

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Moving Forces in the History of Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered before the Sixth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, at Washington, D.C., on April 30, 1959.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE SIXTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 30, 1959

What are the moving forces in the history of mankind? Philosophers and historians have long debated this question.

There was a time—and not so very long ago—when history was written in terms of famous men—generals, emperors and presidents. In Shakespeare's plays, for example the common people take the stage only as prosy clowns and buffoons; the timeless poetry comes from royal or noble lips.

But more recently history has been written in terms of the changes in methods of production—or even of destruction. The progress from the stone axe to the automated factory—the progress, if one can call it that, from the caveman's club to the intercontinental ballistic missile—each has had great effect.

We are met today to pay tribute to one of those truly great ideas which transforms history—the proposal, put forward in President Truman's inaugural address 10 years ago, that America and the other industrialized nations should, in his words:

"Help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens."

This bold new program was the fourth point in President Truman's list of foreign policy objectives for the United States. It is important to note that point 4 was designed to be an integral part of a much broader program. The point 4 program is not a substitute for adequate military defense. It is not a substitute for sound trade policies. It is not a substitute for any other necessary element in our overall foreign policy. But it is a valuable, and, indeed, indispensable, element to any effective foreign policy, specially in the less-developed areas of the world whose future may determine the destiny of all mankind.

Mr. Truman's point 4 captured the minds and hearts of men everywhere, both because it was new and bold and yet drew its inspiration from our heritage. Like all great ideas in history, it did not spring full-grown from the brow of one man. Great ideas emerge from the accumulated wisdom, experience, and aspirations of men, and they have their greatest force when their time has come.

The point 4 idea is rooted in the humanitarian imperative of all great religions—the strong should help the weak, the rich should

help the poor—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Point 4 was really the projection of our unique historical experience—the international application of the lessons that we learned in the development of the American frontier.

In developing the American West, we formulated a new approach to training and education—land-grant colleges, vocational education, the county agents, all the many practices and institutions that were the prototypes for the point 4 projects of recent years.

At the same time, there was strengthened in the American character the qualities of optimism, of confidence, of initiative, and of impatience with obstacles that make up one of our greatest strengths as a nation.

What is needed in our foreign policy more than anything else today is that we draw on this great heritage of ours, this well of national strength, to carry through admittedly difficult and discouraging undertakings.

Much of the force of the point 4 idea was its timeliness. President Truman understood the mighty struggle between totalitarianism and freedom. It was he who launched the Truman doctrine which saved Greece and Turkey from communism. He knew then, as we all know now, that in the many-faceted world struggle the economically underdeveloped and politically unaligned nations may well hold the balance of power.

We should be proud of the humanitarian roots of the point 4 idea. We should not be apologetic about the fact that rightly used it can be an instrument of greater peace and stability in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. Let us be grateful that there is a program which is humanitarian and politically relevant at the same time—a happy and fortunate combination.

And, speaking of humanitarian values, what is more humanitarian than helping to prevent "darkness at noon" from spreading over areas where new freedom and new hope have just been born?

In retrospect, we can see that "point 4" was long foreshadowed—indeed, was implicit—in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and in the Marshall plan. Yet, when President Truman put it forward, it caught even some of his own officials unprepared. As one of them has recalled:

"Messages of surprise and delight poured in from all over the world, and a hurried meeting of department representatives was held to consider the practical problems in meeting the expectations which the President's words had produced overnight. As we gathered in the State Department's conference room, the atmosphere was a curious mixture of excitement and perplexity.

"A senior official of the Department was the first to speak. 'Well, fellows,' he said with a smile, 'what do you suppose he meant?'"

Such was the sweep and the dynamism of the President's idea that even today, after 10 years of living with it and working with it, we are still discovering in it fresh meanings and fresh dimensions.

But an idea is a dazzling, even a blinding, thing—and there is every human tendency to dim it down a bit, so that it is more comfortable to live with.

So, for a while, too many of us put on heavily tinted glasses before we dared look this idea in the face.

First, there was a tendency to "sell it cheap." All we had to do, we assured ourselves, was to pass on to other peoples our

so-called know-how and then leave them to their own resources. It was the easiest kind of virtue, costing us little more than words.

Second, when we began to realize that know-how is paralyzed without some material backing—be it something as simple as fertilizer or as elaborate as a hydroelectric project—we felt a need to avoid even the appearance of generosity. So we began calling much of our economic aid "defense support" and applying the label "mutual security program" to the whole enterprise.

Oversea aid suffered—and still suffers—from these heavy military overtones. Too often, we give the impression that our main interest is to "buy allies in the cold war."

Third, we seemed fearful that we might not get full credit for the element of genuine generosity which remained in the program. We wanted the tag, "Made in America," fastened firmly to it.

Although we did join in the U.N. expanded technical assistance program and more recently in the U.N. special fund, we have preferred to keep most of our aid in our own hands.

Unfortunately, this is a game that two can play. Khrushchev does not hesitate to pick up a good idea when he sees one—even from the capitalists he professes to despise. The Russians, it's true were "Ivans-comelately" in this field, but they are catching up fast. Their loans and their technicians are already at work in many crucial areas of the world.

It is a real measure of the basic soundness of the point 4 concept that it has survived 10 years of cold war and worldwide turmoil.

A curious attitude has developed about this whole oversea aid program—a sort of national inferiority complex. We seem to think of Uncle Sam as Uncle Sap, constantly being sold a bill of goods by European, African, and Asian leaders of dubious loyalty to our side. As the Draper report puts it:

"In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, we may be gradually choking this vital feature of our national security to death."

Mistakes will be made in any great enterprise, but what bothers me more than the mistakes is the way we dwell upon them—rather than taking them as lessons to be learned while we move forward.

Too often our aid programs have been sold to the American people on the basis of being against communism, rather than being for humanity. They have been considered painful expedients—hopefully short-term—rather than the heart of a constructive American foreign policy designed to build a stable and enduring peace through the conquests of poverty, disease, and suffering.

The motivation for these important and valuable programs should not come from the fear of communism, but rather from the requirements of our political and religious heritage. We must never forget that our true strength lies in the moral and political principles upon which our society is based—the principles of human dignity, equality, and brotherhood. Our own revolution was based upon a belief in the God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is these thoughts and these ideals which should motivate us today.

We are indeed our brother's keeper and we must act in that capacity. We are blessed with abundance and we have a moral duty to share it.

Programs and policies that are designed only to resist the evil forces of communism are never as effective as efforts that are

made to help humanity. As President Truman said almost 8 years ago: "The only kind of a war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies—poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy."

President Truman knew, as we know, that words, however eloquent, are not enough; nor do good intentions, however generous, suffice. Deeds, not words, are needed. We must be for peace and progress—and not simply against the evil threat of communism.

The real trouble is not so much what the Communists are attempting to do in the world, but how much less we are doing than we can and should do. We can be sure that the Communists will be glad to fill in any gaps we leave.

And we need to recapture the enlightened enthusiasm that guided American policy in the great days of innovation and daring under the Marshall plan and the point 4 programs of President Truman. These early programs were characterized by imagination, vision, substance, and long-term planning.

It is not enough to merely perform the ritual in foreign aid—there must be faith—a faith in the importance and soundness of our policies. We need more than the form—we need the spirit, if our programs of assistance are going to be genuinely constructive and effective.

And we must recognize the task of helping other nations to help themselves is a continuing task. It will not be finished next year or the year after. Therefore, let us plan ahead. Our struggle against communism and against man's ancient enemies of poverty, disease, and hunger will be a long-drawn out battle.

So let us prepare ourselves accordingly. To be effective our foreign aid programs should be established on a longer term basis, so that both we and those we seek to help can plan ahead and can rely on a sustained effort.

Therefore, we must make at least three major efforts to strengthen the economic and technical assistance programs of the United States:

1. Place our aid programs on a long-term planning basis, in order to provide the assurance of continuity to the leadership of developing nations, and to avoid the tremendous waste of stop-and-go, hot-and-cold programming.
2. Seek to supplement bilateral programs at every opportunity with multilateral approaches, using existing instrumentalities such as the United Nations and its associated agencies.
3. Design the aid programs not in terms of defensive stopgaps, but rather as the affirmative, constructive building blocks of a world free of poverty and suffering.

To carry out this program I have proposed what I like to call the works of peace.

I have recently proposed a food for peace program, which will put to use the God-given abundance of our farms—not haphazardly, not as a veiled device for dumping surpluses, not on a hand-to-mouth, year-to-year basis, but as an integral part of our total foreign policy effort, planned for 5 years ahead.

Together with Senator LISTER HILL, I have proposed a health for peace program, designed to mobilize the medical and scientific resources of America and of all nations for a concerted attack upon the dread diseases which weaken, cripple, and kill millions of persons throughout the world.

I have called, also, for an education for peace program of worldwide educational development and expanded East-West exchanges of scholars—to be financed largely out of the several billion dollars of "soft currencies" or "counterpart funds" being accumulated by the United States in exchange for food shipments or as repayment of loans. We must wage war on illiteracy.

I can envisage a science for peace program, which, among other things, would seek

breakthroughs in economic development—such as a practical process for the de-salting of sea water which would make many of earth's deserts bloom.

And, last week, I was happy to join with two esteemed colleagues—Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator KENNEDY—in sponsoring amendments to the Mutual Security Act which will transform it into something much more like the development for peace program we all want.

First, and most important, we are proposing that the Development Loan Fund be financed to the extent of \$1.5 billion a year for a period of 5 years—\$7.5 billion in all. And we are proposing—as the administration, indeed, proposed 2 years ago—that the Fund be empowered to borrow this money from the Treasury, as the Export-Import Bank already does, so that it will not have to seek fresh appropriations—and risk fresh curtailments—each and every year.

Second, we are proposing to rewrite the preamble and statement of purposes of the act, to brush away the cobwebs that have gathered on it over the years, and put it in language worthy of our best traditions as a liberal and democratic Nation—with emphasis on economic progress and political freedom.

Third, as a step toward decreasing the present heavily military character of the program, we are proposing increased authority for the President to transfer funds originally allocated for "military hardware" to economic purposes. And, for the same reason, we propose increased authority for our Ambassadors to coordinate military aid with economic and political objectives.

We seek to make a clean break with the argument so often used in Congress, that the mere fact that the funds available for a given year are not fully used is a reason for curtailing next year's effort.

No great business enterprise is conducted upon such a hand-to-mouth, ever-bare-cup-board basis.

Instead, we wish to use the availability of adequate funds—and I emphasize the word "availability"—as an inspiration to our friends throughout the world to prepare sound, well-considered programs of economic development—in effect, to set their own national goals.

We are now nearing the end of the era of Western colonialism, and (I wish I could say the same about the new imperialism of the Soviet Union and Red China). The great struggles for independence which have characterized our generation have been, for the peoples involved, a challenging and inspiring experience. They have written a heroic chapter in the world's history.

But, after the fireworks, after the celebrations of independence, there comes the let-down. We knew it ourselves, after the triumph of our own revolution. Then came the equally difficult task of establishing orderly and free government.

Nationalism is a steed you can ride to independence—but, by itself, it does not carry people further than the first "Fourth of July." The plain truth is that some of the new nations are floundering badly, and most of them are feeling the chill gray dawn of the morning after.

Political independence must be related to economic interdependence. The passion of nationalism must be translated into hard national goals.

And these goals are incomplete without timetables for achieving them. When I participated as an American delegate at the United Nations, I had occasion to observe how insistent—and rightly so—our Asian and African friends were on timetables for the achievement of political independence.

We need goals for tomorrow's kind of independence—independence from poverty—and we need timetables by which the program toward these goals can be assessed.

These will vary from country to country. Some countries, like India, have formulated their national purposes, set their goals, and are well on the way to achieving them. We—and I include other industrialized nations such as Britain, France, Canada, Western Germany, and Japan—can and do sit down with the Indian leaders and see how we can move toward these goals in a great partnership of nations.

In other countries, what is needed are the preconditions for establishing such goals. The U.N. Special Fund, under Paul Hoffman's able leadership, is already busy laying the groundwork, making the basic surveys of resources and potentialities which are too often lacking. In many countries it should be possible, after this essential preliminary work has been done, to set both short-term and long-term goals.

There is every reason why some of these goals should be projected on a regional basis. We could take the lead in the Organization of American States, for example, in mounting a 5- or 7-year development plan for Latin America—spelling it out in terms of miles of roads, kilowatts of electricity, and tons of steel. We could do the same with the Colombo plan nations, in cooperation with Japan, and in the Middle East, with its tremendous oil resources—and in emergent Africa, too.

In all these undertakings, we would, of course, look to private investment to do its full share, and I might say that by "full share" I mean substantially more than it is doing now. The conditions suitable for private investment must often be created by public funds. And public-financed projects usually cannot achieve their full potential without private investment. There is no essential conflict between those two complementary sources of development capital.

Thus, we would be building upon the experience of the Marshall plan—the most spectacularly successful example of our post-war economic policy—which succeeded because it had a goal, and because the participating nations, with wise leadership from the United States, set targets for themselves and mobilized their resources to meet them.

I would go further. There will be a summit conference this summer, and I hope that President DeGaulle will have the opportunity to repeat—with his grand command of language—what he said last month:

"In our time, the only quarrel worthwhile is that of mankind. \* \* \* Why should we not put together a percentage of our raw materials, our manufactured goods, our food products, some of our scientists, technologists, economists, some of our trucks, ships, aircraft, to defeat poverty, develop resources, and help the work of the less developed peoples?"

"Let us do this—not that they should be the pawns of our policies, but to improve the chances of life and peace."

Let us always remember, however, what King Hussein of Jordan so wisely said—that the United Nations is the summit conference of the small nations. If only the Big Four could go forward from their own summit to mankind's summit at the United Nations—and could come prepared to work together for the welfare of all humanity. What clouds of frustration and fear would be cleared from our human horizons.

The United Nations represents one of our great hopes for a just and lasting peace. It should be made a more effective instrument. As a step in that direction I have introduced a resolution in this Congress to strengthen the United Nations' International Court of Justice by deleting the so-called Connally amendment from our declaration of acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction. It is for this reason also that I have joined with Senator CLARK and others in sponsoring a resolution recommending that



the Charter of the United Nations be reviewed to determine what changes should be made in it to promote peace through the development of enforceable world law.

At the United Nations, the great goals could be formulated—let us call them targets—for the 20th century. And, each year, its proceedings would be dominated, not by bitter harangues, but by sober assessment of the progress of its member nations toward these goals.

This is a bold idea—but no bolder than President Truman's was 10 years ago. For, all too often, we forget this vital passage in his inaugural address:

"We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies, wherever practicable. It must be a worldwide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom."

### Tax Reform

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, through the efforts of the Greater New Bedford Junior Chamber of Commerce, more than 12,000 persons residing in the Ninth Massachusetts District have spoken with singleness of voice and purpose in an urgent appeal to the Congress to effect a program of tax reform that would stimulate and stabilize the economy of the Nation.

The petition signed by these 12,000 citizens, and the public spirit this monumental task represents, are most laudable, and deserve immediate attention and action. I resolutely endorse the objectives set forth in this petition, and call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to dedicate or rededicate themselves to these objectives.

In order that the Jaycees' case be accurately stated and clearly understood, may I quote the text of this petition:

We, the undersigned, citizens \* \* \* of Massachusetts do hereby petition and recommend to the Congress of the United States and to other appropriate legislative bodies that they recognize the necessity for reducing or removing present obstacles to the expansion and growth of the economy so that new businesses and more jobs will be created which will result in an even higher standard of living and ever greater national abundance. To this end, the burden of Government expenditures should be reduced to the lowest practicable level and a program of tax reform should be instituted which would result, over a reasonable period of time and on an orderly basis, in a tax rate structure—particularly in regard to the Federal income tax—which would be moderate at all levels and permit the maximum development of the Nation's economic potential.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the United States is carrying heavy and necessary commitments in this crucial cold war period, and that we are deep in national debt. It is vitally essential that we continue to meet these obligations

and take a more responsible approach to reducing and finally eliminating our national debt.

Nevertheless, there is soundness in the junior chamber of commerce point of view that tax reduction would spur the economy. I salute the Jaycees with the assurance of my continuing support of every reduction and reform in our tax structure that will not impair the economic health of the country. And I would like to single out for special commendation Mr. Charles E. Sharek, a member of the New Bedford Junior Chamber of Commerce, for having been selected Massachusetts' representative to the Jaycees' recent Washington conference on tax reduction. With 12,031 names on the above-quoted petition against wasteful Federal spending, collected in greater New Bedford, Mr. Sharek, chairman of the drive in that area, obtained more signatures than anyone else in the country.

As a prize he won a 3-day expense-paid trip to Washington. If we here heed the Jaycees' message, everybody will be a winner.

