

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalm 23: 6: *Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life.*

Almighty God, of whose bounty we have all received and whose mercies cannot be numbered, may we ever be mindful of the attendant responsibility to prove worthy stewards of Thy manifold blessings.

Grant that through the miracle and ministry of Thy grace and goodness we may be inspired to be more sensitive in our sympathies and more responsive to the needs of the less fortunate members of the human family.

May our longings and labors for the welfare of mankind be an earnest of our love toward Thee and a manifestation of our gratitude for the gift of Thy Son, our Saviour, with whom Thou hast freely given us all things.

In His name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1138. An act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON, members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 60-1.

FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING THE PRESIDENT ADAMS PARKWAY

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 7125) to provide for a study of the feasibility

of establishing the President Adams Parkway.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1959

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7500) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of July 21, 1959.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees bring back to the House a bill which represents a compromise between a bill that passed the House and a Senate bill which differed from it in some 57 instances, a number of which were of major importance. The money differences between the two bills this year were relatively less important, and the differences with respect to the relationship of the two bills to our foreign policy and to congressional control over the mutual security program were of relative large importance.

Let me make clear at the very beginning that this bill contains no authority to use foreign currencies without appropriation nor does it authorize any back door approach to the Treasury. The House conferees kept in mind the rules of the House and the sentiment prevailing in the House on these matters, and were careful that no such provisions were included.

It is difficult to make a meaningful comparison of the total dollar authorizations in the two bills. This is true because the bill as it passed the Senate included an authorization for 2 years for the Development Loan Fund and a continuing authorization for the military assistance program.

No funds after fiscal 1960 were authorized in the bill that passed the House. The total of the authorizations for fiscal year 1960 approved by the House was \$3,542,600,000 and the total of the authorizations approved by the Senate was

\$3,543,320,000—a difference of only \$720,000. The conference agreed to authorizations for fiscal 1960 of a total of \$3,556,200,000, which is \$353,200,000 less than the Executive request, and is \$13,600,000 more than the authorization approved by the House.

I feel sure that an examination of the detailed authorizations included in the bill will satisfy the House membership that the interests of the House have been adequately protected. It might be of interest to note that in 1956 the House conferees brought back an authorization which was \$360,100,000 larger than the amount originally approved by the House; in 1957 the authorization approved by the conference was \$250,250,000 higher than the authorization included in the House bill; last year the conference agreed to an aggregate authorization which was \$72,500,000 above the bill approved by the House. I think everyone will recognize that we have done pretty well this year.

As I said a moment ago, the major problems which confronted the House conferees involved matters of congressional practice and congressional control, as well as major aspects of our foreign policy.

The Senate bill included an authorization to transfer up to 30 percent of military assistance funds to economic assistance. The House had made its position very clear to the House conferees during the consideration of the bill on the House floor, and we gave this issue top priority. I am glad to be able to report that the Senate receded with respect to this provision.

Another major issue with which the conference was confronted involved the continuing authorization for military assistance. The Senate bill included such an authorization, which was supported by the executive branch. The Draper Commission, as you know, had recommended only a couple of weeks ago that military assistance be authorized on a continuing basis, and the Senate held very strongly to its position on this matter. After prolonged discussion, a compromise was agreed to by which, after the current fiscal year, such funds are authorized for military assistance as may be required for fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1962. After this 2-year period, further authorization will be necessary. It is the belief of the House conferees that this 2-year period should be regarded as experimental in nature and that the House will have an opportunity to observe the consequences of this type of authorization before reaching a final determination.

The conference faced a major issue also in the case of the authorization for the Development Loan Fund. The Senate bill authorized \$2 billion for a 2-year

July 22

period with the provision that \$750 million could be advanced to the Fund in fiscal 1960 and the remaining \$1,250 million could be advanced during fiscal 1961. We were able to arrive at a compromise, which held the fiscal 1960 authorization to \$700 million—the figure approved by the House—and provided an authorization for fiscal 1961 of \$1,100 million. This involved an overall reduction from the Senate figure of \$200 million. This was the best that we were able to do, and I believe it is a reasonable arrangement considering the situation which exists in the Senate and supported by the Executive.

There were two provisions of the Senate bill which had major implications to our foreign policy. The first was a requirement that \$893,750,000 of the funds authorized for military assistance had to be used to provide assistance to the NATO countries. Had this requirement prevailed, it would have made necessary a cut of 43 percent in military assistance to the non-NATO nations. I firmly believe that a cut of this magnitude in the assistance to the countries outside NATO would have seriously impaired our relations with other nations and would have been dangerous to our national security. I am glad to be able to report that the Senate receded on this point and the requirement that a specified amount of military assistance money should go to the NATO countries was completely eliminated.

The other important foreign policy problem presented by the Senate bill involved the requirement that \$31,500,000 of military assistance for Latin America had to be used either for assistance to a military force organized and directed by the Organization of American States or, if not so used, could be used only to provide economic assistance to Latin American countries. In this case the Organization of American States had no plans, no authority or no desire to create such a military force, and the result would inevitably have been that the money would have been diverted from military assistance to economic assistance. I am glad to be able to report that the House conferees were successful in their opposition to this provision and that this was deleted from the bill.

It gives me great personal satisfaction to be able to inform the House that the provision contained in the House bill for the setting up of an Inspector General and Comptroller to supervise the operation of the mutual security program was accepted by the Senate. I believe that this provision will make a major contribution to tightening up the administration of the mutual security program and to improving its effectiveness. We worked very hard in conference to secure the approval of the Senate conferees to this provision and feel great satisfaction that we were successful.

With regard to other provisions of the bill, we compromised on what seems to me to be on the whole a 50-50 basis. It was necessary for the House to recede completely with respect to some amendments and the Senate to recede completely with respect to others. Most differences were resolved by the adoption of

compromise language. I do not believe that we receded on any matter which will handicap the United States in the conduct of its foreign relations or which involves the policies or precedents of the House. In any conference it is necessary to give and take in order to reach agreement. I believe that the managers on the part of the House have done a good job, and I urge that the conference report be adopted.

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

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

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified by the splendid assistance, those of us who are interested in the surplus population problem received from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and his colleagues who participated in the conference on this legislation in obtaining a clear and unequivocal statement regarding the availability of counterpart funds for land resettlement programs in Latin America. We are hopeful that the administration will now be guided in their negotiations with some of our Latin American neighbors by the findings and recommendations of the conferees.

For the purpose of further clarification of the RECORD, I request unanimous consent to include at this point copies of my correspondence on this subject with the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. C. Douglas Dillon.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

JULY 10, 1959.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Undersecretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DILLON: You are aware, of course, of the fact that the House of Representatives has included in the mutual security bill (H.R. 7500) section 205(a)(3) authorizing the use of counterpart funds for the financing of land settlement projects defined in section 400(b)(C) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

This provision was originally submitted to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by myself after it has been repeatedly indicated to me in the course of negotiations leading to the granting by the Development Loan Fund of certain loans (in U.S. dollars) designed to assist in the development of such projects in Latin America, that existing law does not authorize the use of foreign currency accruing either under the Mutual Security Act or under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress).

Having made an effort to have the Senate include in their companion bill the provision approved by the House, I am now informed by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that according to comments received by that committee from the executive branch, the House provision is not deemed to be necessary in view of the fact that "the President presently has authority to make loans for land resettlement purposes without regard to section 1415 (of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1953) from foreign currencies accruing" under either of the above cited acts. I am further informed that according to the opinion of the executive branch, "neither of these authorities is subject to the requirement that foreign cur-

rencies for such loans be authorized from time to time in appropriation acts." Consequently, according to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the present statutory authority is sufficient to make foreign currencies available for loans to finance land settlement projects determined to promote economic development of certain Latin American countries as defined in clause (C) of subsection (b) of section 400, supra.

