelligence, if policymakers within the administration were ignorant of its findings.

The President is said to have complained that the reports were "far too ponderous to read"; and that there should be headline summaries and briefer text discussions with red arrows and maps appended to make the reading matter more palatable.

The President is reported to have assured Dulles that when these steps were taken, orders will be given for the administration's top 25 or 30 policymakers to read the daily intelligence reports on a regular basis.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first of such reports. All of us have heard about Allen Dulles' statement before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee last November to the effect that Russian advances in missiles and satellites had long been predicted in CIA's daily intelligence summaries.

While it is true that Press Secretary Hagerty has denied much of what Mr. Unna reported in his story, the fact remains that there is little indication of awareness on the part of our top administration officials. What we do know for certain is that Congress has not been given benefit of information available to these officials through our complex information-gathering and intelligence sources.

It hardly need be said, Mr. Speaker, that such information is absolutely necessary and fundamental to timely enactment of legislation which is responsive to the demands of our Nation's progress and security.

Two years ago, for example, I introduced a bill calling for establishment of a national scholarship program for college students pursuing scientific and educational careers. This bill received an adverse report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and, therefore, no hearings were scheduled. Today, of course, the administration is beating its chest for just such a program. Why is it that administration leaders, until only a few months ago, consistently opposed such legislation? Going one step further, why did the President or his immediate deputies not advise Congressional leaders of the urgent need of undertaking the program which we today recognize as being necessary for our national survival?

Is the explanation—as suggested by Mr. Unna—that top administration officials simply found CIA reports too dry or too long to wade through—and were therefore unaware of the situation which we today view with such alarm? The only other explanation is that top

administration officials knew the facts but deliberately withheld them from Congress and the American people.

Whichever the reason, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that there has been a serious failure of Executive responsibility.

It is impossible to imagine a more complete breakdown than the one which has withheld critically important CIA information from the Congress of the United States.

One question which we must answer is whether the legislative branch must continue to depend upon the goodwill and confidence of the executive branch as a prerequisite to obtaining CIA information. This situation has already led us beyond the point of absurdity. It is for this reason that I again suggest the necessity of establishing a joint House-Senate Committee on Foreign Intelligence. I hope that I can look for the support of my colleagues here today on legislation which I shall introduce later in the week to achieve this purpose.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to again commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the positive contributions they have made toward a better understanding of the position of our country today. In the candor of today's discussions rests the hope of tomorrow's solutions.

A BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE ANTITRUST LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 20, 1958, the Supreme Court of the United States in a decision involving cases which had been brought by small-business men against the nationwide big businesses operated by the Carnation Co. and Safeway Stores, Inc., by a vote of 5 to 4, held that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act cannot be used by small-business men as a basis for proceedings against the big businesses who discriminate in price to the destruction of small and independent business enterprises.

The effect of that decision is to limit the use of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act to criminal cases instituted by the Government.

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act provides:

It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to be a party to, or assist in, any transaction of sale, or contract to sell, which discriminates to his knowledge against competitors of the purchaser, in that, any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge is granted to the purchaser over and above any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge available at the time of such transaction to said competitors in respect of a sale of goods of like grade, quality, and quantity; to sell, or contract to sell, goods in any part of the United States at prices lower than those exacted by said person elsewhere in the United States for the purpose of destroying competition, or eliminating a competitor in such part of the United States; or, to sell, or contract to sell, goods at unreasonably low prices for the

purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment not more than 1 year, or both.

In the cases which were decided by the Supreme Court last Monday, small business concerns: namely, the Nashville Milk Co. and Vance, had proceeded against Carnation Co. and Safeway Stores, Inc., on the charge that the latter had discriminated in price and in that connection had made sales at unreasonably low prices for the purposes of destroying competition.

While the decision of the Supreme Court in the Carnation Co. and Safeway Stores, Inc., cases affected only section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, nevertheless small business concerns will be affected seriously and adversely by the decision. It is now clear that small businessmen will not be permitted to proceed under section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act in the future in an effort to protect themselves from the devastating effects of monopolistic price discriminations such as are made unlawful only by the terms of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The ruling of the Supreme Court means that under the existing law small and independent business concerns will not be permitted to use section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act in proceedings against unlawful selling at unreasonably low prices even though such practices result in the creation of monopolies. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1958, I introduced a bill, H. R. 10243, which would remedy that situation. It would amend section 1 of the Clayton Antitrust Act so as to provide that the term "antitrust laws" as used therein would be taken to include section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. In that way monopolistic discriminations in price and other similar unlawful restrictions and monopolies prohibited by section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act would be placed in the same status as other monopolistic practices now prohibited by the Sherman Antitrust and the Clayton Antitrust Acts. The provisions of the bill are as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of the first section of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (15 U. S. C. 12), is amended by inserting immediately before "and also this act" the following: "section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1936."

The bill I have introduced provides for nothing more than what many understood the Robinson-Patman Act provided for when it was overwhelmingly passed by the Congress in 1936. For example, our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], now the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, stated his agreement with that view. In a discussion of that section on the floor

of the House, the following exchange of remarks took place:

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. If a vendor is found guilty of discrimination as provided in this bill, is he subject to the aggrieved party for damages or has he committed a crime and subjected himself to penalty?

Mr. CELLER. If he violates the Borah-Van Nuys provision or the other provision of the bill he is subject to penalties of a criminal nature and has committed an offense.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Would he also be liable for triple damages?

Mr. CELLER. And he would also have to respond in triple damages under the provisions of the Clayton Act. Anyone aggrieved can sue. (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9420.)

As noted, section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act was an amendment authored by Senators Borah and Van Nuys. Therefore, I personally did not take the position that they intended their amendment to apply as an amendment to the Clayton Act. However, I made it clear on more than one occasion that the definition of antitrust laws as set forth in section 1 of the Clayton Act should be amended so that there would be no question about section 3 being thus embraced as a part of the antitrust laws.

The ruling of the Supreme Court last Monday in the Carnation Company and Safeway Stores, Inc., cases makes it imperative that we act without delay to accomplish what I have so often heretofore recommended. We must act to save from destruction thousands of small and independent businessmen. Big business is now free to discriminate by selling at unreasonably low prices in some sections of the country while holding their prices high in other areas. In doing that, they destroy the little fellows and create monopolies to the detriment of consumers.

Mr. Speaker, we are now receiving complaints from small-business men. The complaints are coming in from Texas, Kansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Illinois, and many other States, to the effect that large nationwide distributors of milk are engaging in the practice of price discrimination to eliminate their small, local independent competitors. Recently, your House Small Business Committee held a hearing in Dallas, Tex., and heard testimony from small-business representatives that large nationwide distributors were discriminating in price. In that connection it was shown they had just been selling milk in Dallas at prices as much as 18 cents per gallon below cost while holding the price high in other areas. It was alleged that such discriminations were being practiced to eliminate small-business concerns who had undertaken to sell milk to consumers in Dallas at nondiscriminatory prices lower than the prices which had been charged consumers in the area by the large nationwide distributors. It was alleged that such discriminations were being practiced to eliminate the small distributors and that the large nationwide distributors would then proceed to charge the consumers in Dallas a high noncompetitive and monopolistic price for milk.

The hearings were held in Dallas on December 30 and 31, 1957. Since that

date, we have received numerous complaints from other small-business concerns about similar practices involving some of the same large nationwide distributors in milk. One of the complaints we have is to the effect that in one important area the nationwide distributors had cut the price of milk to 14 cents per half gallon. In that area, the farmers who produce the milk cannot afford to sell it for less than about 45 cents per gallon. Thus, the small distributors are complaining that under the pressures of those monopolistic practices, they are going broke and will be compelled to quit business.

This matter is urgent. It demands serious and immediate consideration. The law must not be left as it is at present providing that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act can be used only in criminal cases prosecuted by the Department of Justice.

It is common knowledge that the Department of Justice has not enforced and has no intention to enforce section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act as a criminal law against predatory pricing practices.

In 1954 the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws made a report in which it was acknowledged that:

Although Congress authorized the Department of Justice and local United States attorneys to enforce section 3, public enforcement organs have largely forsaken this law. * * *

The Government's reluctance to enforce section 3 has relegated its enforcement to private treble damage litigants.

Mr. Speaker, thus it is shown that section 3, on the one hand, stands unenforced by the only Government agency with authority to enforce it and, on the other hand, has now been made otherwise unenforceable. Even those victimized as a result of its violations are denied the right to proceed under it.

Small-business men throughout the country are looking to us now to help them on this matter. H. R. 10243 provides a means to help remedy this situation. I earnestly urge that it be taken up, considered, and passed without delay.

RAISING THE PRIVATE DEBT LIMIT—THE BANKERS' PLAN VERSUS THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there seems no longer any doubt that the Federal Reserve Board is about to reduce reserve requirements of member banks. The signs are clear. A longtime observer of the banking trade can read these signs as clearly as the old-fashioned seaman can read the signs that a storm is blowing up at sea.

The only questions remaining open are the exact timing when the Federal Reserve Board will act and, what is of more interest in financial circles, the exact amount of new money which the Board will allow the private commercial banks to create.

The Wall Street Journal of last Tuesday carries a feature article by one of its staff reporters, Mr. John A. Grimes,

which gives a very clear account, and I think an accurate account, of the way this matter is shaping up. Mr. Grimes said:

The Board already has decided, informally if not by actual vote, to free more funds for lending. Right now, officials are working on a precise formula for lowering reserve requirements at banks in different-sized cities.

While the exact timing of the forthcoming move can't be pinpointed, officials say it can be expected within the next few months. It could come much sooner if the Board agrees quickly on a specific plan.

As to the timing when the Federal Reserve Board can act, of course, no one can say with certainty. Mr. Grimes has said that it is expected, though not certain, that the drop in reserve requirements will be timed to coincide with an offering of securities by the Treasury. And he adds:

The Treasury offering would give the banks an at-least-temporary outlet for their suddenly inflated supply of credit. Later, if the hoped-for rise in business loan demand materialized, the banks could sell Treasury securities to raise funds.

I fully agree that all of the signs are adding up to a substantial reduction in reserves to be made on or about the time when the Treasury offers new securities under the increased debt limit. Last week when we debated the debt increase bill, some of the Members objected to a suggestion I made for having the Federal Reserve System buy the new securities, and they objected for the reason, they said, that this would require the Federal Reserve System to create \$5 billion of new money which, my friends pointed out, would be inflationary. I tried to point out at that time that the alternative to my suggestion would be that the Federal Reserve Board would allow the private commercial banks to create new money with which to buy the bonds, and, furthermore, the Board would most probably allow the banks to create a great deal more new money than it actually needed to buy \$5 billion worth of securities. In either case, furthermore, whether the Federal Reserve Board created the new money, or the private banks create the new money, the money will be created on the credit of the Nation. The principle is exactly the same and the mathematics are exactly the same. The only differences are, first, selling the new securities directly to the Federal Reserve System would have saved the Government \$163 million a year in interest charges; and second, the Federal Reserve Board will allow the private banks to create a much larger amount of new money than the Board would have created in buying the new securities.