Mr. Speaker, this determination of my constituents to move into the arena on the side of a sound fiscal policy against irresponsible and unjustifiable waste in Federal spending is not confined to only one area. At the extreme other end of my district some 240 members of the Women's Republican Club of Norwell, Mass., which this year is celebrating its 35th anniversary, have signed a letter calling on me and other members of the legislative and executive branches of our Government to work with President Eisenhower toward achieving a balanced budget.

These appeals are not idle and meaningless gestures. They are not mere formalities. The citizens, whose chief means of being heard is through their duly elected representatives, are aroused over the trend toward further spending beyond our means. They are, as they have every right to be, insistent that we in Congress run the business of this country on a sound, businesslike basis. We are obligated not to do less.

### Tackle Unemployment Now

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been greatly concerned about the continuance of rather startling unemployment rates in various communities and areas throughout the country, notwithstanding the current prosperity boom which the country is enjoying as a whole.

I will not go into some of the reasons for these trouble spots of unemployment because they are numerous and complex. Undoubtedly, extremely injudicious monetary policies played their

part, and there are other factors as well that I cannot deal with here. However, it is very clear that in the interest of the Nation, not to speak of the several million unemployed workers and their families who are involved, that the Congress must do something constructive and substantial about this problem at a very early date.

I think that we have seriously lagged in coping with this substantial unemployment which in some States and communities reaches alarming percentages and is causing stagnation, paralysis, and privation in many historically prosperous areas.

The situation constitutes a real challenge to the Government and we have no choice in my opinion but to give the problem urgent consideration and work it out so as to alleviate the unemployment and restore the afflicted communities to a condition of prosperity and industrial good health and well-being.

This is an American problem. It cannot in these days be swept under the table and overlooked. We all must recognize that State and local authorities alone cannot solve this problem. The Federal Government must take action. And it must be taken now.

### Reviewing U.S. Role on World Stage— Interview With Senator Fulbright

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a capital interview with Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, conducted by Courtney Sheldon, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 29, 1959, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think Mr. Sheldon has done a distinct service in conducting this interview, and that, in turn, the Senator from Arkansas has rendered a service in expressing his views relative to the foreign policy of this country.

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

REVIEWING U.S. ROLE ON WORLD STAGE—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR FULBRIGHT

(By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Senator JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, a thoroughgoing scholar on foreign affairs, a persistent critic of the Eisenhower foreign policies, and now in a strategic position as chairman of the influential Senate Foreign Relations Committee, says:

"The more dangerous area to us is in the nonmilitary (when it is a question of the relative importance of military and economic aid).

"The President's requests for foreign aid are very modest relative to the need.

"Our international manners are often atrocious.

"Our whole country has not recognized our proper role.

"I have felt in the past that we [Secretary Herter and I] \* \* \* judge the world and many of our problems in a somewhat similar manner.

"I rather regret the size of the United Nations now. It grew too fast."

Of the numerous East-West differences, Senator FULBRIGHT, are there any you feel could be discussed now at a summit meeting with some hope of accord?

"Well, Mr. Sheldon, I am not particularly optimistic about reaching any solutions in the first, or even the second meeting. My approach is rather that these matters need to be solved, and that we should start talking about them and find out if there is any hope for an adjustment of our differences.

"I would prefer emphasis upon the established diplomatic channels, but the Russians seem disinclined to do that and therefore they wish this procedure. I'm perfectly willing to go along with that."

By regular diplomatic channels you are referring to ambassadorial relations?

"Yes, I would hope that our ambassadors could carry on constant negotiations with the Russians.

"For some reason or other the Russians seem to be extremely reluctant to enter into serious negotiations over the settlement of such things as the Berlin business or the Middle East. It leads one to suspect their motives. And I have grave doubt whether the Russians really want to compose these differences.

"But those doubts, in my opinion, do not justify refusing to enter into summit discussions. Now it may be they only want to make propaganda, but I don't know why we cannot make propaganda the same as they do. On the other hand, they are peculiar people and maybe they will gradually consent to serious negotiations. All I am saying is that we ought to find out what they are doing and pursue opportunities to find out."

When you mentioned regular diplomatic channels were you referring at all to the U.N.?

"Well, it can be used in certain circumstances, but it is a rather awkward organization. It has so many members now. I think it has really gotten too large. I rather regret the size of the U.N. now. It grew too fast in size before we had perfected its procedures and established traditions that would support orderly procedure. I won't wish to abandon it, of course. I think it is still a hopeful organization."

Would you cite some of the specific differences that you feel could be usefully negotiated now?

"Well, the most immediate ones, of course, are the status of West Berlin and Germany and the so-called nuclear ban, at least on the restricted basis that has recently been brought forward as a kind of salvage operation, the one which does not require extensive monitoring within the adversary's country."

The Western proposal for a ban on atmospheric tests only?

"That certainly is a possibility, and the discussion of the Middle East is a possibility. I see no reason to exclude any of our differences. These are discussions in the first instance. I don't think we should expect solutions growing out of a meeting immediately. I think it is more of an exploratory discussion to feel one another out."

You are not at all opposed to what is called an open agenda then?

"No, I think it should be an open agenda. They waste more time trying to decide an agenda than anything else. If they don't wish to talk about anything seriously or relevant, why adjourn. We have at least proved that we are not afraid to sit down

and talk. I think this reluctance to have a talk has created the impression we're afraid of them, and that we have no ideas and no policy.

"I realize there has been a very persuasive argument made that they are adept at propaganda, and that they will use a meeting merely to embarrass us. Well that is another way of saying we are so stupid we don't know how to make propaganda or how to combat it. If we are, we had better learn. I think it is that kind of world and we have to accept it."

What do you regard, Senator FULBRIGHT, as the notable successes and failures of the administration on foreign policy in the last 7 years?

"Well, I think the highly unsatisfactory state of our international relations and the tension that exists throughout certainly the Middle East at the moment, and existed only recently in the Far East, would indicate that the successes have not been very great or notable.

"I don't mean to leave the implication that the administration is entirely to blame. I think the people, our whole country, has not recognized our proper role and we have not applied ourselves.

"But to be more specific, as you know I took serious issue with the so-called Eisenhower doctrine. I opposed it, spoke against it, worked against it. I was also highly critical of the decision of the Secretary [Dulles] on the Aswan Dam proposal, that is our relations with Nasser. I think it was poorly handled, and I think his judgment at the time of Russian strength and activity was not based upon realities.

"I suppose you could say our most satisfactory relations at the moment have been with Germany. The preservation, at least, of a fairly high degree of unity among the NATO partners, I believe, would be regarded as the most successful area of activity. The preservation of reasonably good relations with Japan is also a successful area.

"Of course, I think the deterioration of our Latin American relations is another example of failure, largely of neglect. I don't know anything positive that we have done that has alienated them. We just haven't done anything affirmative to conciliate them and make them feel we are interested in them. In this case I think it is not such a material matter. It is an attitude, a matter of good manners. Regarding them as important people, and being courteous to them is very essential. Our international manners are often atrocious."

What would you say has been the trend of American prestige and influence in the world recently?

"I think it has clearly declined. We have presented an image, a picture of indecision, I think, of inconsistency. We talk one way and we act another in many instances, notably in the field of trade and tariffs. I think very often our statements have not been realistic. We have not been able to live up to them. I think we have talked too much and been too brash in some of our statements."

Do you feel that the appointment of Mr. Herter as Secretary of State is going to change this trend?

"I have great respect for Mr. Herter's integrity and his capacity. He has had long experience and I am very pleased with his appointment. I look forward to working with him as closely as I can, and I hope that we continue to agree on many of the basic factors that afflict us. I have felt in the past that we have a good deal in common, that is in our attitudes, that we judge the world and many of our problems in a somewhat similar manner."

On the question of the mutual security program, do you favor giving the President the full amount asked for the program?

"My amendments request a good deal more for the development loan fund than he asked. I think his requests are very modest relative to the need."

This is economic aid you are talking about?

"Yes."

If there were to be a cutback in mutual security, you would prefer it to be in the military rather than the economic?

"I would as a matter of relative threat to our security in coming years, if you have to make a choice. The more dangerous area to us is in the nonmilitary."

## Pricing Ourselves Out of Markets

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I addressed the State convention of the Ohio Private Employment Agency Association in Cincinnati, Ohio. This speech discusses the factors which are causing us to price ourselves out of both foreign and domestic markets as a result of the inflationary spiral and our trade policies.

My remarks follow:

They say that one of the ingredients of a successful speech is if the speaker is in a position to discuss a current issue of mutual interest and concern.

Your business is to find jobs and people with the necessary skills to fill those jobs. You are meeting here this week in Cincinnati to discuss new and improved techniques in order that you may do a better job. But no matter how hard you try, your business will not be successful and prosper unless in this country we have a sound and growing economy to provide the generally broad basis for jobs.

We have heard a great deal in the last year about recession and unemployment. Just 3 weeks ago the labor leaders arranged for a march on Washington by the unemployed for the purpose of demonstrating to the Congress and to the President the seriousness of the unemployment situation in this country. So you can see why I say that you and I have something in common.

I along with my colleagues in the Congress have been challenged to provide jobs for the unemployed. However, our task, I am told, is comparatively simple.

All we have to do is to authorize the spending of additional billions and billions of dollars for new and expanded activities of the Federal Government and—presto—the unemployment problem, whatever it might be, is solved. The lobbies and pressure groups behind all of these new-fangled spending programs will then say I am a fine fellow and a good Congressman who is alerted to the needs of the common man.

Furthermore, I will be a much better Joe if I don't even suggest raising taxes to pay for this new spending spree and just quietly pass this bill on to your and my children, as we have been doing regularly during the last two decades.

Oh yes, it is the easy and popular way out. Just have Uncle Sam borrow the money, for which he will sign a few more billion I.O.U.'s. This will give the employment situation a temporary and exhilarating shot in the arm, and the politicians and labor bosses a chance to take a bow and perhaps win an election or two.



While we are on this lost weekend binge, we can conveniently forget that in doing this we have given the devastating enemy of inflation a potent and permanent upsurge which accelerates pricing ourselves out of our foreign and domestic markets.

You know the result. Instead of more things for more people at lower prices, the cost of everything we buy soars. The American dollar is further eroded not only here but all over the world. Production necessarily declines, and we are again on the toboggan slide of unemployment. The unemployment agencies become unemployed.

Of course, the politicians who took the easy and popular way out should crawl under the table. But they will not worry too much. Some will solve their personal unemployment problems by squeezing relatives on the public payroll.

It should not be inferred from anything I have said that I am insensible or unconcerned about the unemployment that exists in the United States. I don't believe, however, that the unemployment situation generally is as bad as represented by some groups.

No one will deny that there are pockets of serious unemployment in the United States, the causes for which I will discuss later. However, these pockets of unemployment in a generally prosperous economy are being used as an excuse and a weapon for the promotion of some harebrained, socialistic, astronomical spending programs.

LYNDON JOHNSON'S Special Commission on Unemployment Problems will soon conduct hearings in these bad areas and, with the help of certain people who have an ax to grind, will exploit before television these truly bad unemployment areas, to make it appear as if the whole country is in a terrible state.

Certain labor bosses and pressure groups will use this cleverly aroused public opinion to clobber Congress into passing these high-cost, ill-conceived, socialistic measures which otherwise would not have a ghost of a chance of adoption. This maneuvering will, of course, distract attention from some of the practices and basic causes of this novel, spotty unemployment dilemma in which we find ourselves.

Of course, government, along with labor and management, should adopt all sound and reasonable measures to wipe out the causes and practices which lead to this unique unemployment situation. The trouble is that today here in America we have developed a mania that the mere spending of more dollars can solve all of our problems.

Let's see if what I have said is not true. We have been trying to buy friends and allies for many years. After Sputnik the answer to curing the deficiencies in our educational system was more money. The current upsurge in juvenile delinquency is attributed to our unwillingness to spend money on a whole variety of programs and panaceas.

I know someone will say—and justifiably so: "SCHERER, what do you suggest if you're so smart?"

I am convinced that more profligate, deficit spending by the Federal Government will eventually worsen the situation rather than better it.

I know that at a time when the American dollar is eroding and depreciating all over the world—when credit of the United States is being pushed to the breaking point—when our national debt is \$50 billion greater than the total combined debt of all the other nations of the world, such spending is courting disaster, bankruptcy, and the destruction of the economy of the United States. This is exactly what the Soviets want us to do. This is what they have planned for our internal deterioration.

General Claire Chennault, who died last August of cancer, was one of the truly great soldiers of our time. He was the leader of the famous Flying Tigers and later commanded the U.S. Air Force in the Far East.

He was a man who understood the Communists because he had fought them for more than 20 years. The Committee on Un-American Activities wanted the American people to have the benefit of his experience and expert knowledge before he died.

General Chennault said in his testimony just a few weeks before he died, and I quote: "You know that communism is depending on ruining the United States financially, more so than on any military action against the United States \* \* \* Lenin and Stalin both talked about not engaging in war if it can be avoided. Their plan for many years was to ruin the financial structure of the United States.

"I believe that if things go on as they are now, eventually they will achieve that purpose of ruining the United States financially."

In another part of his testimony, he said: "I believe the Communists will not take over a lot of Asia where they could. They want us to continue pouring aid into those areas \* \* \* year after year, until our currency is no longer of any value. Then they will be ready to take the United States in turn."

For years before I went to Congress, I complained and campaigned against the ever-increasing bureaucracy of the New Deal, the astronomical expenditures of the Federal Government, and the ever-increasing taxload on the American people and American business.

I did not go to Washington to support programs and legislation which augment those evils. I did not go to Washington to participate in the dissolution of the economy or fiscal stability of the United States.

Just remember that we are never going to get tax reductions that are justified and do not adversely affect the economy of the United States until we put a stop to unbridled spending. Tax cuts without spending cuts lead to greater debt, move us closer to fiscal collapse, and, of course, fan the fires of ruinous and uncontrollable inflation.

I have on occasion opposed new and expanded activities for the Federal Government which have merit and are desirable. There are two principal reasons, however, for my opposition:

First, because we cannot afford them. Because these programs would further increase the indebtedness of the Federal Government, the tax burden on our people, and weaken the fiscal structure of the United States.

Second, because I felt that the project or program was one that should be carried on by local or State government.

Let me give you an example:

Those who have opposed various Federal-aid programs for education have been charged with being insensible to the welfare of the children of the country, benefits for teachers, and education generally. Just the opposite, however, is true.

Everyone with a grain of sense knows that eventually any type of Federal-aid program results in Federal interference, domination, and control. To argue differently is to disregard the record completely.

Whenever you pour Federal money into local government, Federal control eventually follows as night follows day. Education is one of the last major activities that we have kept in the hands of the local authorities.

If the Federal Government takes over—and I predict that it will if the present trend continues—you are going to have a department of education filled with thousands of new bureaucrats that will dwarf all other departments of Government with the exception of Defense. Your schools, your chil-

dren, your teachers, and your curriculums will eventually operate under mandate from Washington.

I believe our school boards, our school administrators, our teachers, and our PTA's can do a better job for our schools with our own tax dollars than can some bureaucrat in Washington, just as I believe that our city councils, our planning commissions, and our citizens' development committees can do better and more economical jobs at urban redevelopment, free from the redtape and dictation of Washington bureaucrats. You know that for every educational and urban redevelopment dollar Ohio sends to the Potomac, it will be lucky if it gets 50 cents back.

I realize that the States and local governments would have an easier time meeting their financial obligations if the Federal Government did not siphon off so much of the tax dollar. That is one reason why the handful of conservatives in the Congress continue to oppose the ever-expanding activities and programs of the Federal Government—so that the Federal Government will not continue to siphon off more and more tax dollars to the detriment of local government.

But let's get back for a few minutes to unemployment. Oh yes, I can hear those who are calling for more Government spending as the panacea to aid unemployment saying that SCHERER is unconcerned. That is not true. I am looking for basic causes of unemployment and the employment of measures to remove these causes.

As I have pointed out, the unemployment situation which we are facing at the present time is different and unusual. In most of the country employment is good; in many places it is above average. But there are pockets of unemployment where admittedly the situation is bad. This is an unusual and unique situation, different from what we have ever faced.

I certainly am not an expert in this field. Far from it. But from what I have been able to learn, the problem is acute in those industries and areas where we have priced ourselves out of markets and where we are no longer able to compete with the products of foreign manufacturers.

Charles Lucey, the able writer for Scripps-Howard newspapers, deals with this subject in a recent series of articles. He said: "Evidence grows that domestic United States inflation is shoving up our costs so that overseas nations can undersell us."