The purpose of this letter is to obtain from you a definitive determination whether or not the views attributed to the executive branch in the Senate committee's analysis of the Mutual Security Act of 1959 reflect the official findings of the administration and whether you are of the opinion that existing law contains sufficient authority for the granting of foreign currency loans for the above defined land settlement projects.

In view of the fact that the House-Senate conference committee on the Mutual Security Act of 1959 is expected to begin their work within the next few days, your early attention to this request would be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 15, 1959.

The Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Committee
on the Judiciary, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In your letter of July 10, 1959, you asked me to confirm information you have received from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations concerning comments supplied to it by the executive branch regarding section 205(a)(3) of H.R. 7500 authorizing the use of counterpart funds for financing certain land settlement projects.

I can confirm that the expressions quoted in the third paragraph of your letter do represent the views of the executive branch. These views are stated as follows in the position paper on this matter provided by the executive branch to the conferees on the mutual security authorizing bill:

"The President presently has authority to make loans for land resettlement purposes without regard to section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, from foreign currencies accruing under section 402 of the Mutual Security Act and under Public Law 480 when such loans are determined to promote economic development under section 104(g) of Public Law 480. Neither of these authorities is subject to the requirement that foreign currencies for such loans be specified from time to time in appropriation acts.

If the intent of this amendment, apart from its effect, is to provide additional authority to assist land resettlement programs in Latin America, on the assumption that the present authorities for such assistance were inadequate, the fact is, as indicated above, that the existing authorities are already adequate for this purpose and therefore such an amendment would be unnecessary."

I am enclosing a copy of this position for your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Acting Secretary.

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure that there is spelled out in the statement of the managers on the part of the House protective language that will satisfy the gentleman from Pennsylvania, on this matter that I know he has been deeply interested in for a great many years.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it true that this bill as now presented by the conferees has eliminated all so-called back door approaches to the Treasury, such as permitting the organizations to borrow directly from the Treasury rather than to go through the appropriation processes?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. All of the appropriations are now required to go through the regular appropriation processes?

Mr. MORGAN. All of the appropriations are now required to go through the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GARY. It is not a question of going through the Committee on Appropriations, but a question of using the appropriation processes so that they will be acted upon by the Congress.

Mr. MORGAN. They all go through that process.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Chairman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I observe, on page 8, the following: "Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 451(b) of this act."

That is for the small business organization within the program. The language would indicate that the \$2,500,000 requested would come out of the President's contingent fund; is that correct?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. Then, as we go over to page 12 there is a new organization, International Cooperation in Health. Is that not a new section in the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. Did the gentleman say on page 12?

Mr. PASSMAN. The item starts on page 11.

Mr. MORGAN. Again, that money would come out of the contingency fund if the President felt he wanted to use it.

Mr. PASSMAN. But under the present legislation, the gentleman is not asking for an appropriation for this, so it would naturally come out of the contingency fund, and it so states.

Mr. MORGAN. We are not making any separate authorization for the International Cooperation in Health program.

Mr. PASSMAN. Then, on page 14, we find "United States participation in World Refugee Year." That is a new item or section of the bill, is it not?

Mr. MORGAN. That is a new item.

Mr. PASSMAN. And the money for that also comes out of the President's contingency fund?

Mr. MORGAN. Again, that is in section 451(b), which is the contingency fund.

Mr. PASSMAN. In that connection, this legislation would set up a new organization, for which the future expense could be very substantial. If you get them started out of the contingent fund, then in the future they could come in for a regular appropriation, and it is impossible at this time to determine what the cost would be; is it not?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, we are now participating in a number of international

refugee organizations. This does not involve any new organization that I know of.

Mr. PASSMAN. How about the small business section and the health organization?

Mr. MORGAN. These amendments were put in by the other body. They had testimony that our own Government agencies had a large surplus of machine tools. They felt very strongly about the amendment. I think the House by eliminating the separate authorizations and incorporating them in section 451(b) was a victory for the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. In both of these instances, there is being set up, in effect, two new organizations and in future years the cost of operating the program could be many, many times the amount requested this year; is that not so?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not believe any new organization is necessarily involved, some new operations may result. The international health organization and the world refugee organizations are not new.

Mr. PASSMAN. How about the international health organization and this proposed organization that you would set up in Hawaii, the cultural program?

Mr. MORGAN. There is no money in section 451(b) for that.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to ask a further question, if the distinguished chairman will yield.

Is this not true: Are these items, items that you propose to finance out of the contingent fund. From our experience of what has happened in the past, the executive to a very large extent has nullified acts of Congress by reinstating the cuts that we have made in a program, because of this large contingent fund.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, you cannot make that interpretation because these provisions were not requested by the Executive and the Executive opposed putting them in the contingent fund.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true, if I may ask this final question, that practically all the money that was spent last year out of the President's contingent fund went to offset cuts made in other programs by the Congress?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, these programs are all subject to appropriation limitations, as the gentleman knows. The gentleman from Louisiana is the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee which can put limitations on expenditures for them.

Mr. PASSMAN. I just wanted to find out if the distinguished chairman understood that 80 percent of the contingent fund last year was used to offset cuts made by the Congress and the regular committees.

Mr. MORGAN. I have had no report on this matter since the Foreign Affairs Committee concluded its hearings on the mutual security bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] to make a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject that the bills S. 2014 and H.R. 7391 should not pass.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1959 contains a reasonable and constructive compromise between the provisions approved by the House and those which originated in the other body.

The conference report cuts deeply into the request of the President—deeper, I would say, than some of us have considered advisable in view of the overall Communist threat. Further, it proposes to put into effect certain reforms intended to eliminate those abuses in the administration of our foreign aid program which were brought to light by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and by other sources. This legislation has been carefully drafted to safeguard our public interest. The reforms it proposes are sound and needed. I am pleased that they remain in the final version of this measure.

I sincerely hope that the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1959 will receive prompt and overwhelming approval of this House.

At this point, I would like to devote a few minutes to a discussion of an amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1959 which I proposed in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and which was adopted by the committee and approved by the House.

I am referring to the amendment to section 400(c) of the mutual security law, which authorizes the President to use foreign currencies, credited to the United States from the sale of our farm surplus commodities and under certain other programs, for medical research and treatment centers founded or sponsored abroad by American citizens. This amendment, in a clarified form, is included in the conference report.

I would like to begin with a brief background of this amendment.

Several months ago, I was invited to join a national committee organized for the purpose of realizing the construction, in Cracow, Poland, of a hospital for children's diseases. This committee, the American Research Hospital for Children in Poland Committee, includes a number of outstanding Americans.

Among them are the Honorable Averell Harriman, former Governor of the State of New York; Hon. Percival F. Brundage, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget; Hon. Harrison A. Williams, U.S. Senator from New Jersey; Hon. Walter H. Judd, Member of Congress from Minnesota; Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of Saturday Review; Mr. Gardner Cowles, publisher of Cowles magazines; Very Reverend Msgr. Aloysius J. Wycislo, assistant executive director of Catholic Relief Services; Dr. Earl N. Hillstrom, medical adviser to CARE; Dr. Stephen Miezwa, president of Kos-

ciuszko Foundations; Dr. Stanley J. G. Nowak, head of the medical committee, Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences; Mr. Richard W. Reuter, executive director of CARE; Mr. John H. Page, of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Mr. John Richardson, Jr., of the firm of Faine, Webber, Jackson, & Curtis; and others.