BANKERS' LOBBY

The reason for allowing the banks to create more money than is needed to buy the new securities is that this will be merely one step in a long-term program to bring about a new standard, and a new low in reserve requirements. The bankers' lobby has been pushing this program and become more and more demanding. It has been working on all fronts, exerting its influence through all the channels of public opinion, and,

of course, the bankers usually get these days whatever they go after.

My best guess is that the amount of reserves which the Federal Reserve Board will free in its next announcement, will be in the neighborhood of \$1.2 billion. This will allow the private commercial banks to create up to \$7.2 billion of new money.

My estimate is based, first, on the expectation that reserves of the central city reserve banks—that is the banks of New York and Chicago—will be cut from the present 20 percent of demand deposits down to a level of 18 percent of demand deposits. According to Mr. Grimes' report in the Wall Street Journal, these benefits for the New York and Chicago banks appear already to have been decided upon, and the holdup now is that the Board has not quite decided on the benefits for the reserve city banks and the country banks. My own guess is that the Board will ultimately decide that it would not look right to reduce reserves of the New York and Chicago banks without making some reduction for the other banks, and thus it will probably reduce the other banks by 1 percentage point.

Required reserves are the percentage of a bank's deposits which it must keep in reserve, to meet possible depositors' demands for their money. Most of the deposits are, of course, demand deposits and the principal agitation is directed at reductions of required reserves on demand deposits. At present, required reserves at the New York and Chicago banks are 20 percent of demand deposits; required reserves at reserve city banks are 18 percent of demand deposits; and required reserves at country banks are 12 percent of demand deposits. Required reserves against time deposits are 5 percent at all banks.

The fact that required reserves are higher at the reserve city banks than at country banks, and even higher at the central city banks, is traditional and for sound reasons. One of the reasons has to do with the fact that country banks habitually redeposit a large proportion of their deposits with the reserve city banks, and the reserve city banks in turn redeposit a large portion of their deposits with the central reserve city banks. Different percentages of required reserves for the three classes of banks are provided for in the statute, which specifies both the maximum and the minimum required reserves which the Federal Reserve Board may set for each class of bank.

THE BANKERS' \$63 BILLION PROGRAM

The American Bankers Association has in operation a plan for reducing required reserves at all banks to 10 percent of demand deposits and to 2 percent of time deposits. The plan calls for reductions in successive stages, but to achieve the ultimate goal of 10 percent for demand deposits and 2 percent for time deposits within 5 years. The plan is fully set out in the February 1957 issue of Banking, which is, of course, the official journal of the American Bankers Association. The plan was drawn up by the ABA's economic policy commission. The nub of the plan is set out in summary form in the issue of Banking I mentioned as follows:

What the commission's study proposes:

Reduce reserve requirements to 10 percent for demand deposits and 2 percent for time deposits.

Make these requirements uniform for all Federal Reserve member banks.

Include vault cash as part of legal reserves.

Give the Reserve Board discretionary authority to raise the reserve percentage for demand deposits to 12 percent or to lower it to 8 percent.

Set a tentative target date of 5 years for the accomplishment of these changes, with provision that the Federal Reserve Board have full authority to extend the target date by a year at a time if in its judgment such extension proves desirable.

To achieve the ultimate objective of this plan will, I might point out, require new legislation. New legislation will be necessary because the percentages of reserve requirements which the ABA expects to achieve are considerably below the minimums specified in the law, in several instances.

MONEY CREATED ON CREDIT OF THE NATION

But I believe the Members may be interested in these reductions in reserve requirements, even before they reach the level where new legislation will be required. The point is that when the Federal Reserve Board takes an action which allows the private commercial banks to create new money, it is, in effect, Congress that is acting to create the new money. Or to state the matter more precisely, when the private commercial banks of the country create new money, they are creating this money on the credit of the Nation and they are using a delegation of power which is assigned and reserved to Congress by the Constitution. The Constitution states that Congress shall have the power to issue money and to regulate the value thereof.

FOR CENTRAL RESERVE CITY BANKS

The greatest amount of steam is now behind a reduction in reserve requirements for the New York and Chicago banks, a reduction from 20 percent to 18 percent of demand deposits. To cite an example, there is a report in this month's issue of Banking that one of the committees of the New York Chamber of Commerce—the quite influential committee on finance and currency—recently passed a resolution calling for this reduction. This resolution proclaims that, and I quote, "such a move would create credit resources for the communities served by the central reserve city bank"; then the resolution estimates, correctly, that the proposed reduction will free "some \$500 million" of bank reserves as a base for loans in two cities, Chicago and New York City.

Let me invite the Members' attention, for a few moments, to the ways in which money is created, and to what this one-half billion dollars of reserves which the bankers expect to "free" will mean to the banking communities.

FRACTIONAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The System has a variety of ways for putting new money into the banking system. The most important way, in practice, is by purchasing Government securities, through its open market account. Then there are several minor

ways by which the System puts new money into the private banks, such as through loans to its member banks. But a major portion of the money in existence at any one time is created by the private commercial banks. This comes about as a result of the fractional reserve system under which the commercial banks operate.

The justification for the fractional reserve system, according to the theory, is that the supply of money automatically increases or decreases with the demand for money. Within broad limits the banks may increase the money supply, so long as acceptable creditors are willing to borrow at the rates being charged.

In actual practice, furthermore, such a multiplication of deposits, to about the full maximum, has been the case over the past few years. In other words, the banks have had little or no free reserves—reserves against which further loans could be made—in this period.

In reality, 3 different classes of banks have different minimum reserve requirements. For very good reasons having to do with the way country banks deposit funds with Reserve city banks, and Reserve city banks deposit funds, in turn, with the so-called central Reserve city banks, Reserve city banks are required to maintain a higher percentage of reserves than country banks, and central Reserve city banks are required to maintain a higher percentage than Reserve city banks. No class of bank has a requirement of exactly 16 percent. Giving due weight to where the deposits are, however, the average works out to 16 percent.

The proposal which is being pushed at the moment is, as I have indicated, to reduce reserve requirements only for the banks in New York and Chicago. These are, of course, the biggest and most powerful banks, run by the smartest and most influential bankers. But the present proposal is only one step in the American Bankers Association long-run campaign to keep reducing all reserve requirements—with an ultimate objective of 10 percent.

BANKS FREE USE OF \$63 BILLION MORE MONEY

Recently I wrote Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board and asked him what reducing required reserves to 10 percent would mean in terms of expansion of bank-created money. Using bank deposits as of October 1957 as a basis for his computation, Chairman Martin replied, on November 22, as follows:

If required reserves against demand deposits were reduced to 10 percent, the amount of required reserves so released (\$6,345 million) would permit at that level of required reserves a potential increase in loans and investments of member banks of up to 10 times that amount, or \$63 billion. At the end of September 1957, loans and investments of member banks totaled \$139 billion.

In other words, when required reserves are reduced to below 16 percent, the banks may then create money at a ratio greater than \$6 to each \$1 of reserves freed for lending. At the required reserve rate of 10 percent, the potential increase in bank loans and in-

vestments is 10 to 1. So, if and when the bankers' lobby achieves its goal, the banks may create another \$63 billion on which they will collect interest rates and loan fees.

Now we come to the question of how the Federal Reserve System might meet this problem.

The private commercial banks are not, of course, the sole creators of money. The Federal Reserve System also creates money; and it has a variety of ways of regulating and limiting the amount of money which the private banks may create. In practice the most usual and the most important way by which the Federal Reserve System adds to, or subtracts from, the money supply, is through the operations of its Open Market Committee in New York. When the Open Market Committee buys securities of the Federal Government from the banks, it creates money and adds to the credit supply in the commercial banks. Conversely, when it sells Government securities, it contracts the money supply. The Open Market Committee does not, incidentally, buy or sell Government securities in direct trades with its member banks; it buys and sells to a selected group of big securities brokers who, in turn, buy or sell the securities to the member banks. But the result is the same, insofar as they affect the money supply. When the Open Market Committee buys Government securities, the banks then have an increase in deposits, which they may pyramid into larger amounts of loans—at the present rate of 6 to 1.

HIGH-POWERED DOLLARS

So, whether the Federal Reserve System frees bank reserves by lowering reserve requirements or by buying Government securities, the effect on the money supply is the same. The reserves freed by either method constitute what are called high-powered dollars for the reason that the banks are free to multiply and proliferate these dollars.

BANKERS WANT TO CREATE MONEY AND KEEP THE GOVERNMENT SECURITIES, TOO

There is, however, an important difference between the two methods of adding to the money supply, insofar as the private bankers are concerned. If the Federal Reserve purchases Government securities to make available to the banks a given amount of reserves, then the banks may lend these reserves at a rate of about 6 to 1. But when the Federal Reserve System "frees" the same amount of reserves by lowering reserve requirements, this means that the banks can do the same thing, and, in addition, keep the Government securities and collect the interest on these securities as well. In other words, a given increase in the money supply means a great deal more to the bankers if the latter method is used, because the bankers collect more interest as a result of this method, and, of course, the taxpayers lose the difference.

Now we might consider one other way which the Federal Reserve System has for controlling the amount of money in the banking system, after which we can appraise the present posture of the system and see what it is likely to do.

FEDERAL RESERVE SUGGESTS INTEREST RATES

The Federal Reserve Board can, within limits, regulate the extent to which a given amount of reserves are multiplied and proliferated by the commercial banks, by suggesting to the banks the level of interest rates which the bankers should charge on their loans. As I have already indicated, the supply of money in the private banking system is determined, within limits, by the demand for money. Thus, high-interest rates tend to choke off the demand for money, and when creditors do not borrow, the supply of money does not increase.

The Federal Reserve Board suggests to its member banks changes in the interest rates, by announcing changes in the Federal Reserve "discount" rate. The discount rate is, of course, the rate which the Federal Reserve banks charge member banks on their direct borrowing from the Federal Reserve banks. In theory, of course, Federal Reserve direct lending to its member banks is another way by which the System may add to or subtract from the money supply. But in practice the volume of such direct lending which the Federal Reserve banks do at any one time is without respect to the System's current monetary policies, or its current objective to increase or decrease the money supply. Furthermore, the Federal Reserve credit made available in this way is relatively small. For example, at the end of October 1957, only \$710 million of Federal Reserve credit was outstanding through direct loans or discounts to member banks. This compared with \$23.2 billion of Federal Reserve credit outstanding through holdings of United States Government securities and more than a billion dollars outstanding through what is called Federal Reserve float. The \$170 million of Federal Reserve discounts and advances may also be compared to an approximate \$139 billion of member bank loans and investments outstanding as of the end of October.