There is no question but that he is right. This inflationary spiral in the United States has not only priced us out of foreign markets but out of our domestic markets as well. It is a basic economic fact that every time you raise the price of a television set, a washing machine, a refrigerator, or an automobile by \$50, there are thousands fewer families who are able to buy one or more of these items.

Excessive Government spending, especially deficit spending where the Government spends money it has to borrow, as sure as night follows day, lessens the purchasing power of each dollar, and consequently is one of the major factors in the inflationary spiral.

Also making major contributions to the inflationary spiral, the ever increasing cost of living or the declining purchasing power of the dollar are men like Reuther and McDonald and some of the big industrialists who produce basic raw materials.

Over the past decade certain labor leaders in order to maintain their own positions of power within their unions have consistently pushed and pushed for wages that far exceeded the increased cost of living. The industrialists to whom I have referred have readily granted excessive and unwarranted wage increases because these increases offered them an opportunity and an excuse for a price increase which included not only the

wage differential but also a substantial and often unjustified profit margin.

As a result, the man on a fixed income, the pensioner, the schoolteacher, and the white-collar worker, whose incomes, if any, lag behind have suffered most. In turn, industry loses these people as customers.

Remember our economy today is at a high point largely because of the tremendous expenditure of defense dollars. Markets or production caused by defense spending can in a sense be said to be artificially created. If this cold war should end, and we all pray that it will, defense spending and production will come to a grinding halt. You can readily see how the United States will then need badly every possible market or outlet for its industrial program. One can see how vital it is that we preserve our markets for tomorrow.

As a result of high taxes caused by the Government spending I have been talking about and high production costs, industry after industry in the United States today is establishing plants in foreign countries to take advantage of low labor costs and tax concessions. Now I believe we should invest private American capital abroad, but for other reasons than to avoid taxes and to take advantage of low labor costs.

If we continue to invest capital, as we have in the past few years, at an accelerated rate, for building plants all over the world that would have otherwise been spent for normal plant expansion in the cities of the United States, we are headed for a real hair-curling unemployment one of these days.

We have lost many world markets today simply because we can no longer compete. We are going to continue to lose more and more of these markets, in industry after industry, because daily foreign countries, with our technical help and our money, are entering new fields and are manufacturing commodities with the most advanced mass production machinery available. They are doing it without paying astronomical taxes and with labor costs that are only a fraction of ours.

A Ford assembly-line worker gets a wage, including fringe benefits, of approximately \$2.94 per hour, compared with 69 cents in Cologne, Germany. Yet a few weeks ago we reduced tariffs on German cars.

It does not take a genius to see why we are not only losing our European markets but our domestic markets as well.

Some industrialists who 6 years ago, when I first came to Congress, urged me as vehemently as they dared to vote against liberalization of our trade policies, have today reversed their position. They want no tariff barriers or quotas. Why this change? Simply because during these 6 years they have built plants abroad and now want to import their low-cost, foreign-made products into this country without quotas or tariff barriers.

What happens if this flow of American capital abroad for the establishment of plants all over the world continues at the expense of industrial expansion at home? What happens to small business and industry—the backbone of this country—which cannot establish plants in Europe, which, in order to maintain our high standard of living, must continue to pay high labor costs, the 52 percent corporate tax, and even higher personal taxes to sustain this orgy of spending in which we are engaged?

Keeping in mind our unprecedented population growth, what happens to American labor and small business when it will be compelled in the next 2, 5, and 10 years to compete with goods made abroad at an increasing rate and produced at a fraction of the cost of those made here?

President Eisenhower, in his latest economic report to the Congress, said:

"While imports were well maintained, exports declined sharply after 1957. From the

first half of 1957 to the first half of 1958, the value of U.S. merchandise exports fell more—in relative as well as in absolute terms—than those of all other countries combined."

In last Sunday's Washington Post the well-known business writer, Bernard D. Nossiter, said this:

"But imports and other purchases abroad ran ahead of exports by \$900 million, and in national income bookkeeping this is on the minus side of the ledger."

As I said, we recently reduced the tariff on foreign cars coming into this country by about 8.5 percent. Today most European countries fix quotas on American cars. Only a handful are admitted, and the tariffs are exorbitant. The cheapest kind of Chevrolet or Ford costs \$6,500 in France, approximately \$8,000 in England, and \$10,000 in South America. Is this reciprocal trade?

Automobile imports have increased almost 15 times in the past 5 years—from 29,505 in 1953 to 431,608 in 1958. Export of U.S. cars has decreased from 186,262 in 1953 to 125,834 in 1958.

Let's go from automobiles to a little thing like nails. Imports of nails supply more than one-third of U.S. market. Imports are more than 50 times as great as exports of nails.

Barbed wire, an American invention, a few years ago came almost solely from U.S. concerns, both big and small. Today more than one out of every two rolls of barbed wire sold in this country is made in foreign mills, using foreign steel.

Imports of barbed wire amount to more than 50 times our exports. Why? Simply because a Dayton, Ohio, jobber can buy a ton of barbed wire made in Germany for \$40 less than the same product made in nearby Cleveland, where steel wages are three times as high.

The industry estimates that the excess of imports over exports, in terms of man-hours required to produce the barbed wire, equals about 650 full-time jobs. There is no tariff on imports of barbed wire.

Most of the sewing machine business has gone to foreign factories. The White Co., which was No. 2 in this field, gave up in late 1957 after 80 years of business and now has its machines made in Japan.

In 1956 and 1957 we shipped abroad only 80,000 sewing machines. We imported 2 million.

There are steady increases in imports of portable typewriters and calculating and other types of business machines. One company with an overseas plant makes identical machines in the United States and in Germany. It pays an average of \$2.25 per hour to workers in its American plant, less than 60 cents an hour to its workers in Germany. An official of this company recently said: "We are being forced into setting up overseas plants, where labor costs are lower, in order to compete with foreign companies."

In 1957 we exported about 100,000 typewriters and imported 337,000. From January to September of 1958, we shipped only 42,000 typewriters overseas and brought in 280,000.

Last year 800,000 bicycles arrived. Our exports were negligible.

We find that we have similar situations existing with reference to such items as fishing tackle, jeweled watches, clocks, clothespins, woolen gloves, plywood, dinnerware, woolen fabrics, cameras, cotton cloth, and transistor radios.

Insofar as transistor radios are concerned, some U.S. manufacturers, in order to stay in business, have arranged to bring in transistor portables from Japan to sell as part of their own line. Other companies in this field are considering importing sets or parts from Japan.

Now such an arrangement may overcome the companies' current problem of competition, but what happens to the rank and file of American labor that has been making these transistors and parts in U.S. factories?

If one thinks that this problem is confined to small items only, he is sadly mistaken. The Tennessee Valley Authority, after quite a hassle, recently decided to buy a huge steam turbine generator from a British company that underbid U.S. firms by several million dollars.

Let's see how this one purchase affected workers in four cities of the United States. It was Westinghouse and General Electric which were outbid. They have plants which manufacture turbines and turbine parts in East Pittsburgh, Lester, Pa.; Schenectady, N.Y.; and Fitchburg, Mass. All four of these cities are in depressed areas where unemployment is high.

The loss of this contract meant the loss of about 350 full-time jobs for 2 years on direct production and 700 or more other jobs indirectly connected with the project. Again, British wage rates are only 37 percent of those in the United States for similar work.

Here is a headline from Monday's Wall Street Journal: "Producers Spur Imports From Own Oversea Plants, Cite Savings—Harvester Gets First Units."

The news story said: "This week International Harvester Co., the largest manufacturer of farm equipment in the world, imported into the United States the first farm tractors made in Harvester factories overseas."

This week's issue of U.S. News & World Report, in discussing this very subject, says: "U.S. producers trying to meet this kind of competition have two alternatives if they want to stay in business: Turn to more automation, using fewer people, or shift production overseas."

It has been going overseas at an alarming rate.

As foreign countries take on the manufacture of more and more items which they formerly purchased in this country, they will be able to do some real bargaining under our present trade policies. The prices for commodities made in this country will be so high that under no condition will we be able to compete with their domestic products. They will then be able without fear to remove all tariffs on American-made products because we cannot possibly compete with them in their markets. They will grant tariff concessions to us gladly for similar ones on their products coming into the United States.

So you can readily see what I say is true; namely, that we are losing our European markets and soon, under our present trade policies, will be well on our way to losing our own American markets to foreign-made commodities shipped into this country.

Let me give you an example: The manufacturers of sporting equipment laid on my desk the highest quality baseball gloves, basketballs, footballs, etc., manufactured in this country for many, many years. They placed beside this equipment similar items of exactly the same quality made by the Japanese. It was pointed out that under our foreign-aid program we gave to the Japanese the most modern, scientific, mass-production, leather goods machinery.

The American labor that went into these products averaged \$2.50 an hour compared to Japanese labor at 40 cents an hour. Japanese taxes, both business and personal, are considerably lower than ours.

The old argument that American know-how, ingenuity, and mass-production methods can overcome the differential in taxes and labor costs no longer applies. The machinery which the Japanese were given was a later model and more efficient than much of the machinery still used in American plants.

Furthermore, as we all know, the Japanese are a smart and industrious people. Need I point out to you that under these circumstances it is impossible for our manufac-



turers to compete in our own markets with the Japanese products?

Of course, the free traders will tell you that we must allow a certain number of industries to go by the boards in this country because liberalized trade policies are advantageous to our American exporters. True it is that over the years, the United States being a great industrial country, its exports have exceeded its imports. If they had not, the United States would have been in a bad way. That is what we are complaining about now. The gap between our exports and our imports is closing fast; in fact, too fast.

I am well aware of the Biblical injunction that we must be our brother's keeper, but we can fulfill that injunction only so long as we are able to keep ourselves.

## Challenge to American Business

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I made before the chamber of commerce luncheon on April 27, 1959, entitled "Challenge to American Business."

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

#### CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN BUSINESS

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, chamber of commerce luncheon, Washington, D.C., April 27, 1959)

I am grateful for this opportunity to address the business leaders of America and to discuss with you a problem that concerns me deeply.

I refer to a declaration of war Mr. Khrushchev has issued against us—a declaration of economic war.

I need not remind you gentlemen of the all too painful fact of the American recession. I share your rejoicing that we are again on the upgrade; but none of us should ever forget that there is still far too much slack in our economy.

Millions are still jobless. Too many plants are working short workweeks. America is far from hitting on all cylinders.

As you may know, I have recently visited Russia, and I can tell you that the Soviets are pulling out all of the production stops, pressing hard against their full economic capacity, and making great sacrifices to increase that capacity.

Russia is a part of the world where optimism rivals that of America's boldest optimists.

Premier Khrushchev has said that he has declared economic war on us. His aim: to "catch up and surpass America."

The Soviet countryside is strewn with signs bearing these words.

Khrushchev is looking ahead 10 to 20 years. He is using the vast powers of Russia's state machinery to plan and program the great resources of his empire. He has called his first 7-year plan, "Russia's Offensive Opens," and under this plan he has programed vast increases in the capacity of Russia's heavy industries.

By 1965, he aims at adding nearly 30 million tons of steel capacity; more than 100 million tons of oil production; nearly 300 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity.

And while the emphasis is clearly on capital goods to add to Soviet military and economic power, there are also important planned increases in consumer goods. Meat production is to more than double by 1965; butter production, already almost equal to ours, is to increase by almost 400,000 tons. There are to be more shoes and clothes and the gadgets of life for the Russian people, who, you must remember, know nothing of the rich material life we live here.

We would be foolish indeed to discount these plans and programs, ambitious as they may seem. For the Soviets have made ambitious plans before—and they have made them a reality.

Not only have they achieved economic goals; they have taken giant steps in science and technology as well.

The first man-made earth satellite bears a stamp, "Made in Russia."

The first artificial planet to be placed in our solar system likewise is labeled, "Made in Russia."

And to the struggling nations of the world, this label says more. It says, "Made in Russia—only 40 years ago a primitive, uneducated, rural nation, a nation without science, without technology."

To the Indian or the Egyptian, the Burmese or the Syrian, Russia's meteoric rise from laggard to leader in the world of science and invention has the same inspiration as the rags-to-riches rise of the self-made man of America.

If Russia can do it, they say, why can't we?

And so we would be ill advised to underestimate Russia's progress. More important, we would be foolish to ignore the potent effect of Russia's progress on the rest of the world.

Khrushchev's 7-year plan is not just an economic document; it is a political and psychological document, too. The Russians are using it as a major weapon of foreign policy, and they are getting an interested audience in all those teeming underdeveloped countries of Asia, the Middle East, Africa and even Latin America where people are searching desperately for an escape from a life of abject poverty.

Many leaders in India, Burma, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, and elsewhere are fascinated with what is going on in Russia, and it is hardly surprising. Those leaders are not blind to the hideous cost to humanity which the industrial revolution under communism has entailed; but they hope to avoid paying this cost.

At the same time, they know their people will have to make sacrifices if they are to grow in economic strength.

Before these people, the Russian flaunts their 7-year plan, and they get an interested audience.

For what alternative is offered in its place? What is the experience of the prosperous West that seems relevant to their dire problems?

What, they ask us, do you have to offer? You and I know that we have plenty to offer. But have we been offering it? Have we been sharing our best qualities, our greatest talents as fully as we might have?

I do not think so—and I would like to suggest a way in which American business and American businessmen can help export to other countries one of the most precious commodities we have: managerial know-how.

For it is this talent which has contributed so greatly to America's unprecedented wealth and standard of living.

We need to export this talent because the real determinant of a country's economic progress is people.

Certainly a country with vast natural resources can develop more readily than a country with no natural resources—all other factors being the same. However, there are many examples of countries, like Indonesia,

rich in natural resources, which suffer the pangs of abject poverty. Yet other countries, like Switzerland and Belgium, with extremely limited resources, have become highly industrialized and highly productive and their people enjoy high living standards.

Israel and Puerto Rico are dramatic examples of what can be done by energetic people with limited resources.

The key to economic progress is in the know-how, in the talents, in the abilities, in the training, in the experience of the people. But in most of the underdeveloped countries, especially those that have become newly-independent, there is a tragic lack of managers and operators—people who know how to do things, how to get results, how to perform.

It is not that the people of these countries lack inherent ability. There is no country in the world where one cannot find outstanding individuals. The trouble is there are so very few of them.

Training and experience take time. The process of developing know-how is tragically slow.

Under our Point Four program and other public and private efforts, tens of thousands of loyal and dedicated Americans have been living and working as advisors and consultants and teachers overseas, trying to provide the technical assistance which the underdeveloped countries so desperately need.

To these soldiers in the front line of the war against poverty, we all owe a great debt of gratitude.

Where we have failed is in making available in substantial measure America's managerial talents, America's capacity to do, to perform, to get things done.

The greatest reservoir of management talent in the entire world is in American industry. Our corporations have the men and women who know how to organize and get results, how to operate and how to manage. Far too little of this talent has been made available to the underdeveloped countries.

Here lies the greatest challenge to American business in the war against poverty—in the war for free enterprise.

As you well know, management is not produced by any simple formula. Managers and entrepreneurs are not created ready-made by our universities. No one knows better than you that there is no substitute for practical experience.

It isn't enough for us to send advisors and consultants and experts overseas. Yes, they are tremendously valuable and make a marked contribution, but even more important is the need to make available managerial talent. In this area, only American business can meet the challenge.

Will you meet the challenge and meet it in time?

Many have said that private investment abroad can do the entire job. A combination of American capital and American know-how through private investment is highly desirable and must be given every possible encouragement. But for the long-run good of the underdeveloped countries, is this enough?

The best way to encourage free enterprise is to help build local industries, not merely branches of American firms.

In the long run, the underdeveloped countries will become developed only if their own businesses grow and expand and become stronger.

Only American business can determine whether the United States will help the underdeveloped countries secure the management they need for rapid progress. It would be well if every American corporation were to think seriously how it can contribute to meeting this challenge.

We could achieve spectacular results if we could make available hundreds or thousands of management technician teams who

go abroad from 2 to 5 years under management contracts for the purpose of actually running locally owned business. Such a program could result in increasing output, in raising living standards, in brightening American prestige and in thwarting expansion of communism.

Who can doubt that American business can beat the Communists in helping the underdeveloped countries, if it is willing to make the effort?

By making the effort, I do not mean sending only retired people, and adventurous youngsters who have the zeal but not the experience and maturity to be effective. We must make available some of our best people in their most productive years, and they must stay on the scene long enough to show the local business community how to manage and how to run enterprises.

Simultaneously, people from the developing countries must be brought to America and given opportunities to work within our corporations, alongside good management personnel.

Our Government can help induce individuals and companies to participate in such a program. We now provide tax exemption up to \$20,000 a year for Americans who are abroad 18 months or more. To lift this upper earnings limit, would be a small price to pay for the certain fruits of lending our managerial talents to those who need them most.

