

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12839

tions), railroad junctions, tunnels, railroad and highway bridges;

(d) Of industrial establishments, scientific research institutions, design officers (konstruktorskikh byuro), laboratories, electric power stations, radio beacons, radio stations, telephone and telegraph stations;

(e) From airplanes on flight over territory of the U.S.S.R. and also surface panoramic photographs and sketches of industrial cities.

Judging from newspaper accounts, during the months of negotiations the Soviets have been anything but cooperative in providing answers to our questions concerning requests made by the United States in regard to the itinerary and plans of Vice President Nixon in Russia. Their stalling on this matter is not surprising.

As another example of the complete vacuum we seem to have to operate in, in dealing with the Soviets, a few days ago word came out of the U.S.S.R. that a large Soviet consumer exhibition would be opened in competition with the U.S. exhibition. That fair opened on July 22 as thousands of consumer goods went on sale and vast crowds were treated to plays, circuses, movies, and concerts. Another big Soviet fair, the Economic Achievements Exhibition, opened a month ago and will be open all summer.

The fact that there would be competing exhibitions was evidently not known to us, even to the U.S. officials in charge of the fair, as recently as April 29, 1959. The following is quoted from the U.S. Information Agency 1960 Appropriations hearings, on April 29, 1959:

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Are you aware, or have you any idea whether or not there will be some competing exhibition or show going on at the same time in Moscow that will be detrimental to our exhibition in Moscow?

Mr. McCLELLAN [general manager, Moscow Exhibition]. Our major problem in terms of attendance will be how to handle the crowd. That is the view of the Soviets and of our Ambassador and of the others there. There will not be another exhibition that we know of, certainly not in Sokolniki Park. There will be the annual fair of agriculture, industry, and economy which runs about 6 months every year. That will be in operation.

Concerning the competing fairs, an anonymous American official was quoted in the newspapers several days ago as saying:

We know there will be some serious distractions but we expect 4 million people at our exhibition.

Another anonymous U.S. official is quoted in today's newspaper accounts as saying, concerning the rival Soviet consumer fair:

It will keep our own visitors down to a manageable volume.

I wonder what that official really thought about this display of Soviet rudeness.

We know by experience how the Soviets actually do business, as opposed to what they say. Their methods have been well demonstrated. Let's deal with them in a realistic way.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I renew my request, stated at the outset, that our policies in this regard be reevaluated. Our dealing with the Soviets should be on a basis that will assure us equal treatment.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I know there are some Members of the House who have not heard yet that the committee in the other body, the Committee on Finance, will hold hearings on the so-called veterans' pension bill that passed the House a short time ago. I understand the hearings will be next Tuesday and Wednesday.

I hope that the objectionable features of the bill as it passed the House will be removed and that it will become a more equitable bill for the persons affected.

The wife's income should not be taken into consideration in evaluating the veteran's income. That is very unjust.

The bill was very unsatisfactory in many respects and there is the danger of social security taking over the Veterans' Administration activities. The veteran should be treated as a special class as he is. It is tragic to see benefits taken away from him.

The bill that passed the House had some good points, such as the parity for widows of veterans of different wars which is only a matter of justice, the increase in pensions for certain veterans, but a great injustice was done to veterans going on the rolls after 1960. The increase in income limitations was good but there are other provisions that would nullify the good effects of them.

GOVERNOR LONG OF LOUISIANA

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing reports of the dubious and unorthodox conduct of Governor Long of Louisiana. While I have no factual information on Governor Long's physical or mental condition, I feel that the press has neglected to emphasize what the Federal Government should be learning from this pathetic situation.

Although President Eisenhower himself took the lead a couple of years ago in urging legislation to clarify the law with respect to Presidential disability, Congress has continued to ignore the problem. From all I can determine, the issue is dormant. I think it should be revived and a solution hammered out.

Irrespective of Governor Long's competence or incompetence, his case dramatizes the utter confusion where there are no guide lines to determine whether a head of a government is physically capable of performing his duties. It is for this reason Congress should give the problem its early attention as the President has recommended.

A GREAT WHITE FLEET IN THE SERVICE OF PEACE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject I am about to discuss, the Great White Fleet.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, more than 50 years ago a bold and imaginative President named Theodore Roosevelt sent a great fleet around the world in the cause of peace.

The Great White Fleet of Teddy Roosevelt, headed by 16 powerful battleships and supported by auxiliary vessels, made its historic voyage in the face of much opposition and many obstacles.

In Washington, there were critics who opposed any movement of American naval forces from our east coast, because of fears in the Atlantic.

There were some who called a voyage into the Pacific dangerous saber rattling in view of already tense relations with Japan, which was feeling its Far Eastern muscle after an impressive naval victory over imperial Russia.

There was also budgetary opposition, and the strong opposition of some "naval experts" who said the United States Navy was not equipped or ready for a voyage around the world.

No battle fleet of any nation had ever done it before.

Theodore Roosevelt, who loved a challenge and believed in the Navy, sent the Great White Fleet to try.

They sailed from Hampton Roads, Va., on December 9, 1907, under the command of Rear Adm. Robley D. Evans.

The fleet was divided into four divisions, with the first division headed by Admiral Evans' flagship, the U.S.S. *Connecticut*. Rear Adm. William H. Emery, C. M. Thomas, and C. S. Sperry commanded the other divisions.