Nevertheless, the Federal Reserve discount rate is a matter of considerable importance, because, in practice, this rate is a kind of a signal which indicates to the member banks what the Federal Reserve's general policy currently is, in making credit available through operations of the Open Market Committee. When the Federal Reserve System raises the discount rate, this is a signal to the private banks that the System is going to follow, for some unspecified period to come, a policy of credit tightness. The banks can take this to mean that the System is going to go slow and resist adding to the money supply either by purchasing Government securities, or by lowering reserve requirements. It is thus a signal to the private banks that, with the demand for credit running heavy, they may safely raise their interest rates to their borrowers.

Over the last several years the Federal Reserve System has been through several cycles, first of tightening credit and loosening credit again. In this it has shown a tendency to raise interest rates at times when it wished to tighten credit, and to lower reserve requirements—

to the special benefit of the banks—whenever it wished to loosen credit. Since the beginning of 1953, reserve requirements have been changed only downward, never upward.

Thus, in July of 1953, after its credit tightening began to be reflected in a business slump, the Board lowered reserve requirements. It lowered requirements for the New York and Chicago banks 2 percentage points, and lowered requirements for the reserve city banks and country banks each by 1 percentage point. Then in June of 1954, with business recovery still lagging, the Board lowered requirements for the New York and Chicago banks by another percentage point. And in the following month, July 1954, the Board made another reduction of 1 percentage point for all classes of banks.

In its prolonged program of tightening credit, beginning in 1955 and running through November of last year, the Board did not, however, raise reserve requirements again. Rather, it made 7 successive increases in the discount rate, as a result of which this rate was increased from 1½ to 3½ percent. Then, on November 15 of last year, after the business slump was getting out of hand, the Board gave a signal that it was going to ease credit. It announced a reduction in the discount rate from 3½ percent down to 3 percent. This is the signal to bankers that the System is about to take some other action to implement its change in policy. As yet, however, the System has done little if anything to bring on an actual easing of credit. The question now is, What will it do—which method will it use? Will it buy Government securities to increase the money supply, and thus save the Federal Government interest on those securities? Or will it again lower reserve requirements so as to allow the banks to create the money and keep the Government securities, too?

It would be nice, of course, if the Federal Reserve System would allow private banks to create \$3 billions more money in the way which gives the banks the most profits—assuming, of course, that the bankers need an additional subsidy from the taxpayers. But a great deal more is involved than a question of giving the bankers a further subsidy. Lower reserve requirements involve a huge gamble with our whole economic system. Just as a given amount of reserves snowballs to increase the money supply when the level of business is going up, so too, when temporary setbacks occur in our economy, the effect of the fractional reserve system is to snowball and multiply the difficulties. This system has in the past brought on panics and triggered depressions. I am not opposed to the fractional reserve system; it serves our economy well. What I am calling the Members' attention to, however, is a matter of degree. The point is that the further reserve requirements are reduced the greater, also, is the weakening of the safeguards against the banking system triggering a general recession.

We hear a great deal these days about the so-called automatic stabilizers in our economy which were enacted in the

New Deal years. Among these "stabilizers," of course, are unemployment insurance and Federal deposit insurance. But all of the stabilizers taken together do not make our country depression-proof. Indeed, the safeguards set up for the banking system are extremely weak. FDIC reserves, in truth, amount to only \$1.44 for each \$100 of deposits in the insured banks. Such reserves are adequate to cover isolated bank failures; but they obviously could not cope with the difficulties which are likely to arise in a general recession. More than that, the ratio of the bankers' own money now in the banking system is well below the 10 percent which has been traditionally regarded as the minimum for safety.

In short, the proposal to make a further reduction in required bank reserves is, as I see it, a proposal to play Russian roulette with our whole economy. I am opposed to it.

TRINITY RIVER PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I testified before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of the proposal to develop Trinity River power by a partnership between the Federal Government and private enterprise. I should like to repeat my testimony today.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, recently I introduced H. R. 10005, to authorize the partnership approach to the power aspects of the Trinity River project in California. My bill is identical with H. R. 6997 and H. R. 7407 which were introduced last year by my colleagues from California, HUBERT SCUDDER and JAMES UTT.

On previous occasions I have made it quite clear that I favor joint development of Trinity power facilities, but since I am also the author of legislation to authorize the San Luis project which would provide supplemental water supply for the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, and my own district, I want to make it very plain that I am convinced that partnership on Trinity will actually be a decided boon to the San Luis project.

The act which authorized the Trinity River project (Public Law 386, 84th Cong., 1st sess.) specifically makes it an integral part of the Central Valley project. It is important that this fact be borne in mind.

Congress, in its wisdom when it authorized the Central Valley project (Public Law 392, 75th Cong., and Public Law 868, 76th Cong.), specifically provided that the Central Valley project was to be "for the purposes of improving navigation, regulating the flow of the San Joaquin River and the Sacramento River, controlling floods, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters thereof, for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands and lands of Indian reservations, and other beneficial uses, and for the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings and in order to permit the full utilization of the works constructed to accomplish the aforesaid purposes."

In other words the legislation specifically provided that revenues from power of the Central Valley project were to be used to financially aid and assist the water features.

As this committee well knows, the law which authorized the Trinity River project and made it a part of the Central Valley project, has this provision:

"Provided, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to continue to a conclusion the engineering studies and negotiations with any non-Federal agency with respect to proposals to purchase falling water and, not later than 18 months from the date of enactment of this act, report the results of such negotiations, including the terms of a proposed agreement, if any, that may be reached, together with his recommendations thereon, which agreement, if any, shall not become effective until approved by Congress."

In keeping with this directive from the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior made a very careful and comprehensive study of the possibility of selling falling water to a non-Federal agency rather than having the Federal Government build the power facilities. According to the Secretary, ample opportunity was given to all prospective preference and nonpreference purchasers of falling water and that only the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. indicated any desire to do so. The offer of the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. was thoroughly studied by the Secretary and he concluded, "I find the proposal of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to be acceptable generally and recommend approval by the Congress."

The Secretary, in his report and recommendation to the Congress which is contained in House Document No. 94 (85th Cong., 1st sess.), found many reasons for taking this action. I am going to refer first to the added surplus to the Central Valley project which would occur from joint development, since I have referred above to this feature of the legislation which originally authorized the Central Valley project. The Secretary stated in his report that "under the joint plan of development proposed by the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. the payments by the company to the United States would cause the estimated surplus (of the Central Valley project) * * * to be somewhat over \$165 million greater than it would be if the power facilities under the Trinity River Division were to be constructed by the Federal Government. * * * If it is assumed that the San Luis project is constructed by the Federal Government, then the advantage in the surplus credited to the project as a whole would be \$124 million under joint development."

The Secretary evidently was familiar with the language in the original Central Valley project authorizing legislation to the effect that power revenues were to aid and assist irrigation because he pointed out in his report:

"Under the present Central Valley rate structure Trinity power facilities, if built by the United States, would require substantial assistance from other project revenues in order to meet repayment requirements. Joint development under the proposed agreement would convert Trinity falling water into a substantial net asset of the project."

In other words, under all-Federal development Trinity power is a drain on the water and power facilities of the Central Valley project, which runs counter to the authorizing legislation, and only under joint development authorizing partnership as provided in my bill does Trinity comply with the law authorizing the Central Valley project.

Certainly this added surplus created by joint development would be most helpful to the San Luis project both in meeting annual costs and in making water as cheap as possible to San Luis water users.

Aside from these important and overriding facts, Trinity partnership offers several other definite advantages to the San Luis. The Secretary pointed out in his report on Trinity:

"In my opinion, it appears clear from the report of the Commissioner that joint development would provide substantially more funds for potential irrigation and multipurpose development in the Central Valley project area. This means that the power resource of the Trinity River division under joint development would provide the greater benefit to the project area and to the Nation as a whole. This is consistent with my view that our water resources should be developed in the manner best suited to comprehensive use of those resources."

"I am also conscious of the fact that the basic purpose of the reclamation program is the development of irrigation water supply and the reclamation of land. Electric power is generated as an incident to the basic purpose of the program. It seems to me that the development of the power resource of the Trinity River division under a joint proposal such as that offered by the company would mean that power would become a better partner of irrigation development in the Central Valley project area than under all-Federal construction."

Certainly the San Luis project can qualify to share in the increased advantages which would accrue to the Central Valley project as a result of joint development. As a matter of fact, it seems rather inconsistent to me to support the San Luis project and at the same time oppose the partnership development on the Trinity.

There is still another major factor—and in view of the present budget situation it might be the most important factor—which makes Trinity partnership advantageous to San Luis. Obviously, if the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. builds the power facilities instead of the Federal Government, there will be a saving of some \$56 million in project costs. On this point the Secretary in his report had the following to say:

"It should be noted also that the Commissioner's report states that the capital investment of the United States would be reduced by \$55,500,000. This represents an immediate lessening of demands on the Federal budget in the next few years, or this sum could be diverted to the construction of other needed reclamation projects."

According to latest estimates, the San Luis project will cost \$305 million. The saving on Trinity of \$55,500,000 represents over 18 percent of the total cost of the San Luis. The saving on power facilities of the Trinity would provide sufficient funds to build a forebay to the San Luis Reservoir which would permit greater use of off-peak pumping energy which in turn would materially reduce operating costs of the San Luis unit and, what is of more immediate interest to my district, this \$55.5 million saving resulting from partnership on Trinity would provide sufficient funds for facilities of the San Luis project to serve lands in Alameda, San Benito, and Santa Clara Counties. It hardly seems necessary to dwell further on the advantages of joint development on Trinity which would be available and accrue to the Central Valley project generally and the proposed San Luis project in particular.

Those who oppose the Trinity partnership plan will counter my argument with the allegation that cheap Federal power produced at Trinity is essential to the successful operation of the San Luis project. In using this argument they are forgetting one important fact: If my information is correct the Trinity project was originally justified on the basis of expected revenue for power of approximately 4.4 mills. It is also my understanding that opponents of Trinity partnership propose to dedicate Trinity power to

San Luis at a rate of approximately 2.5 mills. This is a rate juggling which amounts to destroying the feasibility of one project to make another one acceptable. It is deceitful to justify a project on one rate, get it under construction, and then change the rate to justify another. Whatever advantage would accrue to the San Luis project from all Federal Trinity power would be taken from Trinity. The situation would be exactly the same as robbing Peter to pay Paul, or transferring money from one pocket to the other and telling yourself you had twice as much as when you started.

Aside from all of the above-named advantages of partnership development it seems to me it behooves all of us to take a broad-gauge view of the present budget situation and wherever possible ease the strain of Federal spending so that as much funds as we can possibly afford can be diverted to our defense effort.

I could not help but think as I read recently in the Washington papers about the contract recently awarded the Chrysler Corp. to produce 1,500-mile-range Jupiter missiles that it just so happens that the savings of joint development on Trinity would be more than enough to finance this entire contract. It seems that we should all be giving thought to matters like this.

The Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, according to the press, recently stated:

"It is my hope that we can save enough out of nonessential items to make up for the increase in defense spending and still keep a balanced budget."

Certainly Federal spending for Trinity power facilities is nonessential simply because others are willing to put up the money and at the same time produce greater return to the Federal Treasury.

I am not unmindful that there are those who feel that the Federal Government has an obligation to build power facilities solely for the purpose of supplying so-called cheap Federal power to the so-called preference customers. On this subject the Secretary had the following to say:

"A vital part of the company's Trinity proposal is its offer to extend this contract for the 50-year life of the Trinity agreement, with amendments which are more favorable to the Government than the existing contract. It is my understanding that the Commissioner's estimate of 470,000 kilowatts (with San Luis) of capacity for preference customers is contingent on the company's willingness to offer the same integration with the company's system in the event its Trinity proposal is not accepted. The company offers to firm up a preference customer load of 450,000 kilowatts, with or without San Luis. If it appears desirable to devote more of the project revenues to the purchase of firming energy, or to raise rates somewhat, the supported loads under joint development could be increased above the amounts indicated by the Commissioner's report."

Thus under the offer of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. the Government could serve loads up to 450,000 kilowatts, whereas even assuming certain favorable conditions the Government could not supply more than 470,000 kilowatts after meeting the requirements of San Luis. Therefore, it can be safely said that the Government could, if it so chose, serve practically as many preference loads as would be possible under the all-Federal development of Trinity. It seems, therefore, that the choice again is whether we want Federal plants to be constructed at a cost to the Federal taxpayer to serve a privileged few, or whether we prefer to accept joint development and permit the benefits to flow to the water users, the taxpayers and all people generally.

So far I have made no mention of the taxes which would accrue to the Federal

Government in the case of joint development. According to the Secretary \$135 million in taxes would be paid by the company to Federal, State, and local governments. About \$70 million of this would accrue to the Federal Government which would largely, if not completely, offset any penalty that would accrue to Federal agencies as an improbable result of having to buy more power from the company under joint development than would be the case under all-Federal development of Trinity power facilities.

When you add to this Federal tax advantage the more than \$65 million which would accrue to the State and local governments as a result of partnership development, the overall advantages of the provisions of the Secretary's recommendations and of my bill become more and more apparent.

Those who are opposing this project have made reference to the losses to Federal agencies as the result of their inability to get Federal power under joint development. I have already pointed out that by accepting the company's offer to firm up to 450,000 kw., the Federal Government can serve almost as much load as would be possible under all-Federal development of Trinity. Probably the biggest Federal load in California is the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory which is located in my district. This laboratory uses large blocks of power but on an intermittent basis and it is a load difficult to serve except from an integrated system such as the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

The fact is that the Government is now supplying only 50,000 kw. of their total requirements and has refused to increase this allocation to Ames even though they have since allocated 7,500 kw. to the city of Roseville.

An early improvement in Federal spending and taxing methods is imperative if the administration is to inspire any public confidence in our economy. The new demands for a \$2 billion hike in our defense budget; supplementary funds for civilian programs; new demands of new interest groups involving increased Federal, State, and local spending—how are these contradictory needs to be reconciled with the basic principles of sound economy? And the basics of sound economy mean reduction in nonessential Government spending and an equitable tax structure. At present, we cannot claim fame from either.

Adoption of the Trinity partnership plan would be an initial positive step toward both goals. Adoption of the all-Federal plan to operate the Trinity power system would continue the "dead center" state we find ourselves in today, with more nonessential Government outlays and stiffer tax burdens. Let's see how.

The public power opponents of the partnership proposal maintain that their way alone can provide cheap power. This is true, but only the few get the advantage of cheap power—the few so-called preference customers who represent only 7 percent of the power users in northern California. The remaining 93 percent are asked to foot the major part of the preference groups' bill, although they receive no direct benefits whatsoever.

It is fallacious to assume that the Federal Government can give something for nothing. Its services including hydroelectric power have a cost, and that cost is borne by the taxpayers—66,005,000 self-supporting, gainfully employed Americans. The public-power advocate in effect asks for a tax hike in championing his case for Trinity. For there is no good genie around ready to fill up the Federal Treasury.

On the contrary, the Treasury is an empty purse, with a debt of over \$270 billion. It obviously can't give anything to anybody without first taking it away from someone else. Again we retrace our circle back to the taxpayer.

On the other side of the coin, we have a proposal for development of Trinity power which would serve three major purposes in firming up our economy: (1) first eliminate another waste in nonessential spending, (2) create \$310 million worth of benefits for the public, and (3) constitute a step toward tax improvement in the form of savings and lightened tax load. Americans everywhere should have a broader understanding of the partnership principle, whether applied to power development or any other field. It is a major economic asset, as the case at Trinity shows.

Private construction of the Trinity powerplants would alone save the Government an immediate cost of \$55,500,000, meaning \$55,500,000 retained by the taxpayers. The Government also stands to get over \$4 million yearly over the 50-year contract period for P. G. & E.'s use of the falling water. That is a net gain of \$165 million to the Government over what its own power operation could produce. Then it can also expect a tax revenue amounting to \$83 million extra over the total repayment period. Nor does this tax revenue include the additional \$62,600,000 more in payments to State and local governments. With State and local spending hitting all-time highs, is it not about time that new sources of outside revenue were tapped, as offered through the Trinity partnership plan? Again, the taxpayer gets the brunt of heavy indebtedness at the grassroots level. It is to his interest to demand new revenue creators.

Residents of Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties in my District may not know it, but the final outcome of the Trinity partnership proposal affects their home base. The Trinity River project is far from being an isolated water project in northwest California. What happens to the development of hydroelectric power at Trinity will indirectly influence our own water supply as well as our wallets.

First, let us take a look at the water situation in Santa Clara County. Latest census figures show that Santa Clara leads the Bay area in population increase over 1956 totals, to be exact a 50,700 increase. This will mean a greater demand for water which is in short supply, and getting shorter. The fact that the city of Sunnyvale was rejected recently as a site for \$40 million of industrial development for lack of industrial water is no consolation. Not only is our local agriculture hit by low water levels, but industrial development can be stunted by a lack of this basic resource.

We in Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and San Benito need water desperately as the evidence proves. And we will need it at the most reasonable price to the farmer and water user. Joint development of Trinity can provide these needs.

It would mean: \$55,500,000 in immediate savings to the Government through private construction of powerplants; \$165 million in additional revenue from sale of falling water; \$145 million in tax payments to Federal, State, and local governments; \$83,040,000 to the Federal Government, \$7,310,000 to California, \$55,345,000 to California counties.

Now, what do all these figures mean to my District? The extra money available through partnership would go a long way toward financing local water projects. For example, the Corps of Engineers San Lorenzo River project, just started in Santa Cruz County, will take another \$1,233,000 in Federal support after 1958. Also, we have the proposed San Luis project sorely needed on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley and my District. This will take another \$305 million outlay if authorized.

The initial partnership construction savings of \$55,500,000 could pay for 55 San Lorenzo River projects, while a total of \$248,040,000 in revenue to Federal coffers

would take care of the major chunk of San Luis.

The point is that partnership would create the funds necessary to carry on these local projects of ours. And everything proves that the maximum contribution to San Luis would be made under this plan.

Can we say the same for the all-Federal plan for Trinity power? I'm afraid not. Federal control of Trinity power would actually be a deficit operation, since other CVP projects would have to make loans to Trinity. What would this mean other than draining the allotments for other irrigation works and making them more expensive in the long run. Certainly, San Luis water would be more costly not only in water prices, but in stiffer loads on the taxpayer.

Tenth District constituents do have a big stake in Trinity. They will be the ones paying these water prices and taxes on new projects.

To refuse approval of the Trinity partnership proposal is to subsidize a few power users at the expense of many. It would be a giveaway in the worst sense. It would defeat the purpose of the Central Valley project to subsidize water development.

Speaking for my constituents who need help in developing a source of water and speaking for fair treatment of the entire Nation rather than a favored few I sincerely hope the bills introduced by Congressmen SCUDDER, UTT, and myself will be favorably considered.

I thank you.

LITTLETON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a statement made by Merrill E. Cobb, superintendent of the Littleton Public Schools, Littleton, Mass., before the Committee on Education.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the statement just referred to follows:

JANUARY 23, 1958.

Mr. McCORD,
Clerk of Committee,
Committee on Education,
House of Representatives.

DEAR Mr. McCORD: The following information is submitted for consideration by your committee relative to the extension and modification of Public Laws 815 and 874.

The information contained in this report is presented as evidence of the undue hardships being imposed upon small, rural communities located within commuting distance of Federal properties relative to the cost of educating the federally connected pupils.

The town of Littleton, Mass., is located some 30 miles northwest of Boston and within easy commuting distance of Fort Devens in Ayre, Mass., and Hanscom Field, in Bedford, Mass. The population of the town is approximately 4,500 people. The town is predominately residential with some farming but little or no industry. The only local source of revenue for the support of education is the real-estate tax.

The current school enrollment in Littleton is 915 pupils. Of this number, 200 or 22 percent of the total are federally connected pupils or pupils whose parents reside in Littleton but are employed on or assigned to Federal installations within commuting distance.

The per pupil cost of education for the 1956-57 school year in Littleton amounted to \$250.57. The per pupil net cost to the town, from local taxation, for this same year was

\$172.67. The total cost to the town of educating the 172 federally connected pupils for this same year was approximately \$30,000. The town received approximately \$18,000 under subsection 3c-1 of Public Law 874 for these same pupils based upon average daily attendance.

In terms of housing, Littleton was forced into a 2-platoon system for 2 full school years for grades 7-12 while waiting the completion of a new \$1,500,000 high school. Preliminary plans are now under way for construction of a new 8-room elementary school. The estimated cost of this project is \$450,000. An application under Public Law 815 is pending on this project which would provide approximately \$50,000 toward the total cost. The school-building program in Littleton has resulted in a net debt of \$1,472,000. Littleton now has the highest per

capita indebtedness of any town in Massachusetts.

The Federal aid which Littleton received under Public Law 874 is only a fraction of the real cost of educating our federally connected pupils. It does, however, provide partial relief to the local taxpayer. Federal aid which is pending under Public Law 815 is also a fraction of the real cost of providing classrooms for these pupils.

While the existing Federal aid is inadequate, it is unthinkable that the Congress could justify a modification or termination of present laws so that the full burden of educating federally connected pupils, which is a direct result of activities of the United States Government, would be borne by local taxpayers.