Mr. Wlodek O. Biernacki-Foray, member of the American Institute of Architects, serves as the secretary of the committee. His organization has prepared the designs for the proposed hospital, and he has expended considerable effort on behalf of this project.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, director of physical rehabilitation at the New York Hospital, and associate editor of the New York Times, serves as a special consultant to the committee.

The project envisioned by the committee involves the construction of a research hospital in children's diseases, of approximately 200 beds, in Cracow, Poland. This hospital, made possible by private contributions and Polish zlotys credited to our Government, would serve as a living testimonial of the friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Poland. It would become a part of the Medical Academy of the University of Cracow, which university will celebrate its 600th anniversary in 1963. It is the fond hope of all interested persons that the project may be completed in time to be presented to the people of Poland during the Cracow University's 600th anniversary ceremonies.

The cost of this project has been estimated at approximately \$4 million. The American Research Hospital for Children in Poland Committee hopes to raise \$1.5 million through voluntary contributions in the United States. In addition, the equivalent of \$2.5 million in zlotys will be needed to pay for services, labor, and materials purchased in Poland.

This is a constructive and humanitarian project. The need for such medical facilities in Poland is extremely great. It is particularly pressing in Cracow, where even the passage of time and industrialization have done little to alleviate the tragic consequences and the ravages of war. The children in Poland are still suffering sickness and miseries of the postwar period, and, according to reports from reliable people who have surveyed the situation, medical facilities available to them are most inadequate.

What could be finer, more constructive, and more humanitarian on our part than to extend a helping hand to the suffering children of Poland by aiding in the construction of this proposed hospital? The bonds of friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Poland are of long standing. Sons of Poland fought for our freedom in the Revolutionary War, and Americans of Polish descent have contributed substantially, over the years, to the development of our continent, and to the economic and cultural progress of our Nation. Then, too, the people of Poland have long shared our love for liberty and democracy. To this very day, in spite of Communist domination, the people of

Poland retain their deep-seated respect for the ideals of freedom and independence which we cherish so greatly.

I fully concurred with the American Research Hospital for Children in Poland Committee that this project warrants and deserves the support and aid of our Government. I have already described the need for this hospital in children's diseases. Further, the sponsoring committee has been organized, the plans for the hospital prepared, and the cost has been estimated. The initial steps have been taken to raise through voluntary contributions, the dollars necessary to cover part of the expense. This is, therefore, a clearly outlined, positive, and going project.

The project does, however, need help, particularly with respect to the portion of construction expenses which will be incurred in Poland. Those expenses can be paid in zlotys, and will be equivalent to approximately \$2.5 million.

Several months ago, the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey, prepared a draft of a bill to provide for Government assistance to this project. Legislation on this subject was subsequently introduced in the House of Representatives. This legislative proposal, in a modified form, became the core of the amendment which I offered to section 400(c) of the mutual security law.

Under my amendment, the President will be authorized to use foreign currencies credited to the United States, and appropriated from time to time, to aid medical research centers sponsored abroad by American citizens. It was my specific intent, endorsed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, by the House of Representatives, and by the conferees on the mutual security bill of 1959, that the proposed research hospital for children's diseases in Cracow, Poland, be aided by our Government under the authority provided in this amendment.

I am particularly pleased that, under this amendment, we will be able to continue our efforts to use our farm surpluses in a constructive way. We have been trying to reduce those surpluses—which cost the American taxpayers an estimated million dollars a day in storage fees alone—for several years. By using foreign currency accrued from the sale of those surpluses to aid the construction of the children's hospital in Cracow, we will be turning our abundance of food into a blessing for the suffering children of Poland.

There is one last point that I want to make:

The type of assistance made available for the children's hospital in Cracow is fully consistent with the objectives of U.S. foreign policy. This assistance has the basic purpose of advancing better understanding and friendly relations between the people of the United States and the anti-Communist people of Poland. It is intended to demonstrate to the freedom loving peoples everywhere that the central objective of U.S. foreign policy is to foster the attainment of peace in the world, and to aid and assist others in their efforts to conquer disease and to improve their level of living.

Mr. Speaker, I am making this statement for the RECORD, so that the legislative history of my amendment to section 400(c) of the mutual security law may clearly indicate congressional intent to aid the proposed American Research Hospital for Children in Poland under the authority given the President in this provision.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives I had the pleasure of supporting my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], who offered the amendment to use foreign currencies, credited to the United States for our surplus farm products, to establish centers devoted to medical research and treatment which are founded by American citizens.

It seems to me that this is a historic and significant use for these currencies. It is particularly significant that one of the first hospitals which may be established pursuant to this legislation will be located in Cracow, Poland, because at this very moment Poland seems to be the object of a considerable amount of wooing on the part of the leaders of the U.S.S.R. Poland undoubtedly has been successful in freeing herself from complete and absolute domination and control by the U.S.S.R. just as Yugoslavia was successful in doing some years earlier. And a hospital there could play a major role in further loosening Poland from the web, indeed the shroud, which the U.S.S.R. is so busily weaving for the proud and history-conscious peoples of Poland who throughout history have fiercely resisted and fought against foreign masters.

It seems to me that here is indeed almost a revolutionary instrument for the cause of freedom which the United States can wield in the cause of mankind throughout the world.

Under this amendment, as has been pointed out by our able colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], the President will be authorized to use foreign currencies credited to the United States, and appropriated from time to time, to aid medical research centers sponsored abroad by American citizens.

There is offered us, through this amendment, the golden opportunity to use our farm surpluses constructively in the cause of peace.

There is a growing awareness of the importance of using surplus food for peace, and what we as a nation can do to advance the cause of free men everywhere by this means.

We are blessed as no other nation has ever been through the long history of mankind with food in abundance.

What a blessing this is, and, at the same time, what a fearful responsibility it is to use it wisely and well.

No other nation in the world at this time has food in abundance and a surplus of food.

The U.S.S.R. is a food deficit nation, its vast and much-advertised agricultural program is well known to be an almost total flop.

Too few Americans appreciate the full sweep of the possibilities open to us to

1959

use food for the peaceful purposes of mankind, and of the free world.

In introducing his so-called food for peace legislation for himself and 10 co-sponsors, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY declared that:

America's abundance of food and fiber is a God-given blessing * * * a powerful potential asset in the world's struggle for peace and freedom.

I joined with Senator HUMPHREY, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] in offering the legislation to use our surpluses, which are costing literally hundreds of millions of dollars just to store here at home, in the cause of peace and freedom.

The establishment of medical centers devoted to medical research and treatment which are founded by American citizens abroad is, in my view, one of the very best ways to use the surpluses we are shipping overseas.

More than three-fifths of these surplus commodities have been sold abroad for local currencies; 6½ percent was donated to foreign governments for emergency assistance; 19 percent has been donated for foreign and domestic relief through voluntary agencies and inter-governmental organizations; while 13 percent was bartered abroad for strategic materials.

Under Public Law 480 more than two-thirds of a billion dollars worth of food has been distributed abroad in 99 countries and territories under the auspices of nonprofit charitable organizations on a people-to-people basis. Last year, 24 organizations supervised the movement of these commodities, including the American Friends Service Committee, Church World Service, CARE and Catholic Relief Services.

The amendment offered by our colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] will expand the opportunities which are open to our people to carry the healing services developed by science to the poor and afflicted peoples in countries around the world.