There are other ways our Government might join hands with business in a joint endeavor. Government might make up the difference between what a local enterprise could pay an American executive and the salary he has been getting. Government might also provide technical assistance funds to dollar-starved countries to facilitate the exporting of executives.

Many countries might be induced to provide local tax exemption for such management teams so that there would be opportunities for large personal savings, thus affording attractive financial rewards.

Of course, in order for American corporations to induce their best people to take these assignments, the companies would have to protect seniority rights. But there is nothing novel about this. We did it for the men who went to fight in the hot war after Pearl Harbor. Why shouldn't we do the same for those who are willing to fight in the front lines of a war just as urgent and just as important to our survival: the cold war against communism?

You should not overlook the possibility that your own management people might learn something from working abroad, and be all the more valuable when they return. After all, we do not have all the knowledge, and we can learn as well as teach.

What I am suggesting is that American business create its own point 4 program.

What I am suggesting is that American business get into the business of exporting free enterprise to other countries—in the form of that greatest of American geniuses—our managerial talent.

And I can think of no more fitting organization than your own to take the leadership in implementing this point 4 program for American business.

What I am suggesting makes good humanitarian sense—and that alone is a good reason for undertaking it.

But it also makes good business sense, in the long run, for America.

You, as businessmen, know that good customers mean good business. Our own economy has grown in large measure because we have had expanded purchasing power and larger markets for our goods.

The same is true of the world markets. As we help underdeveloped countries to grow and prosper, they will become not competitors, but customers for American products.

Of course, there will be some added competition. But when world trade expands, America and her business community are bound to benefit. And our world trade will expand as the poor countries, with our help, grow more prosperous.

The matter of lending management to other countries will not be easy. There will be many headaches and heartaches and frustrations. But who here does not know that nothing worthwhile was ever won without sweat, hard work, and frustration?

The fight against poverty and against Communism is not going to be easy in any of its phases. But surely, in America, there are enough companies, and enough individuals, who will be willing to join in a crusade of commercial missionaries.

America must become recognized throughout the world as the leading force in this Twentieth Century war against poverty. This is a popular war. It is a moral war. It is a war that we can win.

And in winning that war for humanity, we increase the chances of winning peace and survival for ourselves, as well as for men and women and children everywhere.

### Someday Poland Will Exist Again as a Free and Independent Nation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some 168 years ago, Poland adopted its first constitution establishing the rights of its people to enjoy the fruits of liberty and justice. It is well for us to pause for a moment to take note of what has happened to that valiant nation and its people since that time.

Today we find Poland swallowed up in the depths of the Soviet Union's plans for world domination. The freedoms which the people of Poland were guaranteed have been lost in the meaningless mouthings of her Red puppet leaders. Her claim to an independent nation is in doubt because of the string pulling of her Soviet masters housed in the Kremlin.

The people of Poland have suffered terribly in the past generation. Atrocities by both the Russians and the Germans cut down her brave young men and even her women and children in wholesale, senseless slaughter. Her people were sent both eastward and westward to provide the backbreaking work force for factories, mines, and farms. Families were split asunder, never again to be reunited.

After World War II came the bitter enslavement of the Communists, of Russian troops on Polish soil, of heartless suppression of freedom and individuality. Finally, the Poles revolted and won the promise of an end to religious persecution and collective farms. But the Red masters had no intention of carrying out their promises. Since the revolt in 1956, the newly won freedoms are being spirited away, one at a time, until now Poland is once again completely under the heel of a brutal police state.

It is the hope of all of us that someday Poland will exist again as a free and independent nation, free to determine her own destiny.

On this day, it is wise for us to contemplate the fate of those who were forced to deal with the Communists, and who now find themselves under their subjugation.

### Protection of Wild Horses and Burros

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Emory S. Avant, executive director of Peoples Lobby, Inc., regarding the slaughter of wild horses and burros to provide food for dogs and other domestic pets. The sad plight of these animals has been told in several national magazines and other publications.

Mustangs, as has been written, are as traditional to the West as the six gun, and they are now facing extinction. In Nevada alone there are but 50 still remaining of a herd that at one time numbered 70,000. This is all due to mechanized roundups to capture them to sell as dog food.

Low-flying planes herd the horses to flatlands, where other hunters, waiting in trucks, run them to the point of exhaustion. They are then roped and hobbled until they can be hauled to slaughter. By the time they reach the slaughterhouses their hides have been practically torn to pieces and they are more dead than alive from the brutal treatment they have received.

Hunters who have contracted to bring these mustangs to slaughterhouses have devised this inhumane technique because it is the only way they can effectively round up large herds of animals at a cost low enough to sell the carcasses at a profit.

On January 19, 1959, I introduced H.R. 2725, to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States. The full text of the bill follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:*

"§ 47. Use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros; pollution of watering holes.

"(a) Whoever uses an aircraft or a motor vehicle to hunt, for the purpose of capturing or killing, any wild unbranded horse, mare, colt, or burro running at large on any of the public lands or ranges shall be fined not more than \$500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(b) Whoever pollutes or causes the pollution of any watering hole on any of the



public land or ranges for the purpose of trapping, killing, wounding, or maiming any of the animals referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall be fined not more than \$500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(c) As used in subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) The term 'aircraft' means any contrivance used for flight in the air; and

"(2) The term 'motor vehicle' includes an automobile, automobile truck, automobile wagon, motorcycle, or any other self-propelled vehicle designed for running on land."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 3, immediately preceding section 41, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"47. Use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros."

I might say here that the State of Nevada enacted similar legislation a number of years ago to regulate the capture of wild horses and burros on lands other than those belonging to the United States.

Mr. Avant's letter follows:

PEOPLES LOBBY, INC.,

Washington, D.C., March 17, 1959.

HON. WALTER S. BARING,

Member of Congress,

House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: We are receiving a great deal of mail regarding the killing of the little burro and the wild horses of several States. Many of those that have written know about your bill, H.R. 2725. While there are only a few States that have wild horses and burros, there are 600 humane organizations over the land with a large membership and these humanitarians are very much interested in your bill.

Several years ago, while in the West, I was invited to a burro barbecue. The thought of eating the flesh of the little animal that was left by the miners to starve and who found water and food where it did not exist, was so revolting that I was unable to eat anything for several days.

The Members of Congress are, as a whole, humane and I have no doubt but that your bill will pass both Houses.

Sincerely yours,

EMORY S. AVANT,

Executive Director.

### Justice for Army Chaplains

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have offered an amendment to the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954 as it applies to the service of Army chaplains in order to eliminate the present disadvantages and discriminations against clergymen serving in the Army.

We all recognize the great importance of qualified, ecclesiastically endorsed clergy to serve as chaplains in the Armed Forces. Up to this time we have had a particularly favorable experience in securing highly qualified, splendid chaplains to carry out the spiritual duties in our armed services.

It has been pointed out that the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954,

when it becomes fully implemented in July 1960 as applied to the Army, will possibly completely cripple the ability of denominational endorsing agencies to provide chaplains for the Army in the future.

This handicap and anticipated difficulty arises from the fact that the average age for the appointment of Infantry officers, as distinguished from chaplains, in the Army is 23 years. Since most officers retire in the rank of lieutenant colonel, it is therefore possible for the average Infantry officer to complete 30 years of service at the age of 53 as provided by the above law presently applicable to the Army. No one would question the desirability of the Army and all the services for younger officers and that is not an issue in this matter.

In the case of clergymen, the average age at entrance into the Army is 30 years according to a study made by the office of the Chief of Chaplains of the Army. The usual college graduation age is 22. Seminary studies may continue for an additional period of 3 years or 6 years in some major denominations.

In addition, some denominations require that a graduate clergyman must serve a period of 1 or 2 years before he can receive ordination. Some require a year of successful assistant pastorate after the second year in the seminary before the student is permitted to enter the third year. Other denominations require an ordained clergyman to serve a minimum of three years in civilian parishes before he can be granted ecclesiastical endorsement to serve in a chaplaincy.

While all of the practices referred to above insure a professionally well-qualified clergyman prepared to cope with the difficult problems of the chaplaincy, the fact is that chaplains enter the Army at a considerably greater age, and it is stated by competent officials that the average age entrance of 30 for chaplains is essential to conduct a successful ministry for service personnel.

The way the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954 works out, if a clergyman comes on duty as chaplain during his 30th year then he can only complete 23 years of duty as compared with 30 years of possible duty for other officers.

In the event that a clergyman wishes to spend additional time in professional study looking toward a masters or doctors degree he may well pass the maximum entrance age of 34 and not be able to complete even 20 years of service. Thus, chaplains entering the service under these circumstances, that is, at a later age, must under present law, face the prospect of being separated from the service at age 53 with a maximum benefit of only 50 percent retirement, or in many cases with no retirement at all. Hence there is a justifiable reluctance on their part to volunteer for spiritual duties with the Army. Of course, the same situation applies to Army Reserve chaplains not on active duty and National Guard chaplains.

The purpose of the amendment which I am offering to exempt Army chaplains from the current age provision of the

Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954 and place them in the same status as chaplains in the Air Force and the Navy seems to me to be highly meritorious and necessary in order to insure the proper flow of qualified chaplains into the Army. There would seem to be no justification for present unequal treatment of Army chaplains.

This amendment is endorsed by accredited officials of all basic denominations serving the armed services, and I hope and urge that the committee and Congress will approve it. To my mind, it is the least we can do for those who are rendering such valuable and vital service to our national defense. Spiritual ministrations in the armed services is of great consequence and importance not only to service personnel, but to their parents, families and friends who are naturally concerned that our service boys and girls shall have available to them at all times the counsel, advice and help of their own spiritual leaders. The value of such service to the personnel and to the Nation could not possibly be adequately measured in concrete terms. It is a must for all the Armed Forces.

### Search for Peace

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, like the weather, everybody talks about peace, but few people do anything about it.

In my home city of Philadelphia, however, WIP, an independent local radio station, has been doing something about it for over a year. For its efforts, expressed through a public service program series, "Search for Peace," it has been honored with a national award.

Mrs. Ellen Stoutenberg, producer of "Search for Peace," has been awarded a McCall golden mike, the highest honor given exclusively to women in the radio and television field. She is one of seven women in the United States to win this coveted award, all of whom, in the words of the editors of McCalls, felt part of their responsibility is to help narrow the gap between the world as it is and the world as it can be.

"Search for Peace" is a unique effort for a single radio station, in that it strives to carry its message beyond normal coverage in the Philadelphia area, to the entire world. Benedict Gimbel, Jr., president and general manager of WIP, has, from the beginning, offered tapes of the commentaries of world-famous personalities to stations anywhere in the world.

The response to this has been overwhelming. Almost 100 stations in the United States, including one in each of our newest States, Alaska and Hawaii, carry this program. In addition, it is heard over the 100 stations of the Australian Broadcasting System, over the

Canadian Broadcasting Co., and by individual stations as remote as Aruba, Netherlands Antilles. The Voice of America brings it to countries normally beyond the reach of American radio.

In addition to congratulating my good friend Ben Gimbel, Mrs. Stoutenberg, and the entire staff of WIP, I should like to add a word of praise for the Philadelphia Junior League. As pointed out in the award citation, the coast-to-coast distribution of this worthwhile radio series was made possible through the efforts of this fine organization of young women.

In a day when broadcasting is often criticized for its preoccupation with rock and roll and western movies, I am proud that a radio station in Philadelphia has placed the public good above gain. Through "Search for Peace," again in the words of the citation, "Man's oldest yearning took on fresh interest and excitement."

### We Will Always Need the Guard

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the National Guard of the United States is the Nation's oldest fighting force.

Throughout the years, the National Guard has had a long and honorable history. Today it is rightfully considered as our first line Reserve component, always ready to fight.

Its greatest attribute is that the guard is made up entirely of volunteers, enlisted men and officers, who perform their training willingly and without compulsion.

This has brought about a camaraderie, a sense of esprit de corps, if you will, so necessary to a first-class fighting machine. Undoubtedly this comes about because of the guard's militia status and the fact that it is essentially a State force where men from the same community serve together for a mutual cause.

This militia status is one that must always be maintained in the guard. For many years, more than I can remember, there have been those who would strip the guard of its status and federalize it like every other Reserve and Regular component. This would be a serious blunder for not only does it offend the sensibilities of those of us who believe in living within the spirit and meaning of the Constitution—wherein the maintenance of a militia is guaranteed—but it would tend to treat the guard like every other Reserve component merely for the benefit of uniformity.

In my opinion, we have something outstanding in the guard and I will continue to oppose any change which would deprive it of its dual status.

The guard also has a job to do in this connection. It must never be an ob-

structionist. It must not oppose sensible changes or reorganization when such would be in the interest of national defense. The guard, although old in tradition must be young, alert, and forward looking, in its present thinking.

We are passing into a new age of missiles which travel on the wings of supersonic speed, of space warfare and weapons too terrible to contemplate for use in a civilized world. Nevertheless, we will always need the guard. Its State missions will always be a responsibility and this will be true no matter how far we advance in technology. And it will have its Federal mission as well, for the day of conventional warfare has not passed. So long as men are required to fire weapons, to operate machines and to take and hold the territory of the enemy, the guard will be needed.

So the guard must insist that it has its place in this new world and it must struggle to retain it. A fight is not new to the guard so I have no delusions about the outcome.

Now, contractors for the National Guard Association are completing the National Guard Memorial Building. It is appropriate that such a building should be erected here at the seat of the Government. True, it memorializes those of the guard who have fallen in defense of their country. But in another sense it will be dedicated to the living, to those guardsmen who give unstintingly of their time and talent that this Nation may have a strong reserve force.

When future history is written, the guard will be just as prominent as in the history of the past. The strength and durability of this memorial epitomizes the strength and durability of the National Guard.

### Special Citation to Farrell Lines, Inc.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, outstanding service in the interest of the general public is always to be commended; especially is this true when the operation in question directly affects the well-being of the traveling public. Such recognition has just been given by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of the United States through award of the special citation to Farrell Lines, Inc., for the third consecutive year. The award is made in recognition of the excellent sanitation maintained on the company's vessels during 1958.

Farrell Lines has ever been noted for the maintenance of high standards, and is to be congratulated for this attainment. The presentation was made by Dr. David E. Price, Assistant Surgeon General, and was received by Adm. George Wauchop, executive vice president of Farrell Lines, Inc., at ceremonies

on board the company's vessel *SS African Star* at the 33d Street Pier in Brooklyn.

When it is realized that this corporation operates 16 vessels which earned a rating of 95 or better on official Public Health Service inspection, which includes 166 separate items of sanitary construction and maintenance, it is evident that the accomplishment affords reason for justifiable pride on the part of both the management and all employees of the company.

### Labor Legislation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the following newsletter, written by the able junior Senator of New Hampshire, the Honorable NORRIS COTTON, should be of interest to all:

#### YOUR SENATOR REPORTS

(By NORRIS COTTON)

Trustbusting Teddy Roosevelt said, "The corporation has come to stay as the trade union has come to stay. Each has done great good. Each should be favored as long as it does good, but each should be sharply checked when it acts against law and justice." When he made that statement, he was in the midst of a bitter war against the Fat Cats of Wall Street who named Presidents, made and unmade Senators and Congressmen, throttled competition, starved and exploited labor. Nonetheless, he clearly foresaw the hour when the pendulum would complete its swing and the reins of power would shift from the corporation to the trade union.

That hour came this week when an unhappy Senate writhed under the whiplash of giant labor. It came as the culmination of 26 months of probing by the McClellan committee, during which it published 46 volumes—16,939 pages—1,257 witnesses. It found millions of union funds pocketed by union officers, unions without elections for more than 10 years, members deprived of voice or vote in union affairs, conspiracies between union officials and employers, felons fresh out of prison in places of authority. "The abuses, thievery, skullduggery, and skull-splitting tactics are practiced more often against the workers than the employers. The arbitrary power over workers thus acquired is almost invariably used for personal power and enrichment."—Senator McCLELLAN. Labor itself was shocked by these revelations, and the topflight chieftains of AFL-CIO, whose integrity and respectability is unquestioned, took disciplinary action against 7 unions having 2½ million members.

Three key issues highlighted the 9-day Senate struggle: misuse of union funds, dictatorship in union affairs, abuse of union power.

Dishonest officials who flied at least \$10 million from members' treasuries spent it in various ways—a \$35,000 yacht, a \$57,000 private plane, a stable of thoroughbred horses, and large sums spread over a wide field ranging from Cadillacs and TV sets to theater tickets and women's finery. Dictatorship and abuse of power was even worse. It is an established and accepted fact that



union membership is not voluntary. Workers must join or forfeit their jobs. Dues are deducted from their pay just as the Government withholds a tax. But, in addition to this, they have frequently been deprived of their vote for years at a time, forbidden admission to stacked meetings with doors barred by steel chains, forced to pay initiation fees as high as \$1,000 for the right to work at their trade, and, in some instances, beaten by goons if they dared to protest.