Not until the fleet was actually underway and President Roosevelt had returned from Hampton Roads to the White House was it announced that the great ships would not only cross the Pacific, but would return home by way of the Suez Canal.

Of course the fleet went south down the Atlantic coast of South America, through the dangerous Straits of Magellan, and up the Pacific coast of South America to Callao, Peru.

There was a training stop of 30 days at Magdalena Bay, on the coast of Mexico, and then the fleet continued to San Francisco, where Admiral Evans turned over the post of fleet commander to Admiral Sperry.

From the Golden Gate the course was westward, to Honolulu, to New Zealand and Australia, the Philippines, China, and Japan.

One of the greatest receptions given the fleet was at Yokohama, where three special piers, beautifully lighted and decorated, were built for the American fleet's boat landings.

Admiral Sperry reported to President Roosevelt that more than 1,000 English-speaking Japanese college students were on hand to act as voluntary guides for the Americans, and refreshment centers in Tokyo refused to accept payment from American sailors and officers.

The warm Japanese reception, which our diplomats had watched with apprehension, "even surpassed by expectations," President Roosevelt wrote in his autobiography.

From its successful stops in the Far East the fleet continued westward, reaching Suez on January 3, 1909.

MISSION OF MERCY

In the Mediterranean, the American fleet paused to perform one of history's most dramatic missions of mercy.

The terrible earthquakes of late 1908, at Messina and Reggio, had devastated Sicily and Southern Italy, leaving the almost incredible toll of 96,000 dead and more than 1 million homeless.

News of the disaster reached the fleet as it steamed through the Suez Canal, and the President ordered all possible assistance at once.

In immediate response to the emergency, Admiral Sperry's own flagship *Connecticut* led relief units of the White Fleet to Messina, supported by the tender *Yankton* and the supply ship *Culgoa*.

The fleet units met the Red Cross chartered vessel *Bayern* at Messina, where a burning and shattered city lay in helpless ruins, under martial law. To meet the emergency needs for food ashore, the U.S.S. *Celtic*, a supply ship, with 1,500,000 rations for the fleet, was also ordered to the disaster area by President Roosevelt, and unloaded its cargo at Messina.

The *Culgoa* continued to Reggio, unloading stores of food, clothing, oil stoves, tent canvas, and other emergency supplies, then continued to Catania to assist in relief measures for thousands of evacuees from the earthquake area.

The battleship *Illinois* later joined the units at the disaster area, providing supplies and more than 200 pairs of shoes to meet emergency needs ashore. Four hundred sailors from the *Illinois* participated in excavation work at Messina.

The work of the White Fleet and its men in the Messina and Reggio disasters was a demonstration of compassion and humanity on the part of America which won the admiration of the world, and our fleet sailed on to Gibraltar with the cheers of both Italians and Sicilians ringing in the air.

At Gibraltar, the fleet broke out "homeward bound" pennants and continued west.

On February 22, 1909, the anniversary of George Washington's birth, the great fleet steamed into Hampton Roads once again, to be personally reviewed by the President—the first battle fleet in history to circumnavigate the globe.

In his address at the review, President Roosevelt saluted the men and officers of the fleet as "the best of all possible ambassadors and heralds of peace."

Wherever you have landed you have borne yourselves so as to make us at home proud of being your countrymen—

The President said:

You have shown that the best type of fighting man of the sea knows how to appear to the utmost possible advantage when his business is to behave himself on shore, and to make a good impression in a foreign land. We are proud of all the ships and all the men in the whole fleet, and we welcome you home to the country whose good repute among nations has been raised by what you have done.

There was no doubt in Roosevelt's mind as to the solid achievements of the world voyage.

Not only had the American people and the people of the world been solidly impressed by the capabilities of the fleet, but "nobody after this will forget that the American coast is on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic."

In addition to these results, however, were the larger effects upon the world community.

Speaking later of the broader significance of the voyage, Roosevelt said:

In my own judgment the most important service that I rendered to peace was the voyage of the battle fleet around the world.

OUR NEED TODAY

Today, in the world struggle with the forces of communism, there is need once again for the boldness, the imagination, and the initiative which Theodore Roosevelt exemplified more than 50 years ago.

In this desperate world battle we are spending more than \$3 billion a year on a multitude of projects and programs designed to strengthen the free world and its will and ability to resist Communist aggression.

In cost, and in men employed upon it, our effort today to advance American interests around the world is one that dwarfs the cruise of the Roosevelt fleet.

Our foreign aid expenditures, in a single Asian country each year, far exceed what the Navy spent to send 16 battleships around the world in a cruise that lasted 14 months. Our total foreign aid bill, measured in tens of billions of dollars, renders insignificant the relief efforts of our fleet at the Messina and Reggio earthquakes.

The Roosevelt White Fleet was manned by 12,000 men. We have many more men than that aboard our vessels on regular duty in the Mediterranean today, and many, many times that number on foreign duty, all over the world.

I wonder, however, if our results today, on a man-for-man and dollar-for-dollar basis, even approach the substantial results of Teddy Roosevelt's world cruise?

Many fine things undoubtedly have been accomplished in America's mutual aid program.

Literally millions of people in remote parts of the world have been saved from starvation and strengthened in their fight against famine and disease—and also against communism.

In the Marshall plan, and President Truman's Berlin airlift, we succeeded in capturing the imagination of the world while blocking Communist aims with bold action.