What more splendid and wonderful way can there be to carry the message of democracy to the troubled and the heavy-laden?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees on the mutual security bill have wisely agreed to include in the conference report on this measure a provision authorizing the creation of a center for cultural and technical interchange in Hawaii. The language incorporating this Senate amendment into the conference report on the mutual security bill are identical to a measure I introduced to accomplish this, H.R. 8274.

To add to the abundant contributions which Hawaii has already made to the economy of our Nation in peacetime and to the military defense of our Nation in wartime, the final passage of legislation early this year granting statehood to this bountiful area has provided our country with a new and challenging opportunity

to initiate an effective interchange of cultural and technical knowledge.

In its position at the crossroads of the Pacific, Hawaii has enjoyed and benefited from immediate contact with the people of Asia and the Western Hemisphere who have long held this area as a meeting place. It has assimilated the rich heritages of cultural tradition proffered by both the East and the West. The walls of misunderstanding and enmity have gradually been broken down and replaced with human relationships that abound in tolerance and appreciation of one for the other. Differences in background, culture and tradition have been utilized—rather than minimized—in developing a philosophy that has as its basis the importance of and necessity for diversity in the world's thinking.

This legislation which I was pleased to cosponsor, would give impetus to the free flow of information and exchange of ideas so urgently needed in our society today, by providing the physical means and facilities to attract and bring together scholars and students from the East and West. The specific plan to be developed and submitted to Congress next January by the Secretary of State will include data providing for the center through arrangements with public, educational and other nonprofit institutions. It will call for grants, fellowships and scholarships for students and scholars from both the East and West so that they may come together and engage in study at the center. The plan will also make the facilities of the center available to other qualified persons on a reasonable basis.

Secretary of State Herter has given this matter his personal endorsement and support, and upon passage of this legislation, is expected to proceed immediately with his Department's active participation in the project.

I commend the conferees for their farsightedness and wisdom in approving this legislation and hope it will receive the speedy and hearty support of all Members of this Congress.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I think that on the whole the House conferees did better in this conference than we probably had a right to expect in maintaining the House position. We can report that on all of the major issues except two, among the 50 some items of difference between the two bills, the view of the House prevailed; and on those two, we got a reasonable compromise.

The other body had in its bill a set-aside out of the military assistance of about \$900 million for NATO. This would have deprived the program of flexibility and would have weakened all the non-NATO areas greatly. We got them to recede on that and go more than half way in meeting our figure on the military assistance funds.

The other body also had a provision in its bill that would earmark \$30 million of the military assistance for Latin America which could be used only for assistance to an "international military

force under the control of the Organization of American States for the protection of American states against external aggression." If the funds were not used for that purpose, then they had to go into the special assistance account to promote economic development in Latin America. This seemed to us to be an unwise idea. Latin Americans have not expressed any desire to have any such Western Hemisphere armed force. How large a force would it be? How would it be constituted and organized? Where would it be stationed? Who would command it? Setting aside funds now for such a nonexistent force would not in our opinion improve the security of the Western Hemisphere. As for using the additional \$30 billion for economic assistance, only two Latin American countries need grant assistance, and they are taken care of in the present program. The others need loans, but they can get loans from existing loaning agencies. The other body receded and the conference report specifies that military assistance funds for Latin America for this year shall not exceed the amounts used for this purpose last year.

Again, they had an authorization in their bill that up to 30 percent of the funds in "Title I, Military Assistance," could be transferred by the President to other titles. This would mean that more than \$400 million could be transferred here or there as the President pleased. It could make a shambles of the military assistance program, and it would make a farce of the military assistance programing and of presentations before our appropriations committees. The House had rejected this same provision in an amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] and we persuaded the other body to accept our position.

Again, in several places in the other body's bill, funds were to be made available without going through the appropriation process. The House conferees insisted on its position and the other body eventually agreed.

As you recall we had a provision in our bill setting up an Inspector General and Comptroller, in order to focus in one place responsibility for supervising the accounting and the checking of end use of all forms of assistance. The Inspector General is to be responsible only to the Under Secretary of State, so he could get around bureaucratic attempts to hide mistakes or waste, and do something about situations that needed correcting. Complaints will go to him about things being badly handled or mismanaged. One difficulty in the past has been that when conscientious employees have protested, their protests have sometimes been smothered. Congressmen have seen things that were wrong; businessmen or visitors have seen things that were wrong, and reported them; but we could not seem to get the pattern changed. So the House set up an Inspector General in order that we could hold one man responsible. Where something is believed to be wrong and someone calls his at-

tention to it, he has got to investigate and correct, if needed, or else be held accountable by us. The State Department did not want this Inspector General, but the House put it in and it is in the conference report. We think it can be the most important step we have taken in years to try to correct mistakes, errors, abuses and, frankly, corruption in certain instances. These cases involve only a very small percentage of the total operations, but they are what give the whole program a black eye with the public and with the Congress.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Would this Inspector General in any way circumscribe the Comptroller General if he tried to go into these questions?

Mr. JUDD. No; it would not. If the gentleman will look at page 10 of the bill and pages 32 and 33 of the committee report, he will see that we have made it perfectly clear that this Inspector General has to coordinate his work with that of the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General is the agent of the Congress. We can send him to investigate what we want. This Inspector General will be the chief agent of the Department of State to police its own mutual assistance operations; and also to advise and consult with the Defense Department regarding its operations in this field.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Will the gentleman please explain why, in providing for the compensation of the Office of the Inspector General and Comptroller, instead of making the expenses of his office payable out of the general expense fund where there would be some control over it, it is provided that these expenses should be paid out of the field funds without any check and without any limitation?

Mr. JUDD. The reason is this: If this officer's funds come out of the administrative funds, he can be frozen out. We have seen that happen in the past.

If we make the funds for this officer and his staff available out of the program funds themselves, it will prevent his being smothered by the bureaucrats whose work he is inspecting, to the point where he cannot really do a good job.

Mr. GARY. The bill does not provide any limitation at all. Should there not be a limitation as to the amount of funds that he can expend in his work?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is correct that the bill does not provide any limitation. I really think that probably more of the funds ought to be spent on inspection than in the past. When we are dealing with operations involving \$3½ billion spread all over the world, and we have used only a tiny fraction of that for administration, I think we have invited some of the very irregularities about which we are unhappy.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is a tremendous increase in the amount for administrative expenses for the ICA. Would the gentleman agree that there should be some type of limitation on the amount of money that this new Inspector General expends for travel and entertainment?

Mr. JUDD. No; I do not think we ought to have any limitation on this new officer except the limitation of the funds that are in the bill, because I don't know what the limitation should be. If Mr. Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, sees fit to use more of the program funds for inspection and policing rather than for just programs, I think that is a good thing to do, at least for this year, on an experimental basis.

Mr. PASSMAN. In other words, the gentleman does not believe there should be any limitation as to what this gentleman could and should spend?

Mr. JUDD. That is correct, because we are not in any position as yet to know what a reasonable limitation would be. This is a new function, and I think the Inspector General's problem is going to be to get enough funds from the Department. I am not worried about his getting too much. It will not take any more out of the taxpayers' pockets, if he does use more.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is this program out of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. PASSMAN. So it would come out of the pockets of the taxpayers?