Chairman McCLELLAN rebelled against the mild Kennedy bill and offered a bill with teeth in it. In a nutshell the difference between the two bills was the difference between report and reform. The Kennedy bill merely required officers of a union to report periodically to the Secretary of Labor on the use of funds and on a variety of internal union affairs. For the ordinary union member the Secretary is a long way off. The McClellan version wrote the remedy into the law of the land, enforced by a hundred U.S. district attorneys in every part of the country. It laid down a fundamental bill of rights for every union member (freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom from arbitrary initiation fees and kickbacks, protection of right to sue and to participate in union elections, etc.). It outlawed extortion, secondary boycotts, and blackmail picketing. After a desperate battle McCLELLAN'S first amendment, the bill of rights, was adopted by a hairbreadth margin of one vote.

It was then that the full fury of the astonished labor leaders burst upon the Senate, especially on those Senators who had gained their election from labor's support. One by one the further McClellan provisions were watered down or beaten until finally another vote was secured on the bill of rights and a weakened, diluted version substituted. Most of the Members who had stood up and voted for it only 2 days before reversed themselves, reminding one a little of Ralph Waldo Emerson's remark that, "A hero is no braver than an ordinary man, but he is brave 5 minutes longer." Thus, for a second year in succession the Senate has marched up the hill and down again, passing a bill that is "against sin" but hardly more than the expression of a pious hope that labor's racketeers will be good.

## Des Moines and Mississippi River Flood-Control Program

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. NEAL SMITH**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my testimony given before the House Committee on Appropriations concerning the Des Moines River Valley flood-control program, which is of vital concern to the entire Mississippi River Valley, in particular, and to the whole country, in general. My testimony was as follows:

STATEMENT OF NEAL SMITH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIFTH DISTRICT, IOWA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, APRIL 30, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee: I appreciate the privilege of ap-

pearing before your subcommittee to enter a formal request for \$2 million to be included in the 1960 public works appropriations bill for the Red Rock Dam and Reservoir on the Des Moines River. The reservoir site, approximately 60 miles downstream from the city of Des Moines will be chiefly in Marion County, which is in the congressional district I represent, but four congressional districts in Iowa are directly affected, as well as States bordering the Mississippi River. I feel certain that the citizens of at least 25 congressional districts would be benefited by construction of the Red Rock Dam.

Permit me, first, Mr. Chairman, to commend your subcommittee for its untiring efforts in endeavoring to assign priority to the many worthy projects brought before your subcommittee. I am also aware, Mr. Chairman, of the serious admonishment you delivered in the House of Representatives earlier this week, on April 27. I agree that there are unnecessary expenses we have been doing without and can continue to get along without. My request is not in this category. The project will be an investment in every sense of the word, not a mere expense. It is an investment to save human lives and property. The ratio of benefits compared to costs for this project is 1.51. Few projects in which you ever invested money had that favorable ratio. This is a good investment from a business point of view. For the reasons hereinafter stated, I respectfully request that you give favorable consideration to the request for an appropriation of \$2 million for the Red Rock Reservoir.

#### CHRONOLOGY

Over 21 years ago, in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, the Congress approved a general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Upper Mississippi River Basin "with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers may be advisable." The plan included a reservoir on the Des Moines River, then known as Howell Reservoir and now designated as Red Rock Reservoir (Howell site), with dam site 142.9 miles above the river mouth.

That same year a further study was authorized of the Des Moines River Basin flood problems. In the survey report of 1943 (H. Doc. 651, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) the Chief of Engineers recommended construction of Red Rock Reservoir, with the dam site 155.6 miles above the river mouth.

By the Flood Control Act of 1944, the Congress authorized the 1938 comprehensive plan, "including the project for Red Rock Dam substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the chief of engineers in document 651."

The 1943 report of the Corps of Engineers was reviewed following the major floods of 1947, which cost seven lives in the Des Moines River Basin, the evacuation of over 6,000 persons, left tens of thousands of citizens without drinking water in the tap for a month, and caused millions of dollars in damages. The engineers found that the Red Rock site would not have contained the 1947 flood and recommended construction of the authorized Red Rock Reservoir at the Howell site and a reservoir above Des Moines at the Saylorville site, with dam at mile 213.7.

#### RECURRING MAJOR FLOODS

The Corps of Engineers in its various reports for flood control on the Des Moines River has continuously directed attention to the recurring floods of major proportions, which have caused many millions of dollars of damages to urban areas and serious crop losses. Their magnitude and frequency are a matter of record—June 1851, June 1858, April 1862, June 1865, July 1869, July 1875, April 1876, July 1881, April 1883, May 1892, April 1897, July 1902, June 1903, June 1917,

June 1935, May and June 1944, June 1946, June 1947, and June 1954—an average of a major flood every 5½ years. Moreover, every year significant flood damages are experienced, resulting in average annual flood losses, based on 1952 prices, in excess of \$2 million in the lower valley below the proposed Red Rock Dam.

Local protection measures have been adopted through the years, and our State of Iowa is grateful to the Corps of Engineers for its assistance and cooperation. While these measures have served to lessen somewhat the amount of our economic losses, it is a matter of official record that our local programs are inadequate without the Red Rock Reservoir.

During the 1947 flood, Ottumwa in the fourth district—which has always suffered heavy losses from Des Moines River floods—was without an approved public water supply for 30 days. In the past few years alone, Ottumwa has obligated itself to \$5 million for levees, channel improvements, and storm-water pumping stations, which will supplement the Red Rock Reservoir. In 1956 the city began construction of these improvements after approval by the Corps of Engineers. Within the city limits of Des Moines, approximately 5.5 miles of levees have been constructed. Through the years the district engineer has had to tell Iowans owning land bordering the river that nothing can be done on their losses because their properties lie in the area of the basin authorized for a dam.

Mr. Chairman, the citizens of my State have spent millions—yes, millions of dollars—in local improvement works. While these local works and the soil and water conservation programs that have been inaugurated are helpful in reducing flood costs, they cannot be substituted for the flood-control purposes of the Red Rock Reservoir.

The city of Ottumwa has now undertaken bonded indebtedness to the limit permitted by law in an effort to protect its citizens and its business district from flood damage. They have done all they can do locally and that investment is threatened, by a major flood, which could again easily occur on the Des Moines River, would probably destroy the large investment and sacrifice made by the city of Ottumwa. Citizens on a local level can go only so far with self-help projects. They now need the cooperation of Congress to begin construction of the project long recommended by the Army engineers as the project that should be constructed first.

Many sections of Iowa and Minnesota that are drained by the Des Moines River and its tributaries have experienced dry weather for the past several months. But droughts in this area have been followed by floods, and people are still holding their breath, hoping that floods will not occur. The presently swollen tributaries from Des Moines downstream can be carried by the Des Moines River channel, but additional rain on the upper end will cause serious trouble.

If the dam under consideration had been constructed before 1947, the high water crest in the 1947 flood as far south as Hannibal, Mo., could have been reduced by 2 feet and saved the entire Mississippi Valley millions of dollars in damage, and great human sickness and misery.

The Des Moines River drains an area through central Iowa and Minnesota that receives heavy rainfall. Holding back the flood waters from central Iowa and Minnesota would benefit the entire Mississippi River Valley, and the most logical place to invest in flood control is in the headwaters in this area of high precipitation.

#### RED ROCK NOT A "NEW START"

With reference to the present policy against "new starts," this request for funds

for the Red Rock Reservoir should not be considered a new start. As a matter of fact, construction funds of \$1 million were allotted to the Red Rock Reservoir under the Civil Functions Appropriations Act of June 25, 1948. It was necessary to defer construction, however, following the major flood of 1947 which almost doubled the previous recorded flood heights at some points on the river, and as a result of the Presidential deferment directive during the Korean conflict.

It should also be noted that, while many river valleys have had several projects completed, the Des Moines River Valley has been without any project, and it should not now be doubly penalized because Federal funds have not previously been spent for construction there.

#### IMPORTANCE OF DES MOINES RIVER FLOOD-CONTROL PLAN

The century-old record of severe and frequent flooding in the Des Moines River area, the steadily increasing population in the 21 years since the authorization of the Red Rock Reservoir, the greatly expanded industrial development—these factors all warrant the appropriation of funds at this time in order that construction of the Red Rock Dam can finally be undertaken. Our citizens are uneasy over the possibility of having to wait still longer for the start of this project. They appeal to me and point out that apart from past economic losses, which for the last two major floods amounted to more than 30 percent of the estimated cost of the Red Rock project, each year of delay, each year of postponement, means they are exposed to the hazards of additional flood devastation.

Plainly, the size and importance of the area affected by the Des Moines River Basin and the severity and frequency of flooding compel the Congress to see to it that construction is now begun on the Red Rock Reservoir.

When completed, the Red Rock Reservoir and the Saylorville Reservoir (Public Law 85-500, approved July 3, 1958), together with the Des Moines local protection works, will provide flood protection to 213 miles of the Des Moines River below the Saylorville Reservoir and to the entire area subject to flooding by the waters of the Mississippi. The President's 1960 budget included \$113,000 as the amount necessary to complete the little planning that remained to be done and is now being completed. The Corps of Engineers has advised me that from an engineering standpoint \$2 million can be efficiently utilized for the Red Rock project during the 1960 fiscal year. They could begin work on the project almost immediately.

There, of course, is also need for continuing the studies and surveys for the authorized upstream reservoir at Saylorville. Under the comprehensive plan another pool would be contained near Saylorville. About \$200,000 is needed for making surveys relative to Saylorville. Under the plan of improvement, as now authorized, the Red Rock Reservoir will have an earth dam at the Howell site. The dam would be about 108 feet high and 6,100 feet long. The flood-control pool would cover 65,500 acres at elevation 780 feet above sea level. Saylorville Reservoir would have an earth dam 125 feet high and 6,000 feet long. Its flood-control pool would cover 15,500 acres at elevation 884.

The Corps of Engineers has very recently estimated the tangible benefits of these two projects at \$6.9 million a year, on the average. On the basis of prices obtaining in 1952, the cost of the Red Rock Reservoir has been estimated at about a \$70 million total. We are asking for \$2 million now. Had the Red Rock Reservoir been in operation in 1947, damages in the Des Moines River Basin

would have been reduced by over \$26 million—the amount of damages caused by the 1947 and 1954 floods. This is small compared to the damage to Mississippi River cities that this river valley could deliver.

These authorized projects will practically eliminate flood damage to towns, farms, roads, and railways on the Des Moines River below Saylorville. Along the Mississippi River downstream from the mouth of the Des Moines River, important levee districts and cities, including Quincy in Illinois and Canton, LaGrange, and Hannibal in Missouri would be benefited. The cost of Federal and other highway bridges in the area below the dams would be greatly reduced, and the area including the big ordnance plant near Burlington would be protected. Twice during World War II citizens of the valley had to take time out from fighting the war to fight the Des Moines River. The river should be an asset rather than a menace.

I cannot think of any investment in the future of America that is more justified and worthwhile. It is in full accord with all reports and authorizations of the Army Engineers over the past 21 years. On behalf of thousands of Mississippi Valley citizens, I respectfully request your approval of this investment.

### It's Time To Return Precious Liberties to the Freedom-Loving People of Poland

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, May 3, I will be privileged to speak in Bridgeport, Conn., to a group of Polish-Americans anxious to see the democratic way of life we enjoy restored to their homeland.

The flame of freedom burns brightly in the hearts of the Polish people, not only those who are now Americans but also those still in Poland and subject to the traditional Communist pattern of violating and denying the basic human rights.

This Sunday, one of the most important Polish national holidays, celebrating the adoption of the May Constitution by the Polish Diet, is to be observed.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, this is a time for reflection on our part—a time in which we should renew vigorously our support of the people of Poland who are enduring a difficult period in their history.

The present situation in Poland had its roots in the partition of Poland by the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of August 25, 1939.

In collusion with Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union invaded Poland on September 17, 1939, and on September 28, 1939, the Soviet Union and Germany signed an agreement proclaiming the dissolution of the Polish state and the partition of its territories between themselves, the Soviet Union annexing the northeastern part of Poland.

These acts violated both the Treaty of Riga and the Polish-Russian nonaggression pact.

Except for the partitioners and the allies of Nazi Germany, the world continued to recognize the legal Polish Government, which moved to London.

On July 30, 1941, the Soviet Government concluded a pact with the Polish Government in London by which it recognized "that the Soviet-German treaties relative to the territorial changes in Poland have lost their validity."

On December 4, 1941, the Soviet Union concluded a declaration of friendship and mutual assistance with the London government.

However, under the pretext of being insulted by the suspicion that it might have been guilty of the Katyn Forest massacre, which the Germans revealed in 1943, the Soviet Union broke off relations with the London government in April 1943—though it never actually withdrew its recognition of that government.

In the latter part of World War II, when the Red army entered Polish territory on July 22, 1944, its political commissar, General Bulganin, issued a proclamation to the Polish people declaring the liberation of Poland and the establishment of the Polish Committee of National Liberation.

At Yalta in February 1945, Soviet Russia wrested from the other great powers approval of the Soviet plan for a provisional government of national unity, created in June 1945 with an overwhelming majority of Communists.

The government was recognized by the Allied Powers on the condition that it hold "free, unfettered elections at the earliest possible time." This essential condition was never kept.

Finally, in January 1947, elections took place under conditions of fraud and terror. Backed by the presence of Soviet troops, the Polish Workers—Communist—Party organization exerted pressure to induce voting for the government list of candidates, and although another independent list of the Polish Peasant Party was permitted there was no public control over the counting of votes and the declared results were grossly falsified.

The rape of Poland by the Communist and Moscow-dominated regime of a dictatorial police state continued.

But in June 1956, the political and moral oppression and the economic misrule and exploitation by the regime, clearly subservient to Moscow, resulted in the Poznan revolt. It forced the Communists to make concessions and to liberalize the regime headed by Wladyslaw Gomulka, the new first secretary of the party. Moscow, fearing repercussions in the other captive nations, protested violently but in the showdown in Warsaw in October 1956 Khrushchev, who had personally flown in to stem the tide, had to give way lest an attempt at brutal oppression lead to disastrous results.

Among the gains won by the Polish people were the regime's new policy toward the church, which again permitted religious teaching in schools and other concessions which led to the liquidation of the collective farms so detested by the peasants; the relaxation of censorship which permitted greater free-



dom of the press—though criticism was tempered by the common knowledge that Soviet Russia would not permit the installation of a non-Communist regime; and the cessation of terror by the security police. Although these achievements by no means restored the full enjoyment of human rights, they were important.

As the Communist Party regained control of the situation, the improvement was short lived. Developments in the court of 1958 have been marked by intensified repression of the people, retrogressing toward the conditions in force before October 1956. This retreat from the gains of the Polish October is particularly evident with regard to the freedom of intellectuals, to workers' rights and church-state relations. There are many signs that the gains of October are to be further reduced.

For several months, a ruthless press campaign has been waged against the church and against religion. The Minister of Education on August 4, 1958, forbade religious instruction in state schools by members of religious orders and congregations. On August 9, 1958, the Catholic hierarchy lodged a protest, calling the order an unconstitutional violation of the basic church-state agreement.

Recent statements by leading party members indicate that collective farms are to be reinstated. Gomulka himself stated on September 7, 1958:

The only correct road must in the long run lead to the collectivization of Polish agriculture.

There has been no genuine freedom of opinion in Poland since the loss of independence, and even the freedom of criticism which Gomulka announced at the Eighth Plenum in 1956 lasted less than a year. Censorship has been re-established. Many papers have been banned, including the outspoken organ of the young Communist intellectuals, *Po Prostu*; party control was increased over newspapers and the planned weekly *Europa* was not allowed to appear at all. In May 1958 a ruthless campaign against the more independent newspapermen and writers was proclaimed by Werblan, head of the party propaganda machine. Today the press and other media of information are again becoming as subservient to the party and the regime as before October 1956.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we in America who enjoy our freedom must remember that the people of Poland have always manifested a strong attachment to the Western World.

We should remember, too that in celebrating the 168th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 they would like to regain the liberties accorded them by that liberal document, written chiefly by Ignatius Potocki, supported by King Stanislaw Augustus, and passed at another critical time in Polish history.

In 1772, Russia, Prussia, and Austria had taken away large sections of Polish territory in what became known as the first partition.

Facing possible annihilation, all forces in Poland united behind the new con-

stitution that was greatly influenced by the liberal movements in America, England, and France.

Among the major provisions of the constitution were the following:

All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people.