There was similar appeal in President Eisenhower's "atoms for peace proposal.

Today, however, the bloom has passed from each of these roses, and America's foreign policy is sadly in need of an imaginative "shot in the arm" from somewhere.

From too many observers abroad there come complaints that our aid dollars are often dumped into expensive projects that benefit powerful interests but "do not reach the people."

Other observers report that American dollars often have the effect of bolstering undemocratic and unpopular governments and thereby "lose friends for America."

In some cases, we hear that credit for American gifts and aid has not gone to our country, but has been appropriated by others—and even by Communists in some instances.

At home, there is undoubtedly growing discontent in many sections of our country with parts of our foreign aid program as it is being administered overseas.

In the mining areas of America, and in sections where textiles are a major industry, many Americans are blaming foreign aid subsidies for the strongly competitive position of foreign mines and textiles.

They are also charging that the people of these competing foreign countries have had little direct benefit from the American subsidies involved—that wages of the foreign miners and textile workers have remained miserably low while big interests have profited heavily from the subsidies.

Mining and textiles are only two of a number of American industries which have felt the heavy impact of rising foreign imports in recent years, and have turned upon our foreign policy as a major reason for their troubles.

In my own State, this point of view has many supporters, and there is rising public dissatisfaction with foreign policy administration which does not deal with the distress of our own impacted industries.

This is the backdrop, Mr. Speaker, against which I have carefully considered the proposal of a 38-year-old naval officer from Oklahoma, Comdr. Frank A. Manson, U.S. Navy, for the establishment of a modern-day Great White Fleet as an arm of American foreign policy.

The Manson proposal, which is the subject of this week's feature article in Life magazine, calls upon the President to restore to active service and equip naval vessels now in mothballs, using them as a fleet in the service of humanity for the distribution of surplus foods, medicine and other supplies at disaster and distress points all over the world.

Concurrent resolutions to urge this action by the President have been introduced in this body on Tuesday by 22 Members of the House, including the entire Democratic House delegation from Oklahoma. I understand as of today 30 Members of this House have introduced similar resolutions, and I include the list of those Members at this point.

Similar resolutions have been filed in the other body by the distinguished

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12841

Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and they have been joined by other Senators.

In each of these resolutions, the President is requested to seek the cooperation and financial assistance of private organizations in support of the newly established mercy fleet, which should include vessels equipped for medical aid, for electrical power supply ashore, and for transportation of food, clothing, and supplies and equipment.

The resolutions specifically provide that "provision should be made for the utilization of surplus food commodities of the United States for the relief of hunger through this program."

For the first time since "war colors" were substituted in 1909, the fleet units would be painted white, and "suitably identified to proclaim to the world their peaceful and beneficent purpose."

The cost of a Great White Fleet, Mr. Speaker, would be comparatively small in terms of our present mutual security program.

Naval experts have advised Senator HUMPHREY that a task group of four or five vessels could be operated for a year at between \$5 million and \$7.5 million, assuming costs of nonnaval personnel, supplies and equipment were assumed by private organizations.

The Life magazine estimate of cost, figured for 18 months and covering all aspects of the White Fleet operation, is from \$20 to \$30 million—probably less than one-half of 1 percent of our present annual mutual security bill.

A very large portion of this cost, in my personal opinion, would be met by private individuals and organizations, who are eager for the opportunity to take a personal hand in the world battle to improve man's lot and block the spread of Communist slavery.

If there is a question in your mind about the eagerness of people to meet this issue headon, on a people-to-people basis, then I will cite for you two current pieces of evidence.

The first is provided in last Monday's issue of the New York Times, in the editorial page essay entitled "Aspirin for Dr. Schweitzer."

It tells the simple, heartwarming story of a young boy, the son of an Air Force sergeant stationed in Italy, who wanted to send a bottle of aspirin to Dr. Schweitzer's famous jungle hospital in Africa.

The youngster asked the Allied Air Forces commander in southern Europe if "one of your planes" could drop the bottle at the hospital, and an Italian radio station heard about the request and publicized it.

The result: a flood of interest and offers to help, and when the several planes that were enlisted for the mission flew to Dr. Schweitzer's hospital, they carried a cargo of 4½ tons of medical supplies, valued at \$400,000.

With the medicine traveled the 13-year-old boy who was eager to help in the world's fight against disease and human suffering.

A second piece of evidence is provided by the People-to-People Foundation's

experience with an ambitious plan to demothball a former Navy hospital ship, the U.S.S. *Consolation*, and to staff and equip her for medical teaching and training in southeast Asia. This is the Project Hope mentioned in the Life article.

Annual expense of this operation is estimated at \$3,500,000, and all funds are being raised by private subscription.

This is a large sum of money, but offers to help have flooded the foundation's office and the sailing date has been set for January 1960.

The American people are ready, willing, and even eager to help the people of other countries who need help, and there is no doubt in my mind about their response to the Great White Fleet proposal.

In his Great White Fleet, I believe that Frank Manson has a plan that combines two basic pioneering ideas often missing in our foreign aid program. These ideas are giving direct help to a neighbor in distress and using the tools at hand to do the job.

By using our mothballed fleet to carry surplus food and American technical help to disaster and distress areas of the world, we can place at least a part of our mutual aid program upon a direct, people-to-people basis, and assure maximum benefit to our own country's interest in the process.

The idea makes a great deal more sense to me than some parts of our foreign aid program as it is now being administered.