A statistical summary for the past 5 years is presented below:

Year	Total enrollment	Federal pupils	Percentage of total	Total cost per pupil	Total cost to town	Tax rate
1953-54	571	63	11	\$197.41	\$75,770.75	\$35
1954-55	665	111	16	201.94	88,251.70	40
1955-56	730	158	21	229.81	123,746.13	47
1956-57	810	172	21	250.57	175,375.78	63
1957-58	915	200	22	338.53	212,005.53	68

NOTE.—Tax rates are based on assessed valuation per \$1,000. Assessed valuation on real estate is approximately 35 percent of market value.

Estimated Public Law 874 receipts for 1958 totals \$16,148 or approximately 34 percent of the actual local cost of educating the 200 federally connected pupils.

Respectfully submitted,

MERRILL E. COBB.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. After further examination of the President's message and the recommendations made therein, the Chair believes that the proper committee to which to refer the President's message is the Committee on Education and Labor instead of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, because on the Science Foundation no new law is suggested, simply more appropriations. The other part of the President's message deals with education. Therefore the Chair is going to change the reference of the President's message and whatever bills are introduced on that subject, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Saturday's Washington Post and Sunday's New York Times carried news articles which included my name and that of my wife in a list of people who own, directly or indirectly, television stations. I understand that the news articles gave as their origin a list published in Broadcasting magazine, issue of January 7, 1957.

I wish publicly to announce that this is not true. Neither Mrs. Holifield nor I own a television station, nor do we own

any stock in television stations now or at any time in the past.

I was highly complimented at being placed in such a high level of economic society. Of course, I do not know why the error was made, but I wanted to announce publicly that it is an error.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), until Thursday, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 20 minutes, on Thursday, January 30, vacating special order entered for today.

Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 60 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. DENNISON (at the request of Mr. GRIFFIN), for an hour, on Monday and on Tuesday next.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Monday and Tuesday next, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. MAGNUSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WRIGHT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. ALGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAMER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHANSEN and to include his weekly letter to his constituents.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEAL in two instances; Mr. SPRINGER; and Mr. KEARNS (at the request of Mr. VORYS).

Mr. GWINN in two instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 28, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Helmburger	Counsel	\$7,418.22
Mabel G. Downey	Clerk	7,418.22
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	6,808.86
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	3,843.54
Fauline E. Graves	do	3,792.18
Betty M. Prezioso	do	3,381.12
Gladys N. Ondarcho	do	3,124.26
Alicia F. Shoemaker	do	3,051.42
Jerry Max Perry	do	1,240.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....4,402.15

Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957.....6,994.13

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957.....11,396.28

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957.....38,603.72

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE FUND)

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved

August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession (standing or select committee)	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Richard F. McIlwain	Director, surveys and investigations staff	\$6,088.02
Robert E. Rightmyer	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff	6,195.78
M. Alice Ruml	Stenographer	2,524.80
Lillian M. Mackie	do	2,524.80
John J. Donnelly	Consultant	9,000.00
George Y. Harvey	do	1,500.00

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Agriculture, Department of:		
Dorick, Stanley J.	Investigator	\$2,660.33
Gross, William J.	do	4,484.00
Sherman, John I.	do	3,559.34
Army, Department of:		
Rosenman, Harvey	do	2,366.26
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Bolsen, James L.	do	3,460.44
Moore, John R.	do	4,813.19
Budget, Bureau of:		
the Newmann, Richard	do	931.82
Central Intelligence Agency:		
Duro, Richard	Clerk-stenographer	532.72
Commerce, Department of:		
Brinkman, Harry R.	Investigator	1,990.44
Hansen, Morris	do	655.39
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bennett, Carl L.	do	4,454.64
Bowers, Hollis W.	do	3,416.67
Carlson, Howard A.	do	3,779.43
Hair, Harold H.	do	4,603.50
Haynes, Robert H.	do	4,148.67
Jenkins, Thomas J.	do	4,512.53
Lewis, Paul Harlan	do	2,813.73
MacDonald, Albert G.	do	2,630.94
Miller, Richard A.	do	4,446.37
Murphy, Robert M.	do	4,421.57
Nugent, James E.	do	5,368.77
Reiser, Robert E.	do	3,166.07
Ruhl, John A.	do	4,421.57
Scott, Ralph D.	do	3,348.00
Shannon, Andrew J.	do	4,347.13
Vahey, Eugene W.	do	3,175.49
Virden, Samuel E.	do	4,421.57
Contribution to retirement fund.	do	3,803.03
General Services Administration:		
Robinson, Melville C.	do	4,880.80
Interior, Department of:		
Edwards, Percy L.	do	3,982.13
Gilbert, Fred	do	4,442.31
Lacasse, E. C.	do	4,511.62
Miller, Donald H.	do	4,634.65
O'Neill, Robert S.	do	3,217.89
International Cooperation Administration:		
Eldridge, David N.	do	3,473.38
Interstate Commerce Commission:		
Pittman, John I.	do	3,077.20
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:		
Cushman, Ralph R.	do	5,096.37
State, Department of:		
Minor, Charles W.	do	4,437.03
Tennessee Valley Authority:		
Cowser, Joyce W.	do	3,500.82
Grandy, Rodney L.	do	4,442.20

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—CON.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Veterans' Administration: Jones, William F.	Investigator	\$4,064.95
Veterans' Canteen Service Field Office: Osolin, Harry.	do	3,570.86
Travel and miscellaneous expenses.		82,327.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$500,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....

Amount expended from Dec. 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957.....263,686.62

Total amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957.....263,686.62

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957.....236,313.38

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Corbal D. Orescan	Clerk and staff director	\$7,418.22
Kenneth Sprinkle	do	7,418.22
Paul M. Wilson	do	7,418.22
Jay B. Howe	Staff assistant	6,808.86
Ross P. Pope	do	6,808.86
Robert M. Moyer	do	6,808.86
Carson W. Culp	do	6,808.86
Samuel W. Crosby	do	6,808.86
Frank Sanders	do	6,288.66
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	6,288.66
George S. Green	Clerk to minority	6,437.28
E. L. Eckloff	Clerk to majority	6,325.80
Robert P. Williams	Editor	5,917.14
Robert L. Michaels	Staff assistant	5,322.60
G. Homer Skarin	do	4,727.94
Earl C. Silsby	do	4,564.44
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	3,723.66
Francis G. Merrill	Staff assistant	3,552.42
Samuel R. Preston	Junior staff assistant	3,124.26
Donald F. Berens	Clerical assistant	2,524.80
Randolph Thomas	Janitor-messenger	1,678.02
John C. Pugh	Consultant	1,461.00
Julia M. Elliott	Clerk-stenographer	2,610.42
Mary A. Vaughn	do	2,610.42
Betty G. Coll	do	2,610.42
Phyllis N. Troy	do	2,610.42
William J. Neary	do	2,610.42
Shirley Rae Cooley	do	2,610.42
Catherine D. Norrell	do	2,610.42
Donald L. Bernard	do	2,610.42
Edward Rice	do	2,610.42
Molly O. Day Saguto	do	2,610.42
Rose Marie Kline	do	2,610.42
Margaret B. Linton	do	2,610.42
Silas Taber	do	2,610.42
L. Margaret Murray	do	870.14
Margie H. Trev	do	2,610.42
John G. Clevenger	do	2,610.42
Gladys Kofmehl	do	2,610.42
Frank B. Melchior	do	2,507.64
Frank Mentillo	do	2,353.50
Lenore Cummings	do	2,353.50
Robert V. V. Rice, Jr.	do	2,010.96
Josephine Birdsall	do	2,610.42
Harris H. Huston	Staff assistant	794.37

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald R. Bridges....	Clerical assistant....	\$1,392.22
Patricia Anne Hap- penberger.....	Clerk-stenographer....	1,740.28
Lucille K. Brand.....	do.....	1,839.72
Robert Cope, Jr.....	do.....	733.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$435,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....
Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957..... 181,818.65

Total amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957..... 181,818.65

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957..... 253,181.35

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JANUARY 1, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart.....	Chief counsel.....	\$7,400.00
John R. Blandford.....	Counsel.....	7,366.00
Charles F. Ducander.....	do.....	7,366.00
Philip W. Kelleher.....	do.....	7,366.00
Janice G. Angell.....	Committee secretary.....	3,509.59
Bernice Kalinowski.....	Secretary.....	3,509.59
Oneta L. Stockstill.....	do.....	3,209.87
L. Louise Ellis.....	do.....	3,209.87
Marie M. Abbott.....	do.....	2,811.66
James A. Deakins.....	Bill clerk.....	2,811.66

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL OPERATING PURSUANT TO H. RES. 67 AND 68, 85TH CONG.

John J. Courtney.....	Special counsel.....	\$7,418.22
Edward T. Fogo.....	Staff assistant.....	5,173.93
Lloyd R. Kuhn.....	do.....	4,014.84
Raymond Wilcove.....	do.....	7,013.22
Robert N. Tyler.....	do.....	4,014.84
Dorothy Britton.....	Secretary.....	2,781.72
Jane Wheelahan.....	do.....	2,610.42
Ethel L. Mott.....	Clerk.....	2,610.42
Adeline Tolerton.....	do.....	2,610.42

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 37,434.18

Amount expended from January 1957 to June 1957..... 37,434.18

Total amount expended from July 1957 to December 1957..... 41,848.55

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1958..... 70,717.27

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 7, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person em-

ployed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Cardon.....	Clerk and counsel.....	\$7,418.22
Orman S. Fink.....	Professional staff.....	7,418.22
John E. Barriere.....	do.....	7,418.22
Helen E. Long.....	Deputy clerk.....	3,980.58
Mary W. Layton.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,980.58
John M. Devlin.....	Editor.....	4,951.08

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 86, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Eleanor Hamilton.....	Research assistant.....	\$3,000.06
Alberta Masumian.....	Secretary.....	3,021.48
John J. McEwan, Jr.....	Housing economist.....	7,418.22
Grady Perry, Jr.....	Clerk.....	3,552.42
Robert R. Poston.....	Chief Counsel.....	7,418.22
Betty B. Ridgell.....	Secretary.....	3,329.76
Annie Louise Odum.....	Research assistant (to Aug. 31, 1957).....	801.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$100,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 27,346.56

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957..... 41,875.07

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957..... 69,221.63

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957..... 30,778.37

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 2, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.....	Clerk.....	\$7,403.34
Wendell E. Cable.....	Minority clerk.....	6,808.86
Ruth Butterworth.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,031.94
Dixon Davis.....	do.....	2,698.44
George McGown.....	Research analyst.....	3,723.66
Margaret S. Rogers.....	Assistant clerk (July 1 to 31).....	463.62
Leonard O. Hilder.....	Investigator (appointed Sept. 1, 1957).....	3,350.24
Ann L. Puryear.....	Assistant clerk (appointed Aug. 1, 1957).....	2,418.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$7,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 543.75