Commoners were granted the right to acquire land; to become commissioned officers; religious freedom was guaranteed; powers of the government were divided between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches; and a two-chamber legislature established.

Within a few years after passage of the May Constitution, Poland was completely overrun by the armies of Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

During the century and a quarter of foreign oppression that followed, the May constitution served the Polish people as a symbol of democracy and independence.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the gallant people of Poland regain the precious liberties given them by the Constitution of 1791 but of which they have been deprived for so many years by the tyranny of foreign oppression.

### Food for Peace

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1959 issue of the *Capper's Farmer*, a transcription of an interview with the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota appears concerning his food for peace bill. Although Senator HUMPHREY's and Congressman WOLF's, of Iowa, United Nations food bill utilize the food and fiber resources in different ways, the purposes of the bill are similar. Both bills have as their respective goals the utilization of our food resources in ways which will aid the underdeveloped nations of the world and the starving peoples of this world in their quest for a better life.

Mr. Speaker, too many have thought of our great food and fiber abundance as a millstone around our necks. It is refreshing to know that through the leadership and explanations of Senator HUMPHREY and others, we are beginning to see the enormous use and value of our food resources—that it is a gift to be used for man; not for the purpose of rotting in food storage tanks.

Under unanimous consent, I include the interview of Senator HUMPHREY in the RECORD:

FOOD FOR PEACE—OUR MIRACLE WEAPON  
(An interview with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Minnesota's Senator HUMPHREY is introducing a bill in the Senate to establish a Food for Peace Administration. Here he tells how this program would work.)

Question: "Senator, what would your proposed food for peace program do that is not now being done under Public Law 480?"

Answer: "We intend to use Public Law 480 as a base and expand upon it. We need a Food Administration—a Food for Peace Administrator. Our present arrangement is clumsy. There is really no one spot where the responsibility for the use of food and fiber as an instrument of foreign policy is centered.

"Part of the responsibility is in the Department of Agriculture and part is in the Department of State."

Question: "One objective then will be to make Public Law 480 more effective?"

Answer: "Yes; and to improve its administration. But we need a Food for Peace Administration with vitality, imagination, and momentum. The present program is short of something to make it work. We are missing the great opportunity. And I want to say that if we keep on missing it for another 5 years we won't have any more chances."

Question: "What countries would receive our food for peace?"

Answer: "I am thinking of the new nations, the rising countries, those just coming out of colonialism that need capital for development. I mean those countries that do not have American dollars.

"The great opportunity in this program is that we can sell to these countries for their own money. That is a key to Public Law 480. But we have failed to make full use of it."

Question: "Can we make use of all these foreign currencies?"

Answer: "We use what we need to pay our bills in those countries. But here is where our products become 'food for peace.' We can loan the money back to them for their economic development—to build roads, schools, factories, or whatever they may need to improve themselves."

Question: "Haven't we been criticized for delay in putting these loan funds to work?"

Answer: "Yes. The sheer bureaucratic delay in negotiating some of these loans is tragic. We not only hold back opportunity for the new countries to develop. But while the money lies idle, inflation may be eroding away its value.

"We could be building future trade and permanent good will for our country. We could be helping new countries promote health, education, and business expansion."

Question: "Education then would be a big part of a food for peace program?"

Answer: "If we can sell food to these countries for their money, they can use their supply of American dollars to buy other things they need for industrial development. We can loan their money back to them for scholarships, school facilities, laboratories, classrooms, books, and visual aids."

Question: "Senator, Capper's Farmer readers are asking if an expansion of Public Law 480 is only a substitute for an adjustment of production that would prevent surpluses."

Answer: "We are justifiably concerned over surpluses because they are depressing farm prices. Unfortunately, lower farm prices do not show up in lower consumer prices.

"If a food for peace program were developed on a big enough scale, it would siphon off our depressing surpluses and put them to work in parts of the world that are short of food and fiber. It would upgrade our own economy and that of deficit countries.

"We could make food for peace the greatest instrument we have ever had to maintain a prosperous agriculture at home and create good will abroad."

Question: "If we expanded the Public Law 480 program, would we be accused of dumping our surpluses in the markets of our friends?"

Answer: "We could upset normal trade patterns if we acted like ignoramus. But this kind of program would be carefully

planned. I can't imagine that we would proceed without careful cooperation with our friends and allies.

"Food for peace would not be sold in our normal dollar or pound sterling markets. It would operate where there are no dollars or British pounds."

Question: "How much control would we have over the funds that we loaned back to these countries?"

Answer: "The projects would be decided upon by negotiation between the Food for Peace Administration and the recipient country, in accordance with such law as Congress might enact. But the purposes of the loan and the terms of repayment would be set forth in an agreement."

Question: "Isn't there a danger that food for peace might retard agricultural progress in such a country?"

Answer: "We are not thinking of a world-wide relief program. And, of course, our food surpluses are not unlimited. But the need of these countries is great. The pressure for a better standard of living is unbelievable. Either we must help them through democratic processes or they will fall captive to totalitarianism."

Question: "Senator, what set you at work on the food for peace idea?"

Answer: "I caught the idea on a trip to the Middle East about a year ago. I saw what food can really mean. I came back with the feeling that our military aid program in this area was accomplishing little."

"For example, we put millions of dollars in military aid into Iraq. What happened? They used the guns to kill the very government that we were supporting. And the people felt no gratitude to the United States."

"But I am confident that if we had loaned them money for a school lunch program, or helped them with health and education improvement that could have been identified with the humanitarian impulses of the American people, we would have a reservoir of goodwill in Iraq today."

Question: "Would Food for Peace be limited to the amount of our crop surpluses?"

Answer: "Such a program should not be wholly based on the accident of surpluses. First of all, we should have a national security reserve. I mean certain amounts of foods that should be set aside for emergencies that might happen to us or our allies."

"A food reserve is as important as a stockpile of atom bombs. What good would bombs do if we had no food? One of the first acts of an enemy would be to contaminate our fields and livestock. It is good national security to have a surplus of foods."

Question: "Is cost of our farm program high compared to that of our missiles?"

Answer: "We should quit complaining about the cost of food surpluses. We are not complaining much about military stockpiles or the obsolescence of weapons. We put billions into rockets and missiles that will never be fired. Yet that is done in the name of research and security."

"Food is security too. And it will win more friends than weapons. A few tons of powdered milk in Africa will do us more good than a ton of uranium."

"Furthermore when other nations look to us for part of their food needs they will think twice before joining any bloc antagonistic to us."

Question: "From your visit in Russia last year did you get the impression that the Soviets are pushing their farm program for the purpose of using food as a tool in furthering Soviet influence?"

Answer: "Yes; definitely. Premier Khrushchev pointed out how the Soviet Union had sent foods to less prosperous countries. I predict that in 5 years Russia will be a food-exporting country."

"Imagine what Mr. Khrushchev would be doing today if he had our billion-bushel wheat surplus. He'd be the world's biggest wheat salesman and not be worrying how many rubles it would bring. He'd be spending Soviet influence with every kernel."

Question: "Senator, are you looking forward to a world food bank in your food for peace proposal?"

Answer: "Yes, the food surplus producing countries might eventually get together in an international food bank. But I don't think we should wait until we can have a perfect project. We've already learned a lot from the use of Public Law 480. We should build from that and work out bilateral arrangements with nations that need our food now."

### Pending a Reply From State, a Fact-Finding Trip to Nicaragua

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release issued from my office on April 29, 1959:

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 29, 1959.

Following is the text of an English translation of a letter to Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, from the Ambassador of Nicaragua, inviting Mr. PORTER to visit that country, and the text of a letter from Mr. PORTER to Secretary of State Christian A. Herter in which he invites the State Department to comment on the merits of the proposed visit.

PORTER said that "pending a reply from the Secretary of State, which I shall certainly weigh carefully before making the decision, I feel as though such a visit might well help the cause of democracy in this hemisphere as well as add considerably to my own knowledge on this subject." The names of those PORTER intends to take with him if he undertakes the fact finding expedition to Nicaragua are listed in the letter to the Secretary of State.

APRIL 24, 1959.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,  
The House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: I am pleased to confirm the invitation which I personally extended to you on April 9, 1959, on behalf of the President of Nicaragua, Luis A. Somoza D., to visit our country accompanied by a group of persons whom you may wish to travel with you.

President Somoza has special interest in discussing with you general aspects of policy relative to Central America, as well as in affording you an opportunity of seeing by direct appreciation the real truth about Nicaragua in all its facets. He has instructed me to inform you, on his behalf, that it would be a pleasure to receive you and your companions as guests of the Republic of Nicaragua.

In order that you may more completely enjoy your sojourn in Nicaragua, we have decided not to prepare a formal program. Naturally, the protocol section of our foreign ministry will be at your disposal should you find it desirable to avail yourself of its services.

For the purpose of informing the Nicaraguan people of your visit, we will appreciate

it very much if you would advise us some time in advance of the date of your arrival to Managua.

I take advantage of this opportunity to renew to you, sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

GUILLERMO SEVILLA SACASA,  
Ambassador of Nicaragua.

APRIL 28, 1959.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,  
Secretary of State,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The President of Nicaragua has invited me to visit his country as his guest. He wants me to see for myself that Nicaragua, contrary to opinions I have expressed on occasion, is a democracy, not a dictatorship. I can bring with me any persons I choose to help me investigate the facts. Of course, I am to be entirely free to go any place and talk to anyone.

The suggestion of this visit was first made to be by our Ambassador to Nicaragua, Thomas E. Whelan, when he was in my office early in March. Later the Ambassador of Nicaragua invited me personally and we discussed the matter at length. I told them both that I had my doubts about whether anything useful could be accomplished and that I would consult with the Department of State upon receipt of a written invitation.

A copy of the invitation and a copy of the translation are enclosed. I will appreciate your comments and an opportunity to confer with Department specialists in due course.

If I accepted the invitation, my present plans would be as follows: Set aside a long weekend when I would miss no business on the floor of the House, which would mean I would have a maximum of 4 days for the visit.

Ask to accompany me the following: Robert Alexander, author of "Communism in Latin America" and professor at Rutgers University; Martin Agronsky, NBC commentator; John O'Rourke, editor of the Washington Daily News and former president of the Inter-American Press Association; and Ulises Carbo, subeditor of *Prensa Libre*, Havana, Cuba; Fabricio Ojeda, Caracas, Venezuela; and perhaps others.

The trip would be publicized in and out of Nicaragua. Informed persons would be encouraged to write to me. We could stop briefly in both Costa Rica and Honduras to talk with exiles before going to Nicaragua. The entire group would of course be extensively briefed before leaving the United States.

In Nicaragua we would stay at a hotel and would not be entertained by the Somozas or the Government or by any other political faction. We would split up into groups of two or three to cover the prisons, the schools, the press, radio, the opposition, peasants, businessmen, and others, all more or less at random.

I told both Ambassador Whelan and Ambassador Sevilla-Sacasa that it is possible our report would be inconclusive because of the short time available. My own opinion, at present, is based on many talks with Latin Americans, including Nicaraguan exiles, and with U.S. experts, including several in your Department. I believe President Somoza achieved his office by force and fraud and maintains himself by the same means. I believe any liberalization of policy, such as allowing a free press and radio (which I understand do exist) and proclaiming amnesties (which I understand are more proclamation than fact), arise from his fear of revolution and the Somozas' wish to remain alive and continue to be enriched by the extensive wealth in Nicaragua which somehow has accumulated to their family.

My opinion is that any freedoms we might observe could be and would be set aside by



the Somozas the minute they felt their dignity or wealth to be endangered.

These opinions of mine, widely held in Latin America, are not news to Ambassador Whelan or the Somozas. They apparently believe that I would alter them if I consented to visit Nicaragua.

If in fact, the Government of Nicaragua is firmly committed to democratic institutions, and if I could so decide from such a visit, then I'd like to say so publicly and rejoice accordingly. Of course, from here at this time, it would seem that one of the best proofs of good faith would be to arrange for free elections immediately.

Apart from the question whether I could do any good is the question whether the trip would do harm to surging democratic forces in Latin America. One Latin American friend of mine, a leading democrat, says Somozas wants to "use" me and that my visit would create confusion among the democratic forces of Latin America and disappointment to the Nicaraguan youth.

It is not clear to me why these results would have to occur. With this in mind I am releasing this correspondence to the press in the hope that others will express their opinions of the advisability of this trip and the best ways to make it worthwhile if I do decide to accept the invitation.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER,  
Member of Congress.

## Communism and Immigration Policy

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much disturbed about the changed policy of this Government that has resulted in deportation proceedings against some Polish refugees.

The apparent basis assigned by the Government for this change of policy is that political changes have occurred in Poland that now renders it possible for refugees to be returned to Poland from this country without danger of political persecution, retaliation, or oppression.

While some temporary gestures of conciliation and softening of policy occurred under the so-called Gomulka government, they were shortlived indeed. In the American press, in our diplomatic reports, in all the evidence that is available, it is clear that the leopard has not changed his spots and that the Polish Government is still a Communist puppet and can be no more depended upon to administer impartial justice or refrain from ruthless actions than any other Communist government whether it be Hungary or Red China.

All the responsible evidence that we have available indicates that in fields that by any stretch of the imagination constitute a real test of fair-minded, impartial, humane treatment of human beings, that the Polish Communist Government fails to measure up to standards that free-minded peoples would expect and that the United States above all should insist upon in its relations with other nations.

It is clear from available evidence that the concessions made by the Polish Government following the events of October 1956 are being systematically withdrawn and that no reasonable expectation exists that democratic freedoms and human rights are being or would be consistently observed or recognized by the present Polish Communist government.

What reasonable man could doubt on the current evidence that the Polish Communist Government is a government by edict, dominated by force and committed to ruthless regimentation of the Nation's political and economic systems and of the people.

The following facts cannot be denied—

First. Workers in Poland have been placed under strict party rule and discipline contrary to their will.

Second. Censorship in Poland has become more rigorous than ever.

Third. Free speech, free expression, free inquiry, free publication in Poland are ruthlessly suppressed.

Fourth. Rigid control of religious practices and worship and bans on religious education are in existence in Poland and constitute another shocking repression of individual rights.

Fifth. Religious symbols like crucifixes and other articles of great sacredness to sincere religious worshipers have been banned in Poland by the mailed fist of violence and heavy penalties on so-called offenders.

Sixth. Religious charitable activities have been repressed and religious relief services profaned in Poland so that the National Catholic Welfare Council has suspended all large shipments of relief goods to Poland.

Seventh. Malignant attacks against the religious hierarch have occurred and fake, trumped-up charges of crime brought against religious leaders in Poland characterized by particularly false, fraudulent, and unfounded claims of militarism, fanaticism and intolerance made against religious believers.

Eighth. Despicable unfounded charges were leveled against the Cardinal Primate of Poland and an unwarranted invasion of that Primate's institution at Jasna Gora Monastery was conducted by the government, its offices raided, its books, pamphlets and other documents of historic worth and deep religious significance were confiscated.

Ninth. The offices of Bishop Boleslaw Kominek were raided and searched by minions of the police state.

Tenth. The institution of higher religious education at Wroclaw was seized by the government and all its activities stopped.

Eleventh. Other leading clerics whose only offense was their devotion to God were arrested and jailed on trumped-up charges of violating governmental restrictions on the use of newsprint.

Twelfth. Ministers of the Gospel were imprisoned for their religious sermons to their flocks.

Thirteenth. The religious educational activities in the schools, programs of scientific research and studies were interfered with and the schools required to take active part in the building of communism in People's Poland.

Fourteenth. The autonomy of the legal profession was limited, thus making lawyers mere puppets and instruments of the state and depriving individuals of proper legal representation.

Fifteenth. Threats of violence and imprisonment were made against youth leaders in religion and democracy.

The very substantial flight of Poles from their country to escape these policies and acts of oppression continues and many Poles deeply attached to their native soil and nation are leaving it, driven to despair and fear to flee from oppression and persecution.

During the past 2 years the number of Poles asking for asylum in Western Europe has shown a steady increase. These facts and statistics are well known to American officials. They are also not only well known, but have been confirmed, by the Voice of the Council of Europe as attested in the statement of October 17, 1958, of Mr. Frans Goedhart, delegate from the Netherlands who declared:

In Poland, we have seen possibly a more dramatic swing back toward the old days than in any of the other countries. Nearly all the gains by the Polish people in 1956 appear now to be lost. The freedom of the press has virtually disappeared. Travel abroad has now been curtailed, not by any regulations, but by the simple process of raising the cost of passports by no less than six times within the last year.

The British delegate, Mr. Mulley said:

I believe that it is absurd to try to understand the situation in Poland, unless we take cognizance of the fact that there are 22 Soviet divisions in Eastern Germany.