Here is a national endeavor, built around units of our mothballed fleet and our \$9 billion food surplus, in which every American who wishes to do so can participate.

It also provides a means to channel America's great medical resources into parts of the world sorely in need of medical help.

The extent of that need, even in these times, is almost unbelievable.

In the enlightened year of 1958, medical records show that 15,000 people died in East Pakistan in a smallpox epidemic, 804 died in a 2-month cholera outbreak in Calcutta, and cholera also killed 912 in a 30-day epidemic in Thailand.

Everyone of these deaths was preventable through inoculation. So are the hundreds of thousands of starvation deaths, in the poverty-stricken areas of Asia, if the surplus foods of America are put to work for peace.

In the name of divine providence, Mr. Speaker, how can we justify further delays in the use of our abundant food surpluses, to relieve the hunger of children all over the world?

At our docks stand the idle ships, ready to move this abundance to the starving people of the East.

In our warehouses is the food—food on which we are paying hundreds of millions of dollars for storage each year—and food which is sorely needed by our neighbors.

The experience of Project Hope and Dr. Schweitzer's aspirin surely proves that the American people are ready, willing, and generously eager to help put a new White Fleet to sea.

Let us launch this fleet, Mr. Speaker, and put it to work in the service of man.

Let it be a fleet of gleaming white vessels—a symbol known all over the world for peace and helpfulness, and let it proudly fly the American flag as it steams across the seven seas on its missions of mercy.

In this modern atomic age, we have no swords to beat into plowshares, and the dangers are too great to relax our efforts at preparedness.

We can, however, use our idle tools at hand in the service of suffering humanity.

We can make our flag, and our fleet, not only the symbols of the world's greatest naval power, but also the symbols of a generous and helpful neighbor in time of distress and disaster.

Let the Great White Fleet sail once again, Mr. Speaker, and advance not only our country's interests, but also a cause that is dear to the hearts of all people—the cause of peace.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts who was one of the first in the Congress to see the great possibilities of this idea and to introduce a resolution for it.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] on this occasion as I did when we introduced identical resolutions for the purpose of establishing the Great White Fleet.

Some weeks ago, Commander Manson called at my office with a manuscript he had written on this subject. The contents intrigued me because they revolved around a very imaginative and stimulating concept. While the idea is not a new one, it has never been developed to its full potential and shows great promise in a field where so much can be, and needs to be done.

I need not advise the House that economic aid to foreign countries in recent years has met with quite a bit less than universal support throughout our Nation and is hardly understood overseas. It is not my purpose today to outline the reasons that give cause to this reaction for they are manifold and varied. Whether these objections rise through misunderstanding, administration or in comparison to domestic programs here at home, it is evident that this supplementary program will be one that can be understood and appreciated. Constituted as it is, on people-to-people basis, instead of a government-to-government relationship, it will reflect the heart of America and can be developed to whatever degree the people desire.

In 1955, Chief Petty Officer Murray Chase, of Haverhill, Mass., who was stationed aboard the U.S.S. *Aucilla*, in Barcelona, Spain, also had an idea. The Christmas season was approaching but that was not particularly important to the children of that famous city. Chief Chase, and the officers and crew introduced the name of Santa to that area, raised \$1,500 from his shipmates and gave a Christmas party that brought headlines in the Barcelona newspapers

and cheer in the hearts of the local children. In successive years, the occasion grew to greater proportions. The opportunity to help and the great need to receive, combined to start the construction of a new school. As Chief Chase retired from the Navy a few weeks ago, he said he was "going to try to raise about \$10,000 to finish the project." It is little wonder that Chief Petty Officer Murray Chase is, as reported in *Noticias de Actualidad*, "muy popular entre los chiquillos de un barrio de Barcelona." That is really a people-to-people program that can be hardly matched.

An understanding of that program, together with Project Hope, convinced me that another road to needy people overseas could and should be opened—by the American people themselves.

As a result of the splendid article this week in *Life* magazine, I have already received a heart-warming response with various suggestions and offers of assistance. A great deal of thought and effort must go into its policies and programs. Properly conducted, I believe this "bold proposal for peace" will win the wholehearted support of the American people and the gratitude of people less fortunate than we.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] on his eloquent and appealing presentation of the need for establishing a Great White Fleet. I also commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] for his contribution to this worthy idea.

Formation of a modern Great White Fleet of unarmed mercy ships as proposed by Comdr. Frank Manson of the U.S. Navy is, in my opinion, a sound proposal and one that I enthusiastically endorse. I want to commend Commander Manson for such an outstanding contribution in the interest of humanity and world peace, and also I commend *Life* magazine for its splendid presentation of the idea in its July 27, 1959, issue.

In our search for peace we must not leave a stone unturned, and the Great White Fleet is an excellent opportunity for advancement in our practical application of the Golden Rule and would be one of the greatest stimuli we could put forth to relieve human suffering and proclaim to the world our peaceful intents.