Mr. JUDD. Certainly, but it will not be additional funds out of their pockets. If there is more for inspection, there is that much less for operations. I think more of the funds should go into the policing of the operations, rather than continue to be used all for more of the same kind of operations that have been wasteful.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does the gentleman have a precedent for establishing a position of this kind without any limitation on expenditures?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. In the State Department basic legislation there is provision for an Inspector in the Foreign Service. He has even greater authority than this man will have. He can go into a post and suspend a person or suspend an operation on his own authority, subject to the decision of the Secretary. I read that act and there is no limitation on the amount of money available for the Inspector in the Foreign Service.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is rather loose, and the sky is the limit?

Mr. JUDD. No; the sky is not the limit. There is only so much money provided in the whole bill. Some can be used for administration and some can be used for programs. Do you not want to use more of the money for policing programs that we are criticizing?

Mr. PASSMAN. Oh, we know the same gentleman is going to run it.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman to whom my friend is perhaps referring discovered on his own almost everything wrong brought out by the gentleman's committee and by the Hardy committee, as well as our own committee. This gentleman reported these things that were wrong,

he protested, but the protest was buried. We want to correct that situation. Under this new setup, he will have full responsibility and if he does not take care of it, he will be held accountable.

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

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

Mr. BENTLEY. Will the gentleman explain to the House this section 101:

Programs of military assistance subsequent to the fiscal year 1960 program shall be budgeted so as to come into competition for financial support with other activities and programs of the Department of Defense.

Mr. JUDD. This is a modification of language that was put in by the other body. The purpose is to test out the statement made again and again by our military leaders that mutual security is part and parcel of our defense, it is just as important as our own Armed Forces. For the next 2 years they will have to bring in a defense budget with one part of it, or one title or one chapter of it, for military assistance, alongside its requests for our own Military Establishment. If they ask more for military assistance to others, they will have to take more out of their own funds. We will find out whether they really believe that military assistance is part and parcel of our defense and just as important as their own flattops, planes, or submarines.

Mr. Speaker, one of the two major items of compromise was the Development Loan Fund. The other body had authorized \$750 million this year and the second year's authorization of \$1,250 million. The conferees compromised on \$700 million for fiscal year 1960 and \$1,100 million for fiscal year 1961—a reduction of \$200 million.

The other was the Senate provision giving continuing authorization without limitation for appropriations for military assistance. The House conferees rejected any such permanent authorization and got the Senate to accept a continuing authorization for the next 2 fiscal years on an experimental basis. We make clear in our statement that the legislative committees will review the military assistance programs as in the past, we will have a military assistance title in our bill each year just as now, and we will legislate as heretofore on all matters of policy. In 1962 the whole program will come back to us for whatever action we decide on as the result of the experiment.

Many Members have favored complete separation of military and economic assistance. This will give partial separation for 2 years. I believe it is a reasonable compromise.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON].

(Mr. ANDERSON of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I want to defend the American mutual security program in Vietnam. I visited Vietnam last November, and I speak against the backdrop of what I learned on the ground.

Of course, we want to get the most out of our mutual security dollar. But let us remember the devastation wracked on this little country by the Communists—let us remember the heroism with which they have rolled back the Communists in Southeast Asia.

Certainly a sensation seeking reporter can go into any operation, military, government—yes, or private business—and advertise for the troublemakers and dissidents to air their beefs; and in any operation, including almost any big business you care to name, he can come out with a story more sensational than the one currently being aired on Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I spent some time in Vietnam, and I have studied the situation there. I want to express my opinion that we have gotten more than our money's worth for the dollars spent in Vietnam to halt the spread of communism in Southeast Asia. General Williams, chief of JUSMAAG in Vietnam, has done an outstanding job of building an efficient military machine that will do the job there. He has created from nothing one of the best small armies in Asia, and it is 100 percent anti-Communist. General Williams has worked miracles, but at the same time he has been vigilant and dedicated as a watchdog over the dollars spent in military aid in Vietnam. Newspaper accounts are guilty of inaccurate reporting when they allege that our expenditures are not properly supervised.

The aid to Vietnam has of necessity been largely directed toward establishing a military force capable of defending this little country. The officers of the MAAG, under General Williams' extremely competent direction, have established a very close working relationship with the Vietnamese Government and actively assist not only in the preparation of the Vietnamese military budget, but in supervising the execution of that budget. The relationship between the Vietnamese Government officials and the MAAG is possibly as close and fruitful as any such relationship in the world. When MAAG-Vietnam started its operations, the Vietnamese Government had not had experience in preparing budgets or supervising the expenditure of funds, and the Government has accepted wholeheartedly the guidance of the American officers in establishing effective controls on the use not only of the U.S. money, but of the Vietnamese funds.

In addition, the American officers advise on the training and the logistical operations of the Vietnamese armed forces from the highest level in defense down to and including the combat battalions, and they have established controls and records utilizing the most modern cost-saving methods.

When I was in Vietnam last year, I had an opportunity to observe this small but highly efficient army which has operated under difficult conditions. The countryside still has Communist bands supplied and directed from the North, operating against not only the Vietnamese Government, but the American personnel helping the Vietnamese. When I was there, I noticed the protection provided to me and was impressed with the efforts

the Vietnamese made to safeguard those who are trying to help them. The Communists have threatened and attempted on numerous occasions to assassinate American personnel, and all Americans working in Vietnam know that they are in danger. Numerous attempts on their lives have been made, but fortunately, so far, only two Americans have died at the hands of Communist agents. These two men, Maj. Dale R. Buis and M. Sgt. Chester M. Ovnan, gave their lives as much for the free world in Vietnam as they would have on the battlefields of Korea. Attempts to make such people appear as living too well are ill advised.

During the last 5 fiscal years, excluding the months of April, May, and June, 1959, for which figures are not yet available, the ICA has shown expenditures of \$922,651,000 in Vietnam, which, if broken down, would probably show two-thirds going to defense support to include the pay and allowance of Vietnamese troops, construction of barracks, and similar items. The remainder, probably not exceeding \$50 million a year, has been directed towards the economic development of the country. Notable progress has been made in opening the road net closed by years of war so that commerce could again move. With American help, nearly a million refugees from the Communist terror are being resettled in South Vietnam, new lands are being cultivated and old lands reopened. This is particularly praiseworthy when one considers the lots of refugees in other parts of the world, such as the Middle East. American help has also brought new crops to Vietnam to permit a diversification of the old two-crop agricultural system. Fisheries have been established, providing livelihood for additional people, reducing the price of food, and creating a new export commodity.

The United States has assisted in the importing of equipment to renovate the industries destroyed during the long war and to establish new ones. In this category one finds textiles, plastics, clothing manufacture, rubber and tire processing, power generating facilities, assembly plants for vehicles, pharmaceutical processing plants, numerous secondary processing industries, and new home handicraft industries.

An industrial development center has been established looking forward to still further industrial expansion, and considerable aid has been given in the field of education, including the training of teachers, providing equipment for schools, and general advice to the Vietnamese Ministry of Education.

Despite all these advances, made under the brilliant leadership of President Ngo Dinh Diem, it is true that Vietnam must look to the free world for continuing assistance for some years to come. As a principal bastion of the free world, she must maintain forces adequate to defend herself and to act as a deterrent to Communist onslaughts in southeast Asia. The very presence of this force in being has created the stability that exists in Indochina, and it is interesting to note that the only place in the world where a Communist-occu-

pled area has been recovered by the free world is in Indochina. The two northern provinces of Laos were once under Communist rule, and only very recently has the free government of Laos been able to reestablish its control.