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957..... 225.82

Total amount expended from Feb. 7 to Dec. 31, 1957..... 769.57

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957..... 6,230.43

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JANUARY 8, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Fred G. Hussey.....	Chief clerk.....	\$7,418.22
Russell O. Derriekson.....	Chief investigator.....	7,418.22
Charles M. Ryan.....	General counsel.....	7,129.73
Kennedy W. Ward.....	Assistant general counsel.....	7,418.22
John O. Graham.....	Minority clerk.....	7,418.22
Kathryn Kivett.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,226.98
Jeanne Thomson.....	Assistant clerk (minority).....	3,226.98
Gloria Ann Baysden.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,226.98
Elizabeth R. Myers.....	do.....	3,226.98
Clara Barnes.....	do.....	813.06

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$125,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 14,034.43

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957..... 34,338.31

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957..... 48,372.74

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957..... 76,627.26

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 9, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford.....	Staff administrator.....	\$7,418.22
Roy J. Bullock.....	Staff consultant.....	7,377.36
Albert C. F. Westphal.....	do.....	7,377.36
Dumond Peck Hill.....	do.....	6,808.86
Franklin J. Schupp.....	do.....	5,502.84
Sheldon Z. Kaplan.....	Staff consultant (resigned; July 1957 only).....	1,224.60
June Nigh.....	Staff assistant.....	3,723.66
Winifred G. Osborne.....	do.....	3,638.04
Helen M. Mattas.....	do.....	3,638.04
Myrtle M. Melvin.....	do.....	3,638.04
Helen L. Hashagen.....	do.....	3,638.04
Mary Louise O'Brien.....	do.....	3,549.56
Robert J. Bowen.....	Clerical assistant.....	2,747.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$75,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 4,036.93

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957..... 10,865.31

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957..... 14,902.24

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957..... 60,097.76

THOMAS S. GORDON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses July 1, 1957, through Dec. 31, 1957:	
Full committee	\$3,561.39
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	46,569.32
Military Operations Subcommittee	35,302.44
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	23,421.87
Public Works and Resources Subcommittee	34,242.26
International Operations Subcommittee	24,556.11
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	41,554.97
General Government Activities Subcommittee	26,593.92
Special Donable Property Subcommittee	16,186.90
Special Government Information Subcommittee	36,002.61
Salaries, full committee, July 1-Dec. 31, 1957:	
Christine Ray Davis, staff director	7,418.22
Orville S. Poland, general counsel	6,872.22
James A. Lanigan, associate general counsel	7,310.46
Martha C. Roland, staff member	6,002.58
J. Robert Brown, staff member	5,694.18
Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member	3,937.74
Ann E. McLachlan, staff member	3,389.70
Mona Keating Henderson, staff member (July 1-Dec. 15, 1957)	2,981.66
Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff member	6,808.86
John Philip Carlson, minority counsel	6,002.58
Full committee	3,561.39

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman:

Elmer W. Henderson, counsel	6,065.76
Orville J. Montgomery, associate counsel	6,002.58
William A. Young, professional staff member	5,694.18
Victor G. Rosenblum, special counsel	6,002.58
David Glick, legal analyst	4,507.26
Morton C. Pollock, legal analyst	4,006.26
Earle J. Wade, clerical staff	3,766.50
Lawrence P. Redmond, clerical staff	3,740.82
Edith T. Carper, research analyst	3,021.48
Clara-K. Armstrong, minority, clerical	3,051.42
Expenses	710.48
Total	46,569.32

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:

Herbert Roback, staff director	\$7,418.22
Earl J. Morgan, investigator	5,025.36
Carey Brewer, professional staff member	5,025.36
John Paul Ridgely, investigator	4,515.42
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	3,809.34
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer	3,381.12
Catherine L. Koerberlein, clerk-stenographer	3,038.58
Expenses	3,089.04
Total	35,302.44

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, chairman:

James R. Naughton, counsel	5,508.42
Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member	5,471.22
Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer	3,038.58
Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer (Oct. 1-Dec. 31, 1957)	1,262.40
Nancee W. Black, clerk-stenographer (July 1-Aug. 31, 1957)	813.06
Expenses	7,328.19
Total	23,421.87

Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, Hon. Earl Chudoff, chairman:

Arthur Perlman, staff director	7,310.46
Phineas Indritz, counsel	6,002.58
Miles Q. Romney, professional staff member	5,025.36
Irene Manning, clerk-stenographer	3,081.42
Joan D. Heinly, clerk-stenographer	2,426.28
Milton K. Cummings, consultant	202.23
Expenses	10,193.93
Total	34,242.26

International Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr., chairman:

John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel	\$6,000.00
Richard P. Bray, Jr., counsel	5,842.80
Walton Woods, investigator	5,471.22
Maurice J. Mountain, consultant	461.34
Phyllis Semour, clerk	3,381.12
Angela C. Hall, clerk-stenographer (July 1-Aug. 31, 1957)	841.60
Expenses	2,558.08
Total	24,556.11

Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman:

Curtis E. Johnson, staff director	6,511.62
Jerome S. Plapinger, counsel	6,808.86
Hal Christensen, associate counsel	4,646.22
Jerome N. Sonosky, associate counsel	3,723.66
Stanley T. Fisher, accountant-investigator	5,099.70
John L. Anderson, investigator	4,515.42
Elizabeth Heater, clerk-stenographer	3,381.12
Ann Dominek, clerk-stenographer	2,961.54
Ella G. Roller, consultant	2,075.00
Expenses	1,841.83
Total	41,554.97

General Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman:

Edward C. Brooks, Jr., staff director	6,214.38
William E. Townsley, counsel	6,065.76
Vernon McDaniel, associate counsel	3,937.80
John E. Moore, investigator	4,237.50
Irma Reel, clerk	2,867.34
Expenses	3,271.14
Total	26,593.92

Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, chairman:

Ray Ward, staff director	\$6,808.86
John W. McGarry, associate counsel	4,006.26
Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer	3,038.58
Barbara McLaughlin, clerk-typist	1,505.94
Expenses	827.26
Total	16,186.90

Special Subcommittee on Government Information, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:

Samuel J. Archibald, staff director	6,808.86
John J. Mitchell, chief counsel	6,697.38
Paul Southwick, professional staff member	5,508.42
Helen Beasley, stenographer	3,241.26
Catherine Hartke, stenographer	3,241.26
John B. O'Brien, Jr., legal research analyst	2,550.00
William S. Fairfield, consultant	2,975.00
Robert Coll, investigator (Nov. 12-Dec. 31, 1957)	1,157.98
Expenses	3,822.45
Total	36,002.61

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

\$75,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

246,963.80

Balance unexpended July 1, 1957

328,036.20

Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957

288,001.79

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 15, 1958

40,034.41

WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 14, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	\$7,418.22
Majorie Savage	Assistant clerk	6,437.28
Jack W. Watson	do	5,322.62
Lura Cannon	do	4,564.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

\$5,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.. \$1,159.83

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957.. 1,213.20

Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1957..... 2,373.03

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1958..... 2,626.97

OMAR BURLESON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY FEDERAL PRINTING AND PAPERWORK

JANUARY 7, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John F. Halcy	Staff director	\$6,065.76
Philip B. Billings	Legal counsel	5,694.18
J. H. McWhorter	Technical adviser	5,694.18
Asselia S. Poore	Research analyst	3,295.50
Winifred C. Allen	Clerk	1,712.83
Ann Tibbitts	do	664.00
Rose M. Slusarz	Stenographer	1,247.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

\$75,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

22,076.72

Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957

30,141.21

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957

52,217.93

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1958

22,782.07

OMAR BURLESON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

SPECIAL ELECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

JANUARY 10, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from August 22 (date activated), 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Still, Samuel H.	Chief counsel	\$4,043.84
Kenny, Lucille Orr	Research analyst	1,510.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

\$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

None

Amount expended from Aug. 22, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957

6,882.50

Total amount expended from Aug. 22, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957

6,882.50

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1958

43,117.50

OMAR BURLESON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS JANUARY 4, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
George W. Abbott.....	Counsel (to Sept. 30, 1957).	\$3,404.43
Sidney L. McFarland.....	Engineering consultant	6,262.68
John L. Taylor.....	Territories consultant	6,262.68
George H. Soule, Jr.....	Minerals and lands consultant	6,262.68
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold.....	Chief clerk	5,545.56
Nelda Boding.....	Clerk (to Dec. 31, 1957).	3,552.42
Gertrude S. Harris.....	Clerk.....	3,552.42
Laura A. Moran.....	do.....	3,552.42
Eve F. Twomey.....	do.....	3,209.88
Barbara A. Peters.....	Clerk (to Sept. 30, 1957).	1,262.40
Madlyn Smyth.....	Clerk (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957).	1,776.21

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$57,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	7,503.30
Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957.....	14,493.22
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957.....	21,996.52
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957.....	35,503.48

CLAIR ENGLE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 6, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
Elton J. Layton.....	Clerk (retired effective Nov. 1, 1957).	\$4,933.32
W. E. Williamson.....	Clerk (from Nov. 1, 1957).	2,466.66
Kenneth J. Painter.....	1st assistant clerk.....	5,396.94
Marcella M. Fencl.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,595.20
Georgia G. Glasman.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer.....	3,295.50
Mildred H. Lang.....	Clerical assistant.....	3,181.42
Roy P. Wilkinson.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,781.70
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson.....	Expert.....	7,400.00
Kurt Borchardt.....	Legal counsel.....	7,400.00

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional Staff—con		
Sam G. Spal.....	Research specialist.....	7,400.00
Martin W. Cunningham.....	Aviation consultant.....	7,400.00
Additional temporary employees (H. Res. 69, amended; H. Res. 152, amended):		
Barbara S. Dearing.....	Clerical assistant.....	2,610.42
Mary Ryan.....	do.....	2,995.80
Glenn L. Johnson.....	Printing editor.....	4,515.42
Joanne Neuland.....	Clerical assistant (from Aug. 5, 1957).	2,501.67
Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety:		
Henry A. Barnes.....	Consultant (reimbursement for actual expenses). Research analyst.....	5,025.36
Nancy M. Henderson.		
Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight:		
Bernard Schwartz.....	Chief counsel-staff director (from Aug. 1).	6,181.85
Baron I. Shacklette.....	Chief investigator.....	7,400.00
Oliver Eastland.....	Assistant chief investigator (from July 24).	5,679.58
Joseph P. O'Hara, Jr.....	Investigator (from Aug. 1).	\$5,002.15
Stephen J. Angland.....	Attorney (from July 24).	5,235.58
Joseph T. Conlon, Jr.....	Attorney (from July 8).	3,858.71
Francis X. McLaughlin.....	Attorney (from July 25).	5,202.24
Mary Louise Ramsey.....	Attorney (from July 26).	5,168.89
Herbert M. Wachtel.....	Attorney (from Sept. 1).	3,355.40
Paul S. Berger.....	Attorney (from Aug. 26).	2,437.21
Herman Clay Beasley.....	Staff coordinator.....	5,694.18
Mildred B. Lenhardt.....	Administrative assistant (from Oct. 1).	1,497.90
Helen Kayser.....	Clerical assistant.....	2,995.78
Elizabeth Ruth.....	Clerical assistant (from July 22).	2,662.93
Mary Bastianelli.....	Clerical assistant (from Oct. 9).	1,025.36
Helen Hotchkiss.....	Clerical assistant (from July 8).	2,879.3
Rhoda Watkins.....	Clerical assistant (from July 7).	766.56
Walter M. W. Splawn.....	Consultant (per diem-actual expense basis) (no salary).	-----

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$350,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	11,840.60
Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957.....	93,323.92
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957.....	105,164.52
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957.....	244,835.48

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick.....	Staff director.....	\$7,418.22
William R. Foley.....	General counsel.....	7,418.22
Walter M. Besterman.....	Legislative assistant.....	7,418.22
Murray Drabkin.....	Counsel.....	4,564.44
Walter R. Lee.....	Legislative assistant.....	7,418.22
E. Willoughby Middleton, Jr.....	Associate counsel.....	6,808.86
Violet Benn.....	Clerical staff.....	4,509.95
Anne J. Berger.....	do.....	4,564.44
Lola Bikul.....	do.....	4,151.88
Frances Christy.....	do.....	4,359.48
Helen Goldsmith.....	do.....	3,980.58
Velma Smedley.....	do.....	4,564.44
Mary D. Well.....	do.....	3,438.25

SALARIES PAID JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1957, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 107 AND H. RES. 125, 85TH CONG.