Along with a number of my fellow colleagues who introduced like resolutions, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 344, declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy. It is my sincere hope that President Eisenhower will establish from our mothballed Navy a fleet of mercy ships to carry American surplus foods, medical aid, and supplies in the interest of aiding humanity the world over to meet disaster. There is no question but that it will be a busy fleet, and one that will no doubt grow beyond the suggested six ships to start with—the hospital ship, complete with operating rooms, X-ray

facilities, and medical wards; a carrier supplied with helicopters for rescue work; a small destroyer escort to provide coastal communities with emergency power; a cargo vessel loaded with stores of food and clothing; a transport converted into a floating technical school to help improve the local standard of living; and a supply vessel to replenish the fleet. The suggestion to add a seventh ship with an exhibit of U.S. culture and industry when the fleet has become established is also, I feel, a good one. The Great White Fleet will be recognized internationally as a symbol of peace, and will be one of our best ambassadors of good will to create a better understanding among the peoples of the world.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleague from Oklahoma in strong support of the proposal for a new Great White Fleet. This is a bold peace plan for the United States, with tremendous possibilities. This imaginative idea could harness America's productive good will and energies to help insure peace and combat the spread of communism.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in the fact that an outstanding Oklahoman, Comdr. Frank Manson, thought up the idea of a New White Fleet. I also take pride in the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], in association with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and others in the Congress who have been so active. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] has led the way toward a congressional endorsement of this project.

I congratulate the gentleman on his fine work.

I would add, Mr. Speaker, that I have followed his leadership by also introducing in the House a resolution urging the President to take the necessary steps to put the Great White Fleet in operation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this morning a representative of *Life* magazine called my office asking if I would be on the floor to hear the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] describe his wonderful project for 30 minutes and that he spearheaded the Great White Fleet project. They asked me to introduce a companion bill to his, which I am, of course, delighted to do and I shall file the bill today.

I congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma for his eloquence and the wonderful picture he has painted of the practical and idealistic value of a Great White Fleet—the peace and mercy fleet. The gentleman from Oklahoma is always forceful and plausible. I also congratulate my colleague from Massachusetts

[Mr. BATES] for his fine statement just made. He was effective also.

We all know that the servicemen are devoted to children. In every country where they go they make friends through their kindness, and they leave money and supplies wherever their ships go, for the children and the needy. I have always found that the way to the parents' hearts is through the children.

The medical supplies that will be donated will take life and health to the poor of the countries visited and that will be bound to make friendly feelings for the United States. I know what this will mean to our men in the White Fleet, and I know what it will mean to the people of foreign countries to see those white ships of peace and good will steaming into their ports. They will act as supercarriers of good will and kindness and practical help.

Again I congratulate the gentleman. Please let me know if there is anything in the world I can do to help in this.

It is splendid that the powerful *Life* magazine takes such an interest in the Great White Fleet. Their aid will be invaluable.

As to the cost of this project, I believe it will mean fewer dollars in foreign aid as it will take the place of it and it will have ready more ships available for war if needed.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts very much.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep and sincere appreciation to my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]; also to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] for having taken the initiative in this great movement; and I call it that because I believe it is going to terminate in something really worthwhile. I think it is a great movement in fact.

I am happy to join in this effort and follow the leadership of these distinguished gentleman and others. I also introduced a resolution along this same line relative to the Great White Fleet yesterday.

I do believe that this is not a visionary thing at all; I believe definitely it is not some fantasy. I believe it has real validity, and I can see in it a program that will be of great benefit to the entire world, including our own great Nation if it becomes a reality.

May I conclude with just this thought: It seems such a tragedy to me that we in this great Nation have such an abundance of food, such a great surplus of food, and yet in certain areas of the world there are people starving. The fact is that we are not getting our food to these people as we should. I do hope that this movement, and I call it that advisedly, will result in our moving some of these surpluses, that we have, to areas where there are earthquakes, where there are floods, where there is famine, and so forth.

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12843

It will do two things: It will help primarily those starving people, those people in need; and we in this country with such an abundance of wheat, such a surplus we hardly know what to do with, it will help us eventually from an economic standpoint. So it will help first the starving people which is a tremendous thing in itself, and indirectly it will help our farmers in this country and all of our people. I am happy to join my colleagues in an effort to write into law this great idea.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join those who have extended commendation to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. This is a dramatic idea. I think it is an idea that the common people, the average man, will feel they have a part in.

As you know, our foreign aid program is a government-to-government proposition. I have felt many times that in the administration of this program we have had many weaknesses and glaring defects, but I feel that this is a program that will go from the heart of our people to the heart of needy people throughout the world. I think it will spread much good will throughout the world and do more good than some other things that have cost many times what this will cost.

Another thing I like about this particular idea is the fact it will take from us the things that we have in abundance to be given to people who need them so badly. Also it will give the opportunity to show how we feel toward needy people everywhere. The idea that we people can give and can have a part in this program is one that is good rather than one we as representatives of the people, taxing the people, could give. I think it is an excellent idea. I have great hope that this dramatic suggestion of a White Fleet will catch on and will shine as a great star in leading toward world peace.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for his effective and commonsense observation about this proposal.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, of course, the objectives of the proposal made by the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] are highly desirable and commendable. The proposal even comes well recommended to the House by the very nature of the sponsors themselves. However, I think we ought to look down the road a little way on this. It is very easy to agree at the outset with the objectives of this, but when we start to develop the mechanics of it, frankly I have some reservations.

In the first place, the resolution itself is silent as to what the eventual cost might be to the Federal Government. I listened to the gentleman attentively, or intended to, and the only reference he

made to cost was a reference in the article in Life magazine.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I made reference also to the estimate given by people who have studied this; for instance, Senator HUMPHREY, who said it would cost from \$5 million to \$7½ million a year.