The United States is currently assisting South Vietnam in establishing a number of small radio stations and one medium-size station near the border of Communist North Vietnam, in an attempt to counteract the powerful and effective radio propaganda emanating from Communist North Vietnam and from Communist China. In Phnom Penh, Cambodia, there is now a powerful transmitter, given to the Cambodian Government by Communist China, with Communist technicians operating it, which comes strongly into South Vietnam with all its criticisms of the Vietnamese Government. From North Vietnam come also the powerful transmissions of the Communist forces, and there are many places in Vietnam where today only the voice of Vietnam's enemies can be heard. Radio Hanoi is now broadcasting the most violent hate America campaign, including such vile inventions as the story that American officers use helpless women and children as machine gun targets and for bayonet practice. It is essential that we move fast in assisting the Vietnamese in counteracting this situation, for Radio Hanoi in North Vietnam is joining Peking and Moscow as one of the three most powerful stations in the world.

Negotiations are underway in ICA, Washington, for purchase and delivery of a 50,000 watt medium wave station to be constructed in Hue in the northern portion of South Vietnam. This station will enable the South Vietnam Government to influence sympathetic Vietnamese north of the 17th parallel and counter the enemy propaganda.

In the Far East a grim struggle continues against communism, in Taiwan Straits, in Indonesia, in Burma. In this struggle Vietnam represents the only clearcut major victory for the free world in the last 5 years. This is an aid program which has paid dividends far beyond expectations and the United States can be proud of the results. Any efforts to diminish or disrupt this assistance could well lead to disaster not only to us but to the entire free world. I honestly believe Vietnam can be properly used as an example of how we should assist other new countries.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, my remarks should under no circumstances be taken as criticizing the conferees on the part of the House who, I am sure, did the best job capable in conference with the members from the other body on this bill. Nevertheless, I point out the rather remarkable fact that the House authorized a figure of \$3,542,600,000, the Senate amendment to the House bill was less than \$1 million in excess of that, and the conferees then came up with a figure of \$3,556,200,000 which is higher than the authorization figure either as it passed the House or as it passed the

Senate. I suppose that is possible, but it is rather remarkable, I think, that the conferees did increase the authorization figure of the bill both as it passed the House and also as it passed the Senate.

I would also like to point out to Members that in addition to the \$3.5 plus billion contained in the conference authorization, there is, for the purposes of the Development Loan Fund, an additional authorization of \$1.1 billion to be advanced prior to July 1, 1961. So, as I say, we are faced with an additional 2-year authorization for this program in excess of this \$3.5 billion plus figure which we are considering today.

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

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

Mr. BURLESON. I take it that explains why the conferees have actually agreed on a greater amount than that approved by the House or the other body.

Mr. BENTLEY. No. I think, if the gentleman from Texas will look at these figures, he will find that the figure as approved by the conferees is in excess of both the Senate and the House figure even without that \$1.1 billion to be authorized over the next 2 years.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman was complimentary to our conferees. I am complimentary to the conferees, and as I look at this report, which I have not had time to study, it seems to me that the conferees on the part of the House have done all the yielding. Here is a total figure in this report that is in excess of the House or the Senate figure. I just did not know that was done, but it is.

Mr. BENTLEY. I prefer to yield to the chairman if he desires to refer to that fact.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, if the gentleman will examine the table in the conference report, he will see, item by item, that the conferees stayed within the limitations of the two bills.

Mr. BENTLEY. But then how was the final figure in excess of both authorizations, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MORGAN. The final figure was in excess because the compromise figures arrived at added up that way.

Mr. BENTLEY. But it is not included in this \$1.1 billion advance authorization for the Development Loan Fund, is it?

Mr. MORGAN. No. That is not included.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman. As I say, I am sure the conferees of the House did the best job they could with the bill that passed the House, but obviously those of us who opposed the bill in the House would have no reason for changing our position now with this conference report.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the House can be proud of the works of its conference committee. It was a difficult conference, starting with 56 points in disagreement. It ended with all important differences resolved in our favor.

No conference is ever entirely one-sided, there has to be some give and take, especially when most of the take is on our side. That our conferees were such excellent traders is something we can feel extremely pleased with the results. I congratulate the chairman and those who accompanied him and this House for having men of tact, patience, and wisdom to serve on the conference committee for the mutual security bill.

(Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, what I have to say is certainly not to be construed as any criticism of the conferees on the part of the House. I think they have done the best job that they could. I particularly desire to commend them for their success in eliminating from the bill all direct borrowing from the Treasury, which has been frequently referred to on this floor as the back-door approach to the Treasury, because I think that was one of the most dangerous features of the bill. In my judgment it is one of the most dangerous tendencies that we are facing in the Congress today, and I know that some of the Members of the other body were very insistent on that approach in this bill.

I do want to call attention, however, to two things in the bill. I have always voted for the mutual security bill, although I have tried to hold the appropriations down to a reasonable minimum. I find it difficult now, however, to convince myself that this is the time for new programs. It seems to me that the time has come when the program should be tapering off, and we should be cutting down activities instead of embarking on new programs. Yet, there are two entirely new programs in this bill. One is to be found on page 11, International Cooperation in Health. We did not have that in the House bill. It never came before the House. Yet here we are entering upon a brandnew program without a committee of the House having had any opportunity whatever to study it, to consider it, to pass upon it.

We are already spending approximately \$85 million a year for health activities under this program. We contribute nearly \$5 million a year to the World Health Organization of the United Nations. Now this new program is proposed. Let me read it to you:

The Congress of the United States recognizes that large areas of the world are being ravaged by diseases and other health deficiencies which are causing widespread suffering, debility, and death, and are seriously

detracting the efforts of peoples in such areas to develop their resources and productive capacities and to improve their living conditions. The Congress also recognizes that international efforts are needed to assist such peoples in bringing diseases and other health deficiencies under control, in preventing their spread or reappearance, and in eliminating their basic causes. Accordingly, the Congress affirms that it is the policy of the United States to accelerate its efforts to encourage and support international cooperation in programs directed toward the conquest of diseases and other health deficiencies.

It is true they do not ask for any direct appropriation to implement the program, but they do provide that \$2 million may be taken from the contingency fund. We have heard how costly socialized medicine is in England. I am afraid once we begin this program, we will soon be trying to establish a program of socialized medicine for the entire world. I think it is a very dangerous step.

In the second place, section 601 provides—and here is another new program:

The purpose of this chapter is to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific (hereinafter referred to as "the East") through cooperative study and research, by establishing in Hawaii a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, either as a branch of an existing institution of higher learning or as a separate institution, where scholars and students, in various fields from the nations of the East and the Western World may meet, study, exchange ideas and views, and conduct other activities primarily in support of the objectives of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, and title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 and other acts promoting the international educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States.

That contemplates the establishment of a school. It contemplates grants, fellowships, and scholarships and various other inducements, because, the law says, we must make it attractive so people will attend the school.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to embark upon programs of this kind, at least they should have the consideration and the study of a House committee. That has not been done in this instance.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to ask the gentleman this question, since he participated in redrafting section 505(b) when this legislation was before the House. Just what changes are made in the Senate version of this proposal to divert the payment of interest and principal on loans that now are coming into the Treasury to the Redevelopment Fund, in counterpart funds? Just what did the Senate do to the House bill in that respect?

Mr. GARY. It is my understanding that the use of any funds now has to be authorized by the Congress under regular appropriation procedures. They are not permitted to use those funds unless they are so authorized in appropriation bills. The chairman of the committee has so stated.

Mr. BAILEY. The bill as it is right now provides that U.S. dollars are received in repayment of principal and in the payment of interest and that any repayments made under this section shall be deposited in "Miscellaneous receipts" of the Treasury. That seems to be a Senate amendment. That was not in the original bill. That is a good gesture, but that is all it is, because none of those nations will pay its obligations in American money when they can do it in their own currency.