Leonard Appel.....	Assistant counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.....	\$5,694.18
Robert E. Bauman.....	Messenger.....	1,755.84
Lucille E. Brooks.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,980.54
Gertrude C. Burak.....	do.....	2,809.66
Garner J. Cline.....	Assistant counsel.....	3,723.38
Laurie L. Coleman.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,867.34
Eisenberg, Milton.....	Associate counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.....	2,334.78
Eisenberg, Roberta.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,209.88
Herbert Fuchs.....	Assistant counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.....	5,471.22
Constance Glagola.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	560.54
Kenneth R. Harkins.....	Counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.....	7,254.72
Michael Kelemonick.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,867.34
Herbert N. Maletz.....	Counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.....	7,254.72
Elizabeth G. Meekins.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,209.88
Samuel R. Pierce, Jr.....	Associate counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.....	3,404.43
Julian H. Singman.....	Assistant counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.....	5,471.22

Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and revision of the laws:

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1957.....	\$31,519.16
Appropriation received July 1, 1957.....	100,000.00
Expended, June 30, 1957-Dec. 31, 1957.....	131,519.16
Balance, Dec. 31, 1957.....	26,585.40
B. Revision of the laws:	
Appropriation received July 1, 1957.....	16,500.00
Expended, June 30, 1957-Dec. 31, 1957.....	7,418.22
Balance, Dec. 31, 1957.....	9,081.78
C. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1957.....	2,764.01
Appropriation received July 1, 1957.....	100,000.00
Expended June 30, 1957-Dec. 31, 1957.....	102,764.01
Balance, Dec. 31, 1957.....	107.42
Balance, Dec. 31, 1957.....	102,656.59

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... 190,000.00
Amount of expenditures for period Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957..... 130,882.18

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957..... 59,117.82
H. Res. 125 adopted Feb. 7, 1957..... 190,000.00

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JANUARY 6, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946,

Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to January 6, 1958, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry.....	Chief counsel.....	\$7,451.64
Bernard J. Zinke.....	Counsel.....	6,967.48
Charles F. Warren.....	Assistant counsel.....	2,512.68
Robert H. Cowen.....	do.....	533.56
W. B. Winfield.....	Chief clerk.....	4,855.38
Frances Still.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,253.82
Ruth E. Brookshire.....	do.....	3,381.12
Edith W. Gordon.....	Secretary.....	3,381.12
Vera A. Barker.....	do.....	3,381.12
Shirley Schwartz.....	Minority clerk.....	4,066.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....988.85

Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Jan. 6, 1958.....18,017.00

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1957, to Jan. 6, 1958.....19,005.85

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 6, 1958.....30,994.15

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

JANUARY 15, 1958.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen.....	Chief counsel.....	\$7,418.22
George M. Moore.....	Counsel (July 1 to Sept. 15, 1957).....	3,042.92
Charles E. Johnson.....	Counsel.....	7,143.24
Henry C. Cassell.....	Clerk.....	6,808.86
Weldon T. Ellis, Jr.....	Professional staff member (July 1 to Oct. 6, 1957).....	3,631.39
John B. Price.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,809.34
Lillian Hopkins.....	do.....	3,723.66
Lucy K. Daley.....	do.....	3,452.42
Elsie Thornton.....	Secretary.....	2,824.50
Blanche Simons.....	do.....	2,824.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....6,736.22

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957.....11,173.64

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to Dec. 31, 1957.....17,909.86

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957.....32,090.14

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 8, 1958.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profes-

sion, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Margaret R. Belter.....	Chief clerk.....	\$6,808.85
Richard J. Sullivan.....	Chief counsel.....	6,808.85
Robert F. McConnell.....	Counsel.....	7,399.98
Joseph R. Brennan.....	Engineer-consultant.....	6,808.85
S. Philip Cohen.....	Staff assistant.....	3,809.34
Helen M. Dooley.....	do.....	5,322.62
Helen A. Thompson.....	do.....	4,172.60
Louise B. Cullen.....	do.....	3,766.50
Anna McHale.....	do.....	1,505.94
Ester M. Saunders.....	do.....	2,096.62

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$125,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....12,842.26

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957.....37,896.22

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957.....50,738.48

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957.....74,261.52

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

DECEMBER 18, 1957.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas M. Caruthers.....	Clerk (standing committee).....	\$5,694.18
Barbara M. Thornton.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,723.66
Jane W. Snader.....	Minority clerk.....	4,151.88

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 9, 1958.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing:		
Donald T. Appell.....	Investigator.....	\$6,140.02
Richard Arens.....	Director.....	7,399.98
Juliette P. Joray.....	Recording clerk.....	4,802.44
Isabel B. Nagel.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,295.50
Rosella A. Purdy.....	Secretary to counsel.....	3,963.45

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing—Continued		
Thelma I. Searce.....	Secretary to investigators.....	\$3,963.45
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.....	Counsel.....	7,399.98
Anne D. Turner.....	Chief of reference section.....	4,727.94
Lorraine N. Veley.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,124.26
William A. Wheeler.....	Investigator.....	5,991.42
Investigating:		
Alice W. Anderson.....	Information analyst.....	3,184.20
Margaret B. Attinello.....	Information specialist.....	3,295.52
Karl Baarslag.....	Special consultant (resigned Aug. 15, 1957).....	1,535.01
Beatrice P. Baldwin.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,267.88
Thomas G. Beesley.....	Editor (appointed Oct. 16, 1957).....	834.35
Frank J. Bonora.....	Investigator.....	4,237.50
Jeanne M. Cassebaum.....	Clerk-typist.....	1,814.04
Raymond T. Collins.....	Investigator.....	3,873.54
Patricia R. Crovato.....	Clerk-typist.....	1,908.24
Anniel Cunningham.....	Information analyst.....	3,092.10
Barbara H. Edelscheln.....	Editor.....	2,696.04
Elizabeth L. Edinger.....	do.....	3,124.26
Emily R. Francis.....	Clerk-typist (appointed Oct. 1, 1957).....	907.02
Helen M. Gittings.....	Research analyst.....	3,809.31
William F. Heimlich.....	Special consultant.....	6,065.76
James C. Hogan.....	Clerk-typist (appointed Oct. 1, 1957).....	919.86
Lillian E. Howard.....	Research analyst.....	3,616.65
W. Jackson Jones.....	Investigator.....	4,951.08
Olive M. King.....	Editor.....	3,693.72
Maura Patricia Kelly.....	Research analyst (appointed Aug. 19, 1957).....	1,838.94
Stephen V. Kopunek.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,222.94
Gwendolyn L. Lewis.....	Administrative assistant to director (appointed June 17, 1957).....	5,175.98
Regina McCall Wilt.....	Clerk-typist.....	1,839.72
Mary B. McManus.....	Special consultant.....	3,252.72
Jeanni M. O'Neill.....	Assistant chief of reference section.....	2,867.34
Winston.....	Clerk-typist (resigned Oct. 6, 1957).....	954.23
Joseph P. Orsulak.....	do.....	
Alma T. Pfaff.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,096.64
Katharine Phillips.....	Switchboard operator.....	2,107.32
Maureen Roselle.....	Information analyst.....	2,485.57
Louis J. Russell.....	Investigator.....	4,951.08
Dolores F. Scotti.....	do.....	3,723.66
Josephine E. Sheetz.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,439.18
Lela Mae Stiles.....	do.....	2,499.12
Cele F. Sweeney.....	do.....	2,439.18
Eleanor Ann Tehan.....	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Aug. 19, 1957).....	1,838.94
Max Truitt.....	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 15, 1957).....	909.27
Vera L. Watts.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,901.60
Richard S. Weil.....	Research analyst.....	4,149.90
Billie Wheeler.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	1,678.02
George C. Williams.....	Investigator.....	5,266.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$305,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....145,258.98

Amount expended from July 1, 1957 to Jan. 1, 1958.....147,361.74

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1957 to Jan. 1, 1958.....292,620.72

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957.....12,379.28

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 9, 1958.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	\$7,418.22
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel	7,418.22
George W. Fisher	Clerk	7,418.22
J. Buford Jenkins	Housing consultant	6,511.62
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	5,322.60
Helen A. Biondi	do	4,151.88
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	3,638.04
George Turner	Assistant clerk	3,509.58
Harold A. L. Lawrence	Professional aide (minority)	7,418.22
Ida Rowan	Clerk (minority)	6,808.86
Investigating staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	5,322.60
Joanne Doyle	Clerk-stenographer	2,524.80
Jean Johnson	do	2,524.80
Paul Smiley	Investigator	2,873.76
Davis Grant	do	7,202.70
Frank Ikard, Jr.	Supply clerk	298.06

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	17,524.88
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957	26,254.87
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957	43,779.75
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957	31,220.25