Mr. AVERY. From \$5 million to \$7½ million a year. That is for a perpetual operation and \$20 million to \$30 million for readiness of operation of the fleet for 18 months.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think that the \$20 million to \$30 million figure was the estimate of Life magazine, which included within it 18 months' operation and all costs from private sources and everything else. I think that the Humphrey estimate was assuming that personnel, medical supplies, and things of that nature would not be at governmental cost.

Mr. AVERY. That is the point I wanted to bring out. That is, how far the Federal Government's responsibility is going to exist, taking into account the rather intensive effort that the Government will also make in this same direction. The gentleman referred to the mutual security program. I would like to narrow that down to the ICA program, because aside from the mercy or the benevolent aspects of medical help, the ICA program would pretty much complement the program as was described in Life magazine.

In the ICA program, under Public Law 480, funds under title 2 were authorized just this week under the mutual security program, which included about a billion and a half dollars for economic development in these countries, and I assume it would be about the same countries this program would be directed to.

In the field of health we make a rather substantial contribution there already through the world health organizations under the auspices of the United Nations. The United States contributes almost \$5 million to that.

Now, would the gentleman agree with me that if there is an expense to the Federal Government in the operation of this Great White Fleet program probably that expense should be extracted from appropriations or for programs that are presently authorized in the operation in this same direction?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would agree with the gentleman, to this extent; I believe that the President with this resolution behind him would have the authority necessary to draw from either mutual security funds or from armed services appropriation funds. Incidentally, this is being reviewed by the Committee on Armed Services, and they might add some language which would be more specific on that point. It would be our hope that the very great bulk if not all of the cost of this proposal, aside from the cost of the surplus food and commodities, might be borne by private subscription. Incidentally, this project is a very fine prototype for what we are talking about, a wonderfully far-seeing venture into this field, one that should have the support of all people. This project would demonstrate how the people of the country would rally be-

hind this kind of movement if given a vehicle for their help.

Mr. AVERY. That, of course, would be the ultimate objective to work to. But the gentleman will agree with me, we should not set up another Federal program to compete with programs we already have charged up to the taxpayers?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I certainly do not see that it is any competitive program at all.

Mr. AVERY. Well, I would just like to make one further reference to the story in Life magazine. The first page that fell to my attention in Life magazine was a picture of a camel pulling a walking plow demonstrating the virtues of deep plowing in north Africa. I suggest that if we are going to teach the people of north Africa a better way to plow, the most desirable way would be to have some kind of mechanical operation instead of using a camel.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman as an expert on plows here. I have no desire to contend on that point with him.

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

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I immediately am responding to the eloquent presentation made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], by dropping in the hopper the great white fleet resolution as a sponsor.

I am doing this with an especial thrill because the idea of establishing a great white fleet for peace came from Teddy Roosevelt. I am the last man in this Chamber who served in Cuba with Teddy Roosevelt years and years ago in the siege of Santiago in Cuba, and it is most heartening to me to know that in this modern age the dynamic, virile patriotic leadership of Teddy Roosevelt is being implemented. I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for the tremendous presentation he has made here, and I join with him in his advocacy of a great white fleet for peace, sailing in a very real sense into the hearts of people as did the great white fleet for peace that Teddy Roosevelt sent more than half a century ago on a mission so rich in the making of friendship.

Now, in regard to the cost. If you want to reach into the hearts of people, you do not count the cost of a bit of medicine that you are giving to a sick child or a sick woman or a sick man. You do not stop to figure the cost of a loaf of bread before you give it to a starving human being. The quality of mercy is not determined by fiscal mathematics. The cost, as the gentleman from Oklahoma has so well said, will be relatively little; that is, the funds will come in large part, I take it, from the special fund that we have given the President and for other programs in our mutual security bill. Certainly it is much saner to put our surplus agricultural products in the ships of the great white fleet, to carry them to the lands where there is need, than to continue paying out a million dollars a day for storage.

12844

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 23

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank my good friend from Illinois, knowing of his big friend and his strong championship of the ideals of Teddy Roosevelt, and it gives me a real thrill to see him join with us.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. It is a great thought. I have talked to him about it on a number of occasions, and I have received letters from him. I also read this great thought in Life magazine. You just improved on it. You always improve on everything. I have had the joy and the pleasure of serving with you on the Veterans' Committee, and I think you are one of the greatest Members that ever served there. This is a fine program, and this will give life to a lot of people. What you have done is a good job, and I congratulate you from the bottom of my heart.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma). The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma has described in simple, straightforward language an idea of vast significance.

No one who has read "The Ugly American," or who has had occasion to study the reports of the various committees of the Congress, can keep from having some feeling that in our national effort to help economically other parts of the world, we have failed in many cases to convey the really American spirit of neighborliness. This may result from a sort of national self-consciousness, because neighborliness is brotherly love and we are a little timid sometimes about admitting that we are motivated by such a basically good motive.

The Great White Fleet is as American as Teddy Roosevelt; the need for it is as real as the hunger of starving people; the possibility of implementing the idea is as near as the mothballed fleet. I am proud to have been permitted to introduce on yesterday one of 22 identical resolutions urging the creation of the new Great White Fleet.