Mr. GARY. When it is paid into the Treasury, it has to be appropriated out of the Treasury, which is as it should be.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I share the distinguished gentleman's concern about these two new programs. It could be somewhat like the Development Loan Fund, which started off very low and then first thing you know, it was doubled and tripled. It is my understanding that last year the House passed a \$300 million appropriation for the Development Loan Fund. Then, at a subsequent date, they had a \$150 million supplemental appropriation. But, this year there is \$700 million in the bill authorized for fiscal year 1960, which is double the amount the House approved last year. But, in addition, thereto you have an authorization calling for \$1,100 million to be appropriated for some future date. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the full committee if it is his understanding with reference to this Development Loan Fund that notwithstanding the fact we made a lot of fuss about the supplemental a few weeks ago, actually, the agency finished the year with \$225,496,000 in the Development Loan Fund unobligated. Now, they did claim that they had committed \$212 million, but they actually had unobligated \$225 million. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, we have no information about the supplemental appropriation and how those funds were obligated because our hearings closed before the supplemental appropriation bill was signed by the President.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a clarification? Is it not true that out of the appropriation total for the fiscal year 1959, both regular and supplemental, on June 30 they had \$225 million unobligated in the Development Loan Fund?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman deals every day with these figures. If he so states I am willing to take his word as to their accuracy.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield himself time?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. JUDD. I think the point here hinges on the use of the word "obligated." In the Development Loan Fund when they enter a certain stage in the negotiations on a contract, if it is going to cost \$5 million, they reserve \$5 million.

It is not obligated and it will not be until a contract is finally signed. But, the \$5 million is tied up for that program until the negotiations are completed or they fall through. So it may be correct when the gentleman says \$225 million were unobligated, but when they are in process of negotiation, they are committed and are not free to be used or programmed for any other purpose.

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

In fact, you only spent about \$50 million out of all the money we have given. I am only trying to establish the fact that you actually had \$225 million unobligated and you had not gone into the matter of contracts far enough to the point that you could even reserve the funds.

Mr. JUDD. The administrators of the Development Loan Fund did exactly what we asked them to do. We asked them to be very careful and to study these things very thoroughly before signing on the dotted line. And I commend them for doing that.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to put a question or two either to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee or to the conferees on the minority side. By this conference report, we have authorized military assistance expenditures for 2 years hence. Is that correct?

Mr. JUDD. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. What was the feeling of the conferees with respect to the question as to who and what committee and under what circumstances would hear evidence concerning the military program before it went to the appropriations committee.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman will recall that the other body had a provision giving a permanent authorization for military assistance so that the Pentagon would never again have to come back to our committee. We opposed that. We finally settled on a 2-year authorization beyond the current fiscal year, as an experiment. We made it perfectly clear that each year the Defense Department must come to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body and present their case for military assistance just as they have had to do heretofore, and that legislation on policy matters will be recommended and presented to the House in the mutual security bill just as is done now. There will always be in our bill a title I, dealing with military assistance, but it will not have in it a figure as to the amount that can be authorized. That will be determined for those 2 experimental years by the Committee on Appropriations. At the end of that time, they will have to come back to the regular authorizing committees to explain how it has worked out and we will decide what we do from there on.

Mr. ADAIR. And, in the meantime, in the opinion of the gentleman, if it is thought to be necessary, could this provision of the law be rewritten and changed?

Mr. JUDD. On page 19, we have this statement:

It was the consensus of the managers on the part of the House and the Senate that on the basis of such continuous review the Congress might at any time deem it appropriate to reestablish annual dollar authorizations for military assistance.

So if we do not like its operations by next year, we can put a ceiling on appropriations in the authorizing legislation.

Mr. ADAIR. So it was the view of the conferees that this action related only to dollar values in the bill?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. ADAIR. And in nowise would decrease the information on and study of the program by the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was late getting to the House floor from a subcommittee meeting in which we heard certain witnesses from the International Cooperation Administration. At the hearing we learned there among other things that this country has between 30 and 40 people still in Iraq where the giveaway program has been halted for many months. Apparently Kassem does not want our hand-outs.

These 30 to 40 employees draw hardship allowances in Iraq in addition to regular pay and other allowances and are being maintained there until they can be reassigned. I must say that that is a most extravagant and nonsensical operation.

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

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. I want to associate myself with the statement the gentleman has just made. I was at the same committee hearing. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] mentioned new authority with regard to International Cooperation and Health Organization. I suppose embarking on that means that we will have a hospital construction program without limit.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and the witnesses appearing before our subcommittee indicated that they are anticipating just that, because they testified they would have to put more people on the ICA payroll. They are anticipating that, as well as other expansions. It is high time some agency of Government put an end to such crookedness in the foreign giveaway program as permitting one employee to purchase a \$600, 1947 model

Cadillac in New Jersey, ship it thousands of miles to Laos at Government expense, and then sell it to an official of an American construction company in Laos, which was the recipient of International Cooperation Administration contracts, for some \$2,000. This 1947 Cadillac was apparently inoperable at the time and when an investigation of this deal was started it was cut up with welding torches and the pieces dropped down a well to get it out of sight.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The program for the next fiscal year contemplates a 15 percent increase in program personnel.

Mr. GROSS. That is right, and this bill as it is before us today would embark this Nation on a worldwide hospital and medical care program, the cost of which no one can estimate. Here also is the start of a so-called cultural center in Hawaii, the ultimate cost of which is unknown. In view of the financial situation in this country, how utterly stupid can we get? I am completely and unalterably opposed to this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield so that I may ask the gentleman from Iowa a question?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman from Virginia commented on chapter 6. The gentleman from Iowa also referred to chapter 6, but no one has read the provisions of section 603 under that chapter which seem to me to be an authorization without any limitation whatsoever.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. This authorization was inserted by the other body. There had to be some compromises. We insisted on our Inspector General and we accepted their provision for a study of this proposed new program. It is for a study only. There is authorization for funds to make a plan and propose a program. There is no authorization for funds to carry it out.

Mr. JONAS. But it is an authorization without limitation. It reads: "There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter."

Mr. JUDD. That is right, to prepare a plan and a program.

Mr. JONAS. Does not the gentleman think there should be some limitation?

Mr. JUDD. How much should it be? It is for a study to be submitted next January.

Mr. JONAS. I do not approve the issuance of blank checks to any agency.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] referred to a new program in the mutual security bill described in the conference report before us. As a matter of fact, there are numerous new programs in-

involved in this measure. A new one is to be found on page 23 of the conference report. You will find it under the heading "United Nations Technical Assistance Program." It provides for \$100 million, to which the United States contributes 40 percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our colleagues of the Foreign Affairs Committee who served as conferees will tell you that this is not a new program, but a substitute for the rejected and discredited SUNFED program. Our representatives to the United Nations rejected SUNFED, but agreed to this program which is its successor, if not SUNFED itself in another guise.

The United Nations Technical Assistance Program is headed by Mr. Paul Hoffman, who in a recent speech said we should spend \$3 billion in the next 5 years on projects determined by United Nations personnel under this program. In a more recent speech in the city of Detroit, he said we should spend \$30 billion over the next 10 years for this purpose.