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

DECEMBER 31, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Full committee:		
Leo H. Irwin, clerk (C)		\$7,399.98
Thomas A. Martin, minority adviser (P)		7,399.98
John M. Martin, Jr., assistant clerk (P)		7,068.94
James W. Riddell, professional assistant (P)		6,994.62
Loyle A. Morrison, professional assistant (P) (from Aug. 1, 1957)		6,166.65
Gerard M. Brannon, professional assistant (P) (from Oct. 1, 1957)		2,928.84
Frances C. Russell, staff assistant (C)		4,674.78
Susan Alice Taylor, staff assistant (C)		4,482.72
Virginia M. Butler, staff assistant (C)		3,704.56
Grace G. Kagan, staff assistant (C)		3,704.56
Irene Wade, staff assistant (C)		3,706.56
Virginia Brannock, staff assistant (C)		3,616.62
Frances E. Donovan, staff assistant (C)		3,616.62
Harriet I. Lane, staff assistant (C)		3,295.50
Margaretta G. Pestell, staff assistant (C)		2,404.92
Sybil D. Burd, staff assistant (C)		3,616.62
Expenses, full committee		61.20
Excise Taxes Subcommittee, Hon. AIME J. FORAND, chairman:		
Jack Poe, consultant		7,104.98
Hughson Greene, messenger		2,447.70
Walter Little, messenger		2,447.70
Expenses		1,903.37
Total		13,903.75

Foreign Trade Policy Subcommittee, Hon. HALE BOGGS, chairman:		
Loyle A. Morrison, staff director (to July 31, 1957)		1,233.33
Mydr Rashish, economist		6,511.62

Foreign Trade Policy Subcommittee, Hon. HALE BOGGS, chairman—continued		
Mary C. Idle, staff assistant (C)		\$3,021.48
Elma Udall, staff assistant (C)		2,850.20
Expenses		7,765.01
Total		21,881.64

Internal Revenue Taxation Subcommittee, Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman:		
June Kendall, staff assistant (C) (from Dec. 16, 1957)		313.88
Expenses		12,514.77
Total		12,828.65

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$250,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	55,155.92
Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957	48,175.24

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bryan H. Jacques	Staff director	\$7,403.34
Everette MacIntyre	General counsel	7,403.34
Wm. Summers Johnson	Chief economist	6,808.86
Victor P. Dalmas	Adviser to minority members	6,808.86
Irving Maness	Assistant counsel-investigator	6,808.86
Justinus Gould	do	5,322.60
Marie M. Stewart	Clerk	2,960.35
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant-clerk	3,552.42
Joseph Marshall	Research analyst	1,588.44
Julius E. Allen	Economist	2,591.61
Frances K. Topping	do	4,014.84
Lois E. Allison	do	1,559.01
Clarence D. Everett	Investigator	3,552.42
Katherine C. Blackburn	Research analyst	3,423.96
Margaret Fallon	do	3,295.50
Judith Reinitz	Research assistant	2,696.04
Milton S. Fairfax	Secretary	3,723.66
Dorothy F. Council	Stenographer-secretary	2,970.12
Ira D. Coe	Stenographer	2,970.12
Clara G. Romero	do	2,970.12
Mildred C. Darrow	Secretary-stenographer for minority	2,952.96
Mary Vance Wilson	Stenographer-secretary	1,485.06
Anna A. Holovach	Stenographer	590.05
Robert E. Essex	do	654.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$225,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	100,757.07
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957	103,458.13
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1957	204,215.20
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957	20,784.80

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1512. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, relative to a proposal by the Department of the Navy to transfer a 40-foot motorboat, hull No. 15514, now located at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va., to the Lake Sinclair Power Squadron of Milledgeville, Ga., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1513. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the 19th Semiannual Report on the educational exchange activities from July 1 through December 31, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 317); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1514. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1515. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening of counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign-language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1516. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1517. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1518. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to require labor organization reports, to insure disclosure of certain labor organization information, to define certain duties and responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and to provide further safeguards for workers against improper activities in the conduct of labor organization affairs"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1519. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Mrs. Viola H. Montgomery, which, when executed by the superintendent, Muir Woods National Monument, will authorize her to operate a lunchroom, soft-drink counter, souvenir, stationery, and photographic shop for the public at Muir Woods National Monument, during a 2-year period beginning January 1, 1958, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1520. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of re-

volving credit fund transactions for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 10 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984, 986; 25 U. S. C. 470); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1521. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombat activities of the Coast Guard"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1522. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1523. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1524. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act pertaining to network broadcasting. (Rept. No. 1297.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9700. A bill to consolidate into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10266. A bill to extend for 1 year certain programs established under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10267. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize appropriations for forest highways for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 10268. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10269. A bill to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to the price support on wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10270. A bill to provide that all procurement and research for the Department of Defense shall be conducted by a single

agency in that Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 10271. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide for outer-space development through the peaceful application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 10272. A bill to require labor organization reports, to insure disclosure of certain labor organization information, to define certain duties and responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and to provide further safeguards for workers against improper activities in the conduct of labor organization affairs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10273. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10274. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 10275. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a fishery extension service in the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior for the purpose of carrying out cooperative fishery extension work with the States, Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 10276. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of postal and other Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 10277. A bill to reduce from 15 to 13 inches the minimum width of paper in rolls which may be imported into the United States free of duty as standard newsprint paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 10278. A bill to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening of counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 10279. A bill to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening of counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 10280. A bill to extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H. R. 10281. A bill relating to the inspection and certification of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10282. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in potato futures in commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 10283. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize appropriations for forest highways for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONTROYA:

H. R. 10284. A bill to authorize the granting of mineral rights to certain homestead patentees who were wrongfully deprived of such rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 10285. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize appropriations for forest highways for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 10286. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize appropriations for forest highways for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 10287. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 10288. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 10289. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10290. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 10291. A bill to amend the act of August 5, 1953, creating the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 10292. A bill relating to the inspection and certification of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 10293. A bill to establish a national scientific research reserve fund; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 10294. A bill to give all producers of commodities eligible for inclusion in the 1958 acreage reserve program an opportunity to participate therein; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 10295. A bill to extend for 1 year certain programs established under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 10296. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. J. Res. 515. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the United States with respect to the payment of bribes and kickbacks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. Res. 453. Resolution providing for printing as a House document the publication, Adverse Effects of the Expanding Activities of the National Government on the Private Economy and Federal System; the Case for Free Enterprise and Local Self-Government; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 454. Resolution requesting certain information from the Secretary of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Res. 455. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior and all departments of Government to protect Alaska-spawned salmon; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 10298. A bill for the relief of Stefano Viti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 10299. A bill for the relief of Max Magder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. R. 10300. A bill for the relief of Vukasin Krtolica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 10301. A bill for the relief of Nielsen L. Pollard and Elsie M. Pollard, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 10302. A bill for the relief of Gerald M. Brierre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 10303. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Mazzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 10297. A bill for the relief of the Chicago School of Automotive Trade, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Senator Chavez Before the American Road Builders' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 27, 1958

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered on January 20 to the annual convention of the American Road Builders' Association.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR CHAVEZ, CHAIRMAN, SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, AT 56TH CONVENTION OF AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1958, AT 10 A. M.

I am very happy to have the opportunity to speak to you folks during your 56th annual convention. I want to repeat what I have told you before. I want to congratulate you on your long record of accomplishment in improving services and facilities which mean so much to our Nation's economy and strength. Your association represents many fields of industry which contribute not only to the roadbuilding program but also to the production of modern facilities and equipment for the construction of many of our public-works projects. These projects involve navigation improvements on our rivers and harbors, flood-control reclamation developments, the construction of public buildings, and water- and sewage-treatment facilities. The continued expansion of all of these projects is essential to our way of life.

I am extremely proud to be chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee which handles the authorization for a great many of our public-works projects. I am also proud to be a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and in my position as chairman of the Defense Subcommittee I am concerned with a great many endeavors which are designed to improve our defense system.

The Federal-Aid Highway System is an important part of our defense system. In other words, whenever we improve our economic strength by improved transportation facilities, we in turn automatically improve our defense position. The secondary highway

system provides the feeder lines for goods and products which find their way onto the primary and Interstate Highway System. These products then are delivered to all parts of our Nation. In addition, the Interstate System will provide means of moving men, defense equipment, and commodities required in this complex economy of ours.

I am pleased to learn that the highway-construction program has begun to roll. I, along with a number of my colleagues, naturally feel that greater progress should be made. This feeling, I am sure, applies just as much to the States in which the roads are to be built as it does to the Bureau of Public Roads, which has the responsibility for administering the highway program.

I am very much interested in the secondary highway system. It is my hope that this program can be accelerated and that the network of secondary and county roads can be properly integrated and tied into the primary and Interstate System.

In an effort to accomplish my purpose in assuring integration of the systems, I introduced Senate bill 1146 which would provide for a National Advisory Committee of County Officials to facilitate coordination of highway systems. It is my understanding that the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads has taken some steps in this direction through authority which he now has. I would like to see this program implemented so that there can truly be coordination among county, State, and Federal organizations in the planning and construction of our system of roads.

As you probably know, this is the year when the Roads Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee is going to be extremely busy. We must consider legislation to authorize the extension of authorization of Federal aid to the primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions. We must also consider forest highways, forest roads and trails, public lands roads, Indian roads, and other similar segments of our road system. The committee must take a very close look at the cost estimates which have been submitted under the provision of section 108 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

We will also take a very careful look at the reimbursement study which was submitted under the provision of section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 which was made to determine which highways, whether toll or free, completed or put under construction between August 2, 1947, and June 30, 1957, might be eligible to be considered for reimbursement.

I am very hopeful that the vehicles' size and weight study can be completed at an

early date so that recommendations can be made to the Congress with respect to maximum vehicle dimensions and weight.

The highway safety study is an extremely important study which is being made to determine what action can be taken by the Federal Government to increase highway safety. This study is not due until March 1, 1959. It is my hope that all the talent available can be used in completing this study and making recommendations for ways and means of at least reducing the horrible toll of lives on our highway system.

You folks can well see that our committee does not cease to be interested in legislation upon its enactment into law. We feel it is our responsibility to be continuously watchful of the execution of any authorized projects resulting from legislation handled by our committee. The Public Works Committee will be on the alert not only in protecting the Nation's taxpayer from being gouged by dishonest right-of-way speculators but also will do everything possible to maintain a reasonable rate of progress on completing the Interstate System. As you people know, there is nothing more uneconomical than a program of construction which is piecemeal or which is constantly being stopped and started.

I believe we are in a fortunate position insofar as the highway program is concerned because our foresight in establishing the highway trust fund gives us a basis upon which to determine what our annual highway-construction program can be. We are not in so fortunate a position with respect to projects involving the utilization and development of water resources and public buildings. These programs are being continuously kicked around and there is no uniformity of progress. Whenever budget cuts appear necessary these are the projects which are decelerated or cut out entirely.

Last but not least, by any means, there is our inter-American highway program. I am informed that excellent progress is being made in the completion of this system. I am also informed that at the present time this highway which begins at Laredo, Tex., and extends 3,175 miles to Panama City, is passable at all times from Laredo to San Isidro, Costa Rica, except for a few miles in Guatemala near the Mexican border. I also understand that in addition \$10 million is needed to complete surfacing through the Central American countries.

In closing, I would like to say that I always enjoy appearing before this fine group of people and I wish you great success in your endeavors. I want you to know our committee is always happy to receive your suggestions on ways and means of carry-