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, certainly this proposal is deserving of full examination by the Federal Government. I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] on their initiative in taking a leadership position in espousing this project. It will serve as a highly desirable impetus to insure that a full consideration of the merits of the proposal is given. In my judgment this is a useful and sensible way to use the tools already in our possession toward the promotion of peace. We have a Navy and a good Navy. Let us show it off in the best possible light and give tangible evidence to the world of our peaceful intentions.

I cannot help thinking that if the Soviet Union should initiate a similar

project of its own and put it into execution, we here in this country would question ourselves as to why we had not shown at least equal imagination and initiative. At a very small cost, using the tools we already have on hand, a wealth of good will could be obtained for the United States through this project. Let us not dismiss it lightly.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I found this proposal for a Great White Fleet to carry out mercy missions a most dramatic proposal. Certainly its provisions for the relief of suffering, the provision of medical aid to places where it is needed, show vision and imagination.

The question of the provision of food supplies must be weighed against the experience that this Nation has acquired in recent decades in this area. It should be studied together with several suggestions made during this session so that it does not prove harmful.

As a whole, the Great White Fleet, capturing the imagination of the world, could be a wonderful and humanitarian project. It might well have a counterpart in a Great White Airlift that, in the spirit of Air Force efforts in recent years including the airlift to Mecca, could spearhead our mercy efforts.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to accentuate the positive in our approach to foreign policy is the traditional American way of doing things. The most dramatic proposal that has been broached in recent years is the demonstration of our physical, economic, and cultural resources in alleviating the human suffering of peoples abroad by the use of a great "White Fleet" alerted and poised to rush to points of distress and disaster throughout the world and to assist the developing nations.

Our American foreign policy must become geared to the strengths of our Nation; not only our physical resources and the unsurpassed productivity of our economy but to the traditional American symbols of good will, friendship, and brotherly love for peoples everywhere. In our relentless struggle against the forces of communism all facets of our national energy must be brought into the fight in a dramatic move showing the real spirit of the American people to our friends and neighbors abroad. The strength of the "Great White Fleet" proposal is in these areas.

At all times we must maintain our shield of military strength but at best this is a negative gesture and must be reinforced by the positive actions of a great free people who understand the dynamic forces moving in the world today and are equal to the challenge of meeting them.

Coming from a rural area I am acutely aware of the surpluses of food and fiber we possess in a world of hungry people. This is our great blessing if we have the imagination to use it as a force for good in meeting the challenge that has been flung out to us by international communism. President Truman's point 4 program and the Marshall plan were steps in the right direction. Public Law 480 is a move forward in the active use of our food and fiber abundance, in programs of economic and technical assistance, and in the relief of human

suffering. A further important advance can be made in the adoption of the food-for-peace legislation that I have joined in sponsoring. All of these are positive measures which coupled with the "White Fleet" proposal will dramatically highlight American efforts abroad in behalf of other peoples in the have-not areas of the world and will prove a resounding answer to Communist propaganda distortions of American policy and intentions. This is a use of our strength to help meet the weaknesses of our neighbors not because we feel it to be a smart propaganda move but because this is the kind of people we are.

This symbol of American friendship and understanding of other peoples problems is also a use of the services of the Federal Government in cooperation with private voluntary organizations in a manner that makes use of the strengths of both. The Federal Government would cooperate by providing ships, planes, and other vehicles from the mothball fleet, furnishing surplus food and supplies from Government-owned stocks, and providing logistics support through the many facilities of the Government scattered throughout the world. Operation of the fleet services could be undertaken by voluntary groups. The cost would prove negligible in comparison to the amount of good that would be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy and proud to join with my colleagues in sponsoring this legislation that has as its foundation humanitarian motivation and is in accord with the high moral principles for which our Republic has always stood. This is our opportunity to channel the great hope that our people share with other peoples throughout the world for a peace based upon brotherhood. This is a challenge that the American people will wholeheartedly rise to meet.

Under unanimous consent, I include the concurrent resolution calling upon the President to establish the Great White Fleet which I am introducing with a number of my colleagues and to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(a) The President at the earliest practicable time should take such action as may be required to provide for the establishment of a White Fleet designed and equipped to render prompt emergency aid and assistance to peoples of the coastal regions of other nations upon the occurrence of famine, epidemic disease, earthquake, flood, hurricane, or other disaster; and to further serve as a vehicle for the carrying out of technical assistance and training on a continuing basis in the developing nations of the world;

(b) Such fleet should be established through the restoration to active service and the equipment of suitable vessels of the United States Navy now mothballed in storage but could be operated by appropriate nonprofit private philanthropic organizations of the United States devoted to the rendition of emergency aid and assistance to relieve human suffering;

(c) The vessels of such fleet should be suitably identified to proclaim to the world their peaceful and beneficent purpose, and should be divided into task groups, each of which should include a hospital ship for the rendition of medical aid, a vessel suitably equipped to generate electrical energy

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12845

required to meet emergency needs, and one or more cargo vessels suitable for use in the transportation of clothing, medical supplies, and other necessary supplies and equipment;

(d) Fuel and operational supplies, and port, repair, and navigational facilities, of the United States Navy throughout the world should be made available to such fleet in support of its operational activities;

(e) Provision should be made for the utilization of surplus food commodities of the United States for the relief of hunger, and for the furnishing by the United States of medical and other supplies required for the rendition of other necessary aid and assistance, through the use of that fleet; and

(f) The cooperation of private charitable organizations of the United States should be utilized for the furnishing of clothing and other relief supplies for donation to meet the emergency needs of inhabitants of regions to which task groups of the fleet would be directed to provide assistance.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to join the Congressman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] in his resolution on the excellent idea of the White Fleet. His leadership in this will, I am sure, lead to the successful conclusion of an excellent proposal.