The Denver Conference on Immigration held December 6, 1958 among other recommendations for reform of our immigration laws, recommended that our laws and the administration thereof should, to a great extent, practice the time-honored American tradition of granting asylum to victims of racial, religious and political persecution.

How can any reasonable person believe that there is anything in the history of the relations between the Soviet and enslaved countries to justify the belief that an individual's stand criticizing or opposing existing Communist governments would not be followed by forceful, repressive action and persecution of the individual and possibly his family and friends.

The facts clearly show that uprisings in Poland, Hungary and East Germany have been cruelly repressed by Soviet military force. Dissenters against Communist oppression have been murdered in cold blood. It is clear, or it should be clear, to any fairminded, thinking person that it is the fixed policy of Communist governments to persecute those who refuse to submit themselves to Communist ideology, Communist irreligion and Communist hatred of democratic convictions.

In the light of all this evidence which, I repeat, is available to our Government from its own agents, as well as from authenticated reports from other governments, and other authoritative observers and commentators on conditions inside Poland, it is impossible for me to understand how this Government

could even think of changing its policy granting asylum and protection to those seeking a haven in this freedom-loving Nation, who, if they were to be returned to Poland, by every test of logic and experience, might well be exposed to ruthless treatment and possible liquidation.

This Government is becoming naive indeed, if it believes that there has been any basic change in the attitude of Communist governments toward freedom-loving, God-fearing individuals, or any assurances that these governments will not continue as in the past to punish believers in a Divine Being and in democratic principles, by ruthless persecution, imprisonment and death.

I hope that our great President, who is always so deeply concerned in a humane way with the plight of the oppressed and persecuted throughout the world, will take appropriate action to redefine and clarify the position of our Government so that the time-honored, historic principle of asylum for oppressed and persecuted peoples may not only be continued but safeguarded, and every effort made to depart from this principle shall be speedily eliminated from the American political scene.

It is not only millions of Americans of Polish blood and their friends who are interested in this problem, but all true lovers of freedom in the American Nation are interested and vitally concerned that our Government adhere to its noble traditions of protecting the weak and helpless and giving shelter to the oppressed and persecuted.

It would be a most unconscionable policy indeed for this Government to direct the deportation of any Poles or persons of any other nationality to a Communist-controlled state where such a strong likelihood exists that they would be subject to persecution, oppression, and possible liquidation.

With all my heart, I urge our great President and the administration to abandon its present course regarding the principle of asylum and make it clear that in America, the land of the free and the home of the brave, we intend to the best of our ability to protect human beings against the dread persecution of communism and that under no circumstances will we return law-abiding persons resident in this country to the control of ruthless Communist governments.

I recently appealed to the distinguished Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, Gen. J. M. Swing, and his reply is pleasing and reassuring. It is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION  
SERVICE,

Washington, D.C.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: This will reply to your letter regarding the deportation cases of Polish refugees.

Approximately 75 cases of Polish nationals whose claims of physical persecution have previously been approved are now being reviewed. You are assured that no single one of these cases will result in an order to deport until I personally have reviewed the file.

The matter of physical persecution claims of Polish nationals, as well as nationals of

other countries which are concededly Communist dominated or controlled, is the subject of continuing discussions between the Service and the immigration committees of the Congress.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING,  
Commissioner.

In view of this letter, I am very hopeful that the very serious problem presented by the Polish refugee deportation cases is well on its way to satisfactory and humane solution, and I earnestly hope that this will be the case.

### A Bill To Correct an Inequitable Discrimination in Administration of an Excise Tax

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to correct a flagrant and equitable discrimination that has risen under the administration of a tax law.

For decades retailers have been competing with wholesalers and manufacturers in the premium, award and prize market. This involves sales made to business and other organizations for such purposes as sales premiums, incentive and merit awards to employees, for disposition as prizes, scholastic awards, and so forth. Basically these awards are given, as business incentives for scholastic or athletic accomplishment and cultural achievement in furtherance of our economic and social life. Several recent Federal court decisions ruled that sales of this nature are not retail sales as provided for in the Internal Revenue Code and therefore are not subject to the retail excise tax. These decisions, which in part lean on debates in Congress which have tended to define the term "retail," placed these products which are normally taxed at retail on an equal competitive basis in this business and organizational market with other products not normally taxed when sold at retail. In administering these decisions, a tax ruling was issued which restricted their application to sales made by firms "not engaged in retail business." The greatest impact of this interpretation is to deny tax-exempt sales to retailers as well as to restrict the application of the exemption to manufacturers and wholesalers not selling at retail. Strenuous efforts by retailers and others to obtain corrective rulings have been unsuccessful.

The net effect of this situation is to deprive the retailer as well as many wholesalers and manufacturers of any possibility of continuing to compete equitably in this premium, award, and prize market.

The inequity involved here is compounded by the character of the parties against whom it is inflicted. From an

economic point of view the retail industry is, generally speaking, the weakest element in our business structure. By far, the greatest number of retailers are "small business" in every sense of the word. And yet here, through an unfortunate distinction between them and some of their suppliers they are stripped from opportunity to equitably compete in a market that they heretofore have enjoyed.

This bill will clearly establish equitable status for all sales of these incentive awards whose value is well founded by their historical use by business and industry. In this regard this amendment clarifies but does not change existing law. Last year Congress, in the Excise Technical Changes Act, in effect, recognized the value of achievement awards by exempting from Federal retail excise taxes purchases of these products by nonprofit educational organizations. The court decisions referred to previously recognize that other organizations have the same privilege in recognizing scholastic, athletic, economic or cultural achievement without tax.

This amendment will restore retailers to a competitive equality insofar as this premium, award, and prize market is concerned with other levels of industry and thus correct the discrimination that has arisen under the administration of our tax law. It is compatible with previous Congressional decisions that clarify the term "retail" as used in other laws and Government regulations.

It is my earnest desire that the Congress take prompt and favorable action on this bill.

### Heartful Aspects of the Mutual Security Program

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, so much attention is given the military aspects of mutual security that we may tend to overlook the more heartful work carried on under the program. While the total amount of funds allocated to these activities is comparatively small, the dividends realized in terms of friendship and goodwill are enormous. Through these programs Americans are enabled to express their concern for the less fortunate peoples of the world, a concern which is inherent in the conscience of America.

Certain of these activities were described to the Foreign Affairs Committee on April 17 by the following witnesses: Mr. William H. McCahon, Chief, Voluntary Foreign Aid Staff, ICA; Mr. Richard B. Farnsworth, Deputy Chief, Education Division, ICA; Dr. Eugene P. Campbell, Chief, Public Health Division, ICA; Dr. Paul F. Russell, Rockefeller Foundation; and Dr. John D. Porterfield, Deputy Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Department of



Health, Education, and Welfare. As their presentation covered four programs which are of very real interest and importance, I shall summarize their testimony under the respective program heading.

#### OCEAN TRANSPORTATION COSTS

This program, for which \$2.3 million is requested, is designed to defray ocean transportation costs of U.S. voluntary agency gift shipments to needy persons abroad. These gifts which are distributed in the name of the American people, include food, clothing, medicines, hospital supplies, school supplies, hand tools, and other self-help items. The salient points, observations, and facts bearing upon this program are as follows:

First. All supplies involved come from private U.S. sources as voluntary donations either in cash or in kind.

Second. All costs including procurement, processing, packaging for export, and delivery of supplies to U.S. port are borne by the voluntary agencies.

Third. For every appropriated dollar spent on ocean freight, roughly \$15 worth of these privately donated supplies are delivered to needy persons overseas.

Fourth. During the past 3 years, the value of these supplies has averaged \$27 million annually.

Fifth. Thirty-two U.S. voluntary non-profit agencies are participating in this program, including the relief arms of the three major faiths, CARE, and the American Red Cross.

Sixth. Eligible agencies are those registered with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. This Committee was created in May 1946. It has 10 members at present, all serving without compensation, and is chaired by Mr. Charles P. Taft.

Seventh. As a condition of such registration, the voluntary agencies keep the Committee fully informed of their activities. An annual public audit is filed by each registrant. These are available for public inspection.

Eighth. The U.S. origin of the goods is made known to the recipients through labeling, special posters and literature, as well as by personal contacts of the American citizen field representatives maintained by the voluntary agencies.

Ninth. The authorities of the recipient countries exempt the supplies from all duties, tolls and taxes. Inland transportation and related costs from port of entry abroad to ultimate distribution center is paid by the recipient countries or from other non-U.S. Government sources.

Tenth. Forty countries and areas are now included in this program, 16 having been added in December 1958. The additional \$200,000 requested is needed to take care of this and other possible expansion in the number of countries to be served. It is believed that with this modest increase the amount requested will be adequate to finance all estimated shipments in the coming year.

In addition to their material aid shipments, these voluntary agencies are carrying out many other useful services in the fields of refugee care and resettlement, technical assistance and self-help.

These people-to-people activities serve as a useful and important supplement to the government-to-government assistance programs. They provide a good example of how Government and our private citizens can join hands to accomplish mutually desired ends.

#### AMERICAN-SPONSORED SCHOOLS ABROAD

Funds made available under section 400(c) of the Mutual Security Act are designed to further mutual security objectives by increasing the number and quality of human resources available to participate in economic development. Section 400(c), title 5, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, provides that "the President is authorized to use not to exceed \$10 million of funds appropriated" to assist "schools and libraries abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States and serving as study and demonstration centers for ideas and programs of the United States, notwithstanding any other act authorizing assistance of this kind." The amounts available for this program in subsequent years have varied according to demands upon appropriated funds, with \$5 million proposed for the coming year.

The primary objective of this program is to enable American-sponsored schools abroad to contribute more significantly to the development of the human resources so desperately needed by the developing countries. An American-sponsored school is defined as one that provides educational facilities of two nations—namely, those characteristic of the United States on the one hand, and on the other hand, those of the host country. The student bodies include nationals of the country, third country nationals, and may include U.S. citizens. American-sponsored schools abroad are cooperative enterprises supported by U.S. citizens and local citizens. Particular emphasis is placed upon technical education at the college and university level by virtue of the mutual security program objectives.

Graduates of these schools will be among the scientific, political, and economic leaders in their countries. One of the American University of Beirut's most famous alumni is Charles Malik, President of the United Nations General Assembly. Robert College in Turkey, by virtue of its long establishment there, enjoys a wide range of contacts. At the present time it numbers among its graduates three Turkish Ambassadors, the head of one of the major political parties, senior officials of the Industrial Development Bank and a host of industrialists and technicians in private industry. Most of the American-sponsored schools in Latin America, Africa, and the Far East are elementary and secondary schools, nevertheless they also can claim economic, political, and social leaders as their alumni.

In addition to their function of actually training productive citizens and other important elements, is the fact that the American-sponsored schools abroad serve as models and demonstration centers which influence the educational systems of the host countries and thereby improve the type of education offered all

the students in the country. They serve as a local demonstration of improved educational methods, materials, and teaching procedures.

In a broader sense the schools aided provide one means of contributing toward the sound objectives of developing better understanding between the people of the United States and the peoples of the countries in which the schools are established. The students of the host country who attend such schools tend to learn U.S. methods and standards without affecting their basic sense of values toward their own countries. In addition, with an American educational background, these students are ideally qualified for local employment with U.S. firms. They are also better prepared to enter American colleges and universities for advanced training.

In summary, by assisting American-sponsored schools abroad we are supporting American private initiative, we are capitalizing on existing investments, and are utilizing the skills and knowledge of Americans already working in the educational field abroad. The enormity of the developing countries' needs for trained manpower requires that we make maximum use of all our available resources.

#### MALARIA ERADICATION

The administration has requested that \$35 million of special assistance funds be made available to continue worldwide efforts to eradicate malaria. The avowed goal of this program is the elimination of malaria from nations of the world in which reside more than 1 billion persons who are or have recently been exposed to malaria infection. Since the first appropriation for this purpose was received in fiscal year 1958, major progress has been made in 26 nations which have signed bilateral malaria eradication agreements with ICA and in some 50 additional nations receiving indirect U.S. assistance through the special malaria accounts of the World Health Organization and the Pan American Health Organization.

The role that the United States plays in the malaria eradication program is crucial to the success of the worldwide effort. Our leadership in this field was well established some years ago when we initiated a program for the eradication of malaria in the United States and followed it through to a successful conclusion. As early as 1942, we began to share with neighboring countries our knowledge of how to combat this disease.

Today, most of the underdeveloped countries where malaria is still a serious problem have manpower and can finance local costs, but do not have the equipment and materials needed nor the foreign exchange with which to purchase them. These items which we furnish can be provided only from the United States in the quantity and quality necessary for a program of this magnitude. In addition to commodities, we are also providing the top-level leadership and technical assistance where this is required.

Under the present program U.S. assistance is being extended to 26 of the

76 countries now concerned with malaria eradication. Certain of the remainder require no assistance and others are being aided by the World Health Organization, the Pan American Health Organization, or the United Nations Children's Fund. Once malaria has been eradicated by a country, it is neither difficult nor expensive to maintain that condition.

Our Government plans to continue support to many nations of the world through contributions to the special malaria accounts of the World Health Organization in the amount of \$3 million and of the Pan American Health Organization in the amount of \$2 million. The World Health Organization and its Regional Office for the Americas, the Pan American Health Organization play a key role in coordinating the efforts of all nations in the worldwide malaria eradication program and provide technical support for individual country programs through provision of consultation, training fellowships, training facilities, and conferences. These organizations are uniquely capable of carrying out these functions through their official channels with the nations of the world and by their ability to employ scarce experienced malaria experts without regard to nationality. Most important of all, these organizations operate in many countries and territories in which there are no ICA health programs. This is particularly significant since the mosquito is no respecter of political boundaries. The WHO and PAHO also are participating directly in and coordinating field investigations of special problems such as mosquito resistance to insecticides, and the role of drugs in eradication of malaria from tropical Africa.

It is expected that U.S. participation in the malaria eradication program will require about 5 years. Where eradication problems are particularly difficult for technical or other reasons, assistance may be required beyond fiscal year 1962. The program is expected to reach its peak during the coming year.

Described as the greatest nonmilitary international cooperative effort in history, the malaria eradication program has already made substantial progress. Malaria has already been eliminated from large areas and experience to date indicates that the objectives of worldwide eradication are technically possible and within reach. U.S. leadership and participation in this program not only results in improved conditions of health throughout a large part of the world, but also represents a truly international cooperative effort in human welfare.

#### COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY PROGRAM

The sum of \$5 million in special assistance funds is proposed to be used for improving community water supply facilities. Lack of safe water supplies for drinking and personal cleanliness is a keenly felt need by people almost everywhere in the newly developing countries. This situation is most critical in the smaller and moderate-size communities. Major efforts and resources have been dedicated to providing piped water for the very largest cities, but even so the urbanization growth has been so rapid

as to outstrip existing capacities, often inadequately planned when installed. It is not unusual to find capital cities with one-fourth to one-half of the urban populace unserved by the public water supply. The industrial and economic development of the smaller cities and towns, so necessary to stabilize shifting population, almost without exception is contingent upon the availability of water. If it is not provided, industry will rarely come into an area.

This program is designed to spearhead greatly increased efforts attacking the gastrointestinal diseases through the stimulation of national programs to provide safe water supplies for human needs. Technical support on a broad front is needed to encourage and aid the organization and adoption of practical programs to serve the water supply needs for better health, increased productivity, industrial expansion, and improved standards of living. This attack will be carried out in collaboration with other nations, with WHO and the Pan American Health Organization.

This proposal has evolved from recent actions on many fronts to focus attention on this primary cause of much sickness and death in major world areas—the diarrheal diseases. The World Health Organization, Pan American Health Organization, the U.S. Public Health Service, and on more than one occasion President Eisenhower, have all called for combined efforts to help do away with this obstacle to economic advancement in many less developed countries.

The Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives in 1957 endorsed a public water-supply program for the Western Hemisphere. The worldwide needs were considered of high priority by the International Development Advisory Board. In March 1958, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service recommended such a program, along with others, to ICA as appropriate for early implementation. The 88 member nations represented at the World Health Organization—WHO—General Assembly at Minneapolis in May 1958 resolved in favor of increased emphasis on worldwide community water-supply efforts. President Eisenhower in his August 1958 address before the U.N. General Assembly indicated water shortage and disease as two major challenges to Near East development. A resolution adopted by the Pan American Sanitary Conference, October 1958, called attention to the importance of water supply and urged further consideration in program planning. Supporting these affirmations of needs and feasibility is the 16 years' experience in such activities by ICA and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, which have demonstrated the technical, administrative, and economic soundness of water-supply development programs.

Each year an estimated 500 million persons have one or more of the gastrointestinal diseases, which are preventable with clean water. Approximately 5 million infants die each year from these diseases, which include cholera, typhoid, and paratyphoid fever. In ad-

dition to the human suffering and death these diseases cause, they represent a tremendous economic loss to the development of growing nations.