While the actual advantage through medical help and through the feeding of the hungry in disaster areas is perhaps small, this program will certainly once more demonstrate the peaceful intentions which we have toward the less fortunate people of the world.

I am glad that the idea is built around direct contributions from people rather than around Government aid because then this even more truly becomes a manifestation of intent by the people of the United States. I wish the Congressman from Oklahoma every success, and again I congratulate him on his usual brilliant leadership.

OUR MONETARY SYSTEM

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

(Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for taking the time of the House at this late hour, but the matter I propose to discuss is of such importance, I think, that even at this late hour it should be brought to the attention of the Members here and the Members who might read the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I am no expert in monetary affairs. In fact, I wish that some of the Members of Congress who are not experts would stop posing as such in some of the remarks that have been made on the floor of the House in recent months with respect to monetary affairs.

In the management of our huge public debt, however, one does not have to be an expert to know that if it is to be managed efficiently and managed economically and managed in the best interests of all of our people, we must give to the Secretary of the Treasury and the

President the tools with which to work. He does not have those tools today.

On June 8 the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress. I would remind the membership of that message and I would quote from it in part. The President in his message to us said:

Successful management of the debt of the Federal Government is one of the most important foundation stones of the sound financial structure of our Nation.

The public debt must be managed so as to safeguard the public credit. It must be managed in a way that is consistent with economic growth and stability. It must also be managed as economically as possible in terms of interest costs. The achievement of these goals is complicated today by several factors, despite the fact that U.S. Government securities are the safest investment in the world.

Further he said:

Greater flexibility of debt management action is required, however, under present-day conditions if a reasonable schedule of maturities is to be maintained and the safeguards against inflation strengthened.

Again the President said:

The Treasury always tries to borrow as economically as it can, consistent with its other debt management objectives. But in our democracy no man can be compelled to lend to the Government on terms he would not voluntarily accept. Therefore, when the Government borrows, it can do so successfully only at realistic rates of interest that are determined by the supply and demand for securities, as reflected in the prices and yields of outstanding issues established competitively in the Government securities market.

The President at that time asked for legislation to remove the statutory interest ceiling of 3.26 percent on savings bonds. He asked also for the removal of the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on issues of intermediate and long-term Treasury bonds. And he said:

The present ceiling seriously restricts Treasury debt management and is inconsistent with the flexibility which the Secretary of the Treasury has on rates paid on shorter term borrowings.

In addition to that message, Mr. Speaker, on June 29, there was released by the President the Interim Report of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. I would call your attention to a very important finding of that Cabinet committee, and mark these words:

Without firm control of the quantity of money and credit all other measures to check inflation will be futile. Sound monetary policy requires that the Government avoid making its bonds, other than those of comparatively small denomination designed for family savings the equivalent of money. Government bonds are the equivalent of money if they can always be changed into actual money at virtually face value not only when they are due and payable but any time before. This is the case if the Treasury is forced to issue only very short term bonds or if the Federal Reserve System stands ready to buy at a pegged price all Government bonds offered to us in advance of the date when they are due to be paid by the Treasury. There is only an imperceptible difference between the Government's issue of bonds that are the equivalent to money and the Government's just cranking

up the printing presses and rolling out greenbacks.

The Government will be forced to continue issuing large additional amounts of short-term bonds that are the near equivalent of money until Congress allows the Treasury sufficient flexibility to achieve a balance in our debt structure by inducing people of their own free will to invest their savings in long-term Government bonds.

Thus to avoid inflation it is essential that the present limitation on the interest rate on long-term Government bonds be removed as the administration has already recommended.

The issue is whether we want price stability or whether we want in a concealed way to do the equivalent of printing money, something the American public would not stand for if done openly.

Thus spoke, in part, the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. That, Mr. Speaker, was on June 29.

Following the message of the President requesting the lifting of the interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds the Committee on Ways and Means held hearings. Those hearings commenced on June 10. We then went into executive session for days on end getting all of the best advice we could from those officials charged with the responsibility of managing the debt. I do not think there could be a question in any reasonable person's mind that the ceiling existing today is unrealistic and that the Federal Government cannot finance any part of the debt in obligations beyond 5 years' duration as long as the present ceiling of 4¼ percent exists. I do not think any reasonable person would question but what if those charged with the responsibility for managing our public debt are to do so in the best interests of our country and in the most economical fashion that this ceiling has to be removed. But in spite of that fact the majority party members on the Committee on Ways and Means have procrastinated and they have delayed, and it would now appear they have decided to do nothing. We met just a couple of weeks ago and got to the point where the committee voted to request the chairman to introduce a clean bill so that the committee could then meet to report out legislation. But since that time no meeting has been held and no bill has been introduced. There is a bill that has been introduced, however, carrying out the Administration's program. I am speaking of a bill in accordance with the action taken by the majority of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, acting in executive session.

Last evening the 10 minority members of the committee, because of the importance of this matter, addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House requesting that he use his good influence to get this matter to the floor of the House and get action so as to untie the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury and the President and enable them to properly manage this huge national debt of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert at this point the letter addressed by the 10 minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means to the Speaker of the