The funding of this program is expected to highlight U.S. interest and support of a critically needed public health measure. Soundly conceived, the community water supply program should prove highly popular with the underdeveloped nations and make an effective contribution to improved health and economic development.

#### Address of U.S. Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma, at Paul M. Butler Testimonial Dinner in South Bend, Ind.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 1959, in South Bend, Ind., nearly 800 friends and neighbors from throughout the State gathered to pay tribute to one of Indiana's most distinguished citizens, the hard working, courageous and dedicated chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the Honorable Paul M. Butler.

The principal speaker at this great banquet in honor of Paul Butler was one of the finest Members of the U.S. Senate and another distinguished American, the junior Senator from the State of Oklahoma, the Honorable A. S. MIKE MONRONEY.

I am proud to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the splendid address delivered by Senator MONRONEY on this occasion:

I am a lucky Senator indeed to be invited here for this very happy occasion.

It's always a pleasure to come to Indiana to address the front-line fighting troops of the Democratic Party. It's much different here than in my State of Oklahoma. Here, in this area, it's hard to be a Democrat. Old, bad habits are hard to break, and so you face an uphill fight in every election.

In Oklahoma and other parts of the great Southwest it's hard not to be a Democrat. And so I am always glad to salute the people who turned the tide to win outstanding victories for our party in Indiana.

But to be here on this occasion—when a dear friend of yours and mine is honored by his fellow townsmen and others of Indiana—gives me particular pleasure. This warm and enthusiastic testimonial dinner is a well deserved tribute to a great Democratic leader—Paul Butler.

When the invitation was extended to me I wondered why, out of all 64 Democratic Senators, I was lucky enough to be chosen to speak on this occasion.

Reflecting that South Bend's most famous product is the great Notre Dame football team, and knowing that Paul Butler is Notre Dame's No. 1 fan, I finally figured out why this honor came to me.

I asked myself what State had done the most in recent years for Notre Dame and I came to the very definite conclusion that undoubtedly it was Oklahoma. On the 50th anniversary of our statehood, November 7, 1957, Oklahoma was kind enough to Notre



Dame to terminate our record-breaking chain of victories and to establish Notre Dame as the outstanding team in the Nation for that year.

It was a footnote for football history that the team we beat in starting this chain—Notre Dame—turned out to be the one that broke our long winning streak in the end. And so I was happy to accept this invitation as partial payment on South Bend's debt to Oklahoma.

I hope that before we turn to the urgent business of discussing the Republican Party and its current Washington product, you will permit some brief observations on the Democratic Party and its present chairman.

Many Democrats in the past have written distinguished records in the position that Paul Butler fills today, but few, if any, have matched his achievement in rebuilding the party from the ashes of an overwhelming defeat in 1952 to the healthy, robust, aggressive force that it is today. With the party treasury deeply in debt, with even the bastions of the South in political ruins, Paul Butler began the long, hard task of creating an alert, alive, and effective Democratic Party.

He didn't do this on a one-State or a one-section basis, but sought to place the Democratic Party again in the forefront as the truly great national party.

Lets' face it—perhaps Paul stepped on a few toes, hurt the feelings of a few leaders in various sections—but his concern was for the health of the entire Democratic Party, and his courage and drive rebuilt this party to its effective position today.

It was inevitable that in this process, there should be sectional criticism. For Paul Butler has faced no less a task than to articulate for the Nation the broadest aspirations of a national party during a period when that party lacked the natural public platform which the Presidency provides.

Certainly we in Congress can take considerable pride in the fact that the record of the Democratic Party in both Houses contributed substantially to winning the sweeping public endorsement in last fall's elections. But we all are practical enough politicians to realize that elections are not won alone in the halls of Congress, but in the tens of thousands of precincts throughout the Nation. It was in rebuilding this party machinery for the Nation—to the State, to the county, to the township levels, that Paul Butler committed his attention and his leadership so effectively.

No one today who has seen the shambles of the Republican national organization—confused and befuddled, even though they still control the vast powers of the executive department of this Government—can help but realize the superb achievement that Paul Butler has wrought for his party. There has been no patronage; there have been no fancy appointments to ambassadorships; there have been no Cabinet posts—in fact, no executive power to serve as convenient leverage for Paul's rebuilding job. It all had to be done with bare hands and a determination that the Democratic Party would again be resurgent.

The record of the last congressional elections indicates the degree of this resurgence—when Maine joined our ranks with the election of Governor MUSKIE to the Senate, and Vermont sent to the Congress its first Democrat in more than a century.

The extent of this devastating defeat administered to the Republicans portends great days ahead in 1960.

This was done by Paul Butler—not by sitting in a Washington office and issuing pious declarations—but by traveling the long, tedious paths to the 48 States and in these States to the county seats, to insure that every party worker was trained and encouraged in performing the duties required in his particular area of responsibility.

This program has virtually transformed the great western reaches of our country from a happy hunting ground for musclebound Republicans to what approaches a monopoly of Democratic representation in the Congress and in the Governors' chairs.

I predicted in my closing campaign speech at Evansville that after November 4, 1958, the GOP would not be able to run the Republican elephant any more—they would just have to stuff him. And sure enough, not long ago they stuffed the world's largest elephant and placed it in the Smithsonian museum for all to see.

I am proud of the part that Paul Butler has played in stimulating young men of character and ability to enter the political field and to give us the greatest asset a party can have—young, enthusiastic and energetic candidates for positions of responsibility in State and National Governments.

The best illustration I know is here in South Bend, because the consensus among the press and others who watch young Congressmen come and go is that one of the brightest young stars of this victory is your own JOHN BRADEMAs.

Few men have come to the Congress or to the Senate, during my 20 years here, so well equipped as JOHN BRADEMAs. His educational background, his experience in the teaching field, and his practical experience in government make him one of the most brilliant young leaders in the new Congress. Of course, this was perhaps apparent to me somewhat earlier than to others, because of the insight he showed in selecting his administrative assistant.

But my opinion, which might be somewhat open to question, is shared by Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, and the Democratic whip, CARL ALBERT. The fact that in his first term he won an assignment to the committee that handles two of the most important fields of government—namely, labor and education—proves the regard that the House leadership has for him.

I have the great pleasure also of serving with your new Democratic Senator, VANCE HARTKE, who has been my long-time friend. I met VANCE when he was promoting the first Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Evansville many years ago, when I was fortunate enough to be invited as speaker. I recognized his leadership then. I have admired and respected his progress upward in the political field, and I rejoiced, as you did, in his overwhelming victory in the election last November.

He has already won his spurs in the Senate. His ability has been recognized by the choice committees to which he has been assigned. I have the honor of sitting with him on the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, where he has already proven his competence in the wide field in which this committee must legislate.

Winning a position on the tremendously important Finance Committee is unheard of for anyone who has not had at least 6 to 12 years of experience in the Senate—yet he was given this assignment by LYNDON JOHNSON and the Senate leadership.

Because of his grasp of municipal affairs he also is making a mark for himself as a member of the District of Columbia Committee. This is indeed a record of achievement and one that marks him as a man to watch.

Other examples of Indiana's great Democratic resurgence reversed the ratio in the House of Representatives. Where once RAY MADDEN and WINFIELD DENTON held out against nine Republicans, the Democrats now have eight seats and the Republicans only three. Every crap-shooter knows that "eight" is a much better point than "two." But better still, let's concentrate on capturing those three to roll an "eleven" in 1960.

It is now my sad duty to turn to a less pleasant subject—namely "the team"—which is what the Republicans call the Eisenhower

administration—to the chagrin of all good football fans. You know, even the worst football teams usually excel in some department. They've got a guy who can pass—or maybe a place kicker—or maybe a good center. If they haven't got any of those—then they at least have a good cheer leader, or pep club, or drum majorette, or band. But not this team. All it's got is a publicity agent.

But you just can't sell a bad performance no matter what kind of press agency you use. The fans are lots smarter than the Republicans realize. Even the kids are too smart for the Madison Avenue selling job.

Lets' look at the record. The farm front has folded up under Benson's hammer blows. While living costs are hitting new highs each month, farm prices are scraping bottom with new lows. This is the Benson policy of killing two birds with one stone—the consumer with high prices and the farmer with low prices.

The Benson policy was to reduce the farm surpluses by reducing the acreage and the price support levels and thus reduce production and the cost of the farm program. Shades of Wrong Way Corrigan—our surpluses are higher, our support prices much lower, our production greater. And the cost of the program to put the farmer in the fix he is in is six times greater than it was under the Truman administration—\$6 billion today against \$1.05 billion under the Democratic program of farm prosperity.

Instead of liquidating the surplus, Secretary Benson has liquidated the farmers. A total of 4,231,000 of our farm population has left the farms since 1950. What Secretary Benson referred to as the swollen bureaucracy of the Department of Agriculture in 1953 has gained in population under Benson by nearly 7,000 since that date.

But perhaps we can excuse the team on the farm front. After all, they only pass by the farms on the way to the golf courses. But with so many men from big business brought into this administration you would expect some degree of expertness in fiscal affairs.

Instead of the sound fiscal policy that was promised throughout 1952 and 1956—we have had a record number of fiscal fumbles to mar the game. Management of the budget has led to a continuing series of red figures and heavy deficits. This year the budget deficit will range upward to \$12 billions in the red. The cost of paying the interest on the public debt in 1952 was \$5.9 billion. This year the budget asks for over \$8 billion to meet the new Republican interest cost for the largest debt in the Nation's history. An increase of over \$2 billion because Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, the Republican fiscal giant, planned it that way.

This interest cost—I might remind you—is second only to the cost of national defense in the budget. This \$3 billion added cost buys nothing—it is a deadweight upon the taxpayers as this administration raised its own rent on the borrowed money.

The new fairytale budget—which the President and all of his Cabinet are urging us not to unbalance—never was balanced. The reliable Joint Committee on Revenue and Taxation has declared that the budget overestimates expected income in the amount of \$1.6 billion. And even before that, the fairytale balance had been achieved by listing revenue from increased postage rates and gasoline taxes not enacted nor likely to be enacted by Congress.

Meanwhile, as a consequence of its tight money policy as an alleged weapon against inflation, the cost of interest rates to little business, farmers, cities and towns has climbed to the stratosphere to the tune of some \$20 billions. These higher interest rates have had a direct impact upon the ever increasing cost of living for everyone.

During the campaign last November, the resistance to the Republican policy of tight

money and higher interest rates voiced in Congress and by the Democratic National Committee played a definite part in the Democratic sweep.

People found out the hard way that the old definition of what the two parties stand for still holds true: The Republican Party believes in high wages for money—and the Democratic Party believes in high wages for people.

The sad fact is that the Republican piety over a balanced budget is a complete fraud—because it applies only to the budget for fiscal year 1960, the last complete budget year before the next election. It is to be achieved by cramming everything possible into the budgets for 1959 or 1961.

The budget for 1959 is already unbalanced and the Republicans couldn't care less whether it's unbalanced by \$12 billion or \$15 billion, as long as the 1960 budget is lily white. Likewise they aren't interested in 1961, since that is too late to have any immediate political benefit.

This administration is avoiding deficits—it's just shuffling them from 1 fiscal year to the other—in the hope that the political hand will be quicker than the voter's eye. The real tragedy is that the pea in this political shell game is our Nation's safety.

Remember the promises of 1952 and 1956 for a strong national defense? While our commitments abroad have multiplied like Texas jackrabbits, the administration's economy ax has cut deeper and deeper into the numbers and equipment of our military forces.

Year after year the manpower of our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force has been cut. New weapons, ballistic missiles, and aircraft have been squeezed to the minimum.

It has been the leaders of the Democratic Party that have sounded the warning and led Congress to vote more instead of less to strengthen our defense against the threat of expanding Communist military strength.

Our lagging missile program was drastically stepped up. Cuts in manpower proposed by the Eisenhower administration were resisted in Congress, and money was voted to build up—rather than tear down—our ground and sea forces. Most of the additional funds voted by the Congress were frozen by the administration—as was our fighting strength.

Even funds for our National Guard and our Reserve forces—made even more necessary by the reductions in the Regular Army—were cut by the administration, and restored by Congress.

But it has been in the field of foreign policy that our greatest shortages in ideas and ideals have occurred. We have slipped, and slipped badly, in furnishing leadership in this most vital field where the peace of the world hangs in tenuous balance.

The democratic leadership of the Congress has time after time rescued the President on the vital issues of foreign aid and foreign trade to overcome heavy Republican opposition. Congress cannot make foreign policy, but wisely and patriotically the democratic policy has been to keep it out of partisan politics.

Democrats in Congress have repeatedly offered new ideas and new ideals in the struggle to win the hearts and minds of the world's people. One billion people—almost one-third of the world's population—swing in the balance between communism and freedom. These are the populations of the new nations which have only recently won independence from colonial rule. They are looking for a new way of life. Our programs and our leadership can bring to their new freedom a new hope of an improved standard of living.

The shape of tomorrow's world will be decided by the way this billion uncommitted people choose. If they join the billion already under communism, then two-thirds of the world will be under a slave-state system—and the one-third of the world's people living under democratic governments will face gradual erosion of the areas committed to freedom.

The Democrats have shown great understanding of the need for a long-range modernized approach to meeting this Communist challenge in the cold war of economics. In the Senate in the last session of Congress we moved to change our outdated foreign-aid program from one of grants or accommodation-lending by Uncle Sam alone. We urged the administration to get the free world to join in an international banking system for a long-range program to supply financing for economic development by sound banking methods. To achieve this end, a substantial use could be made of the local currencies of these nations which we receive from the sales of our agricultural surpluses abroad.

The Democrats have supported also the vast expansion of peaceful uses of atomic energy. We have a deep feeling that instead of emphasizing the capacity of our bombs for catastrophic destruction, we would impress these billion uncommitted people more by showing how the horror of the atomic bomb could be beaten into a plowshare—to become mankind's greatest servant.

Instead of telling the world how many millions we can cremate with one big blast of a hydrogen bomb, we could far better tell them how we have developed means for making it work for man's survival.

Already we have crossed the threshold to find some 100 uses for atomic isotopes in the diagnosis and treatment of diseases. Soon, with enough research, we may find in atomic medicine the cure for cancer or other dread

diseases that have beset mankind throughout history.

In agriculture, atomic wastes and byproducts can be useful in producing better strains of fruits and vegetables. New livestock breeds of greater size can be created through other byproducts of atomic energy.

In engineering, underground blasts have indicated great new uses for atomic energy in mining and petroleum recoveries. Perhaps some day underground blasts may develop new harbors along our coasts or along the coast of South America from one single explosion.

In large areas of the world where deserts meet the sea, poverty and starvation occur because of the lack of water for irrigation and human consumption. We are nearing a solution to the problem of transforming sea water to fresh water by desalting processes. Surely atomic reactors can hasten the time when we can make many areas, now worthless deserts, bloom like the Garden of Eden.

Many of you have seen the great transformation of farm life when the REA lines reach the farm homes of America. Life comes from the darkness of the 19th century into the brilliantly lighted world of the 20th century by the magic of electricity.

In most of the areas where these one billion uncommitted people of the world live, electricity is nonexistent or so expensive that only the very few can use it. This is because oil or coal must be shipped halfway around the world to supply the energy required to generate electricity.

If we could mass produce atomic reactors at relatively low cost and sell them on long terms, it would bring the hope of the electrical age to thousands of towns and villages of the world now in darkness. Instead of fuel of great bulk shipped at great expense, atomic fuel could be sent in by airmail. A package no larger than a pack of cigarettes can furnish the energy to light and heat a village of 10,000 people for an entire year.

These are but a few of the things we can and should do if the face of Uncle Sam which the world sees is to be the kindly smiling face that we know it to be. But the rest of the world does not automatically know the great spiritual values we hold. Deeds, not words, are required.

I feel if we can spend some 44 billions on the science of death, for our weapons and defense—and I'm for that amount and more—that we should tithe, and spend one-tenth of that amount on science for life.

We have the duty to provide the continuing leadership required if the world of tomorrow is to see our hopes of today realized. Thus can our generation give thanks for the blessings of our science—by sharing with others the abundance it can produce.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 1, 1959

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

Our Father God, turning aside for the moment from the threatening violence and turbulence of human strife, we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish, for without Thy guidance our wisdom is but folly.

Teach us by the adventure of faith how to be victors over life, not victims of it.

Save us from being embittered by ingratitude and pettiness, and from turning coward in this day of battle.

In such a day, as stewards of the world's future, give us, O Lord, a dauntless trust, a firm hope, an understanding charity, and a will to labor valiantly for the things for which we pray.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CHURCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 30, 1959, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6769) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6769) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.