Now, insofar as I am able to determine, the purpose of the present authorization is to send people all over the world to seek programs for which this \$3 billion or \$10 billion can be spent. It says they are to seek ways and means for developing human and material resources of less developed nations. In other words, we do not already have enough people seeking projects to foster on nations which, in many instances, cannot afford them and which in many instances have had their economy upset by overspending, but we are creating a new agency for the same purpose. The only difference in these numerous other programs and this new one is, at least, it is American personnel who discovers and recommends projects. In the case of the United Nations technical assistance program, not one U.S. citizen is in the organization except Mr. Paul Hoffman. The others have a radical Socialist background from England, Canada, France, and the West Indies. Not one American who actually does the work is involved. You accept this sort of thing when you vote for this conference report.

I wish time would permit to go into this matter more thoroughly, but I also want to call your attention to another new program, which is the very last item in the conference report.

Some months ago the President of the United States proclaimed an International Refugee Year, beginning July 1, 1959. We are now 3 weeks in the International Refugee Year, and in this bill we are authorizing \$10 million to support it in some way or other. Seemingly, there is no explanation as to how the \$10 million is to be spent, but nevertheless it is provided in this bill.

An announced candidate for the Presidency of the United States sponsored the amendment in the other body, and our conferees have accepted it. No explanation has been given to the House, and I certainly think we are entitled to have one.

There are bills pending in both bodies of this Congress which, if passed, will circumvent our immigration laws, and

the proclamation of the President for an International Refugee Year plus the \$10 million provided in this bill for some vague purpose, will have the result of opening up our doors to people who can not otherwise gain entry into this country under present immigration laws. I know of no better way to weaken and wreck our immigration laws than to accept such a proposition.

Mr. Speaker, the American Legion legislative bulletin dated July 13, 1959, presents a very excellent discussion on this subject. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the following, and I quote:

The motivation behind the pleas and demands for the admission of more and more immigrants through changes in basic laws * * * or one after the other of the special laws that bring to this country hundreds of thousands of persons in addition to the regular flow of immigration—like the Displaced Persons Act right after World War II, or the Refugee Act of more recent vintage, and many other public and private acts * * * is not too difficult to understand. We appreciate that many well-intentioned persons seek these changes out of the goodness in their hearts—through a desire to aid humanity. But for the most part we think it is prompted by the personal desires of countless individuals who have emigrated in this country and who have now become so strong in politics that they are in positions to demand immigration-liberalizing legislation from their representatives in Congress as well as from most every other echelon of government—from the Nation's Capitol down through the State offices to the local wards. That is how we see it. The problem increases in size and scope, like a snowball rolling downhill.

We hear a great deal about the need for humane consideration of the separated families. Practically every pro-immigration speech contains reference to these separated families and that we must, in the name of all that is good, liberalize the laws so the families can be reunited. Few of the speeches, if any, tell you how most of the separations came about. It works something like this: Consider any country with an immigration quota to the United States, and remember that quota-immigrants may not exceed the number assigned by us to that particular country. So one of its citizens wants to come over here for permanent residence; he applies for a visa, and if he meets the necessary health and individual responsibility tests and comes within the quota for the year, the visa is granted. Now suppose the man has a wife and children. He has but one visa and cannot bring his family but he chooses to come alone. There is a separated family.

It seems reasonable and logical that the above person might better have applied for visas for his entire family and thus avoided separation but in a great many cases it does not work that way. That would be too limiting. On the contrary it seems almost a plot that heads of families come alone—filling the quotas that way—then depending on the warmth of American hearts and the effectiveness of politicians, etc., to reunite the families in spite of basic immigration laws and the controlling quotas. In the past, like in the pioneer days of the development of our west, it was understandable that the men folk of the families went forth to make a way for the remainder who would follow. But now things are different. In the first place a quota immigrant is not given a visa until our officials are assured that he has a job, a sponsor, or independent wealth. His economic future is pretty well assured before he leaves his home country; the need for his coming alone has largely been dissipated.

Now let us survey some of the facts on immigration.

In the year 1958 more than 253,000 immigrants entered the United States for permanent residence. Of these 102,000 were on the basis of quotas. The annual quota for all countries was and still is 154,957. This means nearly 53,000 quotas are unfilled * * * remember this figure as we discuss it later. Unfilled quota countries are largely in northern Europe, with Great Britain using the least of its assigned numbers. Western Hemisphere immigrants are on a nonquota basis except certain Asiatics who must obtain visas charged against the quota allotted to the country of their forebears. In 1958 North and South America contributed 91,827 nonquota immigrants. Subtracting this number from the 253,000-odd who entered we find that 161,438 quota and nonquota immigrants from Europe and Asia joined us in the last year * * * against a quota of about 155,000. Had the quotas been filled our total for 1958 would have been 306,000.

What are some of the legislative proposals now being pushed so hard in Congress?

Some of the most prominent measures would provide that unused quotas be reallocated on a prorata basis to other countries. This would immediately mean that our immigration would be increased by more than 50,000 annually * * * taking us over the 300,000 figure.

But that is not all. Some of the prominent proposals would change the 1920 census base for the national origins quota system to the 1950 census which would mean an increase in the quotas by about 65,000. This, added to the present quota of about 155,000, would total 220,000.

So, the two proposals * * * reallocation of unused quotas—53,000 * * * and the new quota increase of 65,000, would add 118,000 to the present rate of immigration, or an annual total of 371,000.

Now watch this: In addition to the foregoing there is strong urging in Congress that we set up a permanent refugee program to provide for an additional 60,000 per year—over and above the potential 371,000 already discussed. This makes a new total of 431,000.

Even this is not enough. Aided by a White House Conference on Refugees, earlier this year which represents the United States' part in a "World Refugee Year," it is urged that Congress provide for an additional 20,000 refugees during the next 2 years, for a grand total of 451,000. The World Refugee Year program is now being propagandized all over the United States.

All the proponents of this type legislation point to the need for the United States to do its share in accepting and encouraging the immigration of refugees and those from the overpopulated areas. All claim that it will be for the good of America, economically, socially, and from a foreign relations point of view. None appears to worry about our ability to absorb the extra immigration.

Population statisticians now estimate that the U.S. population in the year 2000 will be from 330 to 350 million. Presumably that is based on natural growth plus the present immigration flow. The year 2000 is only 41 years ahead. How will the natural resources within our own borders stack up to the needs of that many people? And what about the years after 2000? Will the bare necessities of water and land be sufficient, or will we be like other overpopulated countries of the world? Today the cry is for more schools—more hospitals, and more of many other things that makes America the place that so many now want to come to. Do we need to artificially increase our population by liberalizing our immigration policies?

Have you ever done the arithmetic to figure out what effect immigration has on the population growth of this country? The current population growth in the United States is

1.7 percent per year. Let's assume that in 1960 we get 450,000 immigrants. If we add 1.7 percent to that figure, compounded annually, we arrive at a total in excess of 867,000 by the year 2000—only 41 years from now. That calculation does not include any immigration after 1960. We have seen figures based on 350,000 immigrants each year from 1960 to the year 2000, to which is added 1.7 percent annual growth. The cumulative total exceeds 20 million. This is something to think about.

It is no longer universally popular to speak out for the good of America and its future—there are many cross currents which at times seem to place individuals' motives and desires above the security and welfare of our country. The American Legion has consistently and courageously too, we believe—raised its voice in opposition to proposals, trends, and events which were considered to be detrimental to our national welfare. We believe the present flow of immigration to this country is the maximum that can be equitably assimilated in even such short-range program as one ending in the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of thing is the best way I know to discredit the worthwhile things contained in this bill. I would like to support a measure for world cooperation with other free peoples and do everything possible to assist the less developed areas to remain free and develop their physical and human resources, but I am not going to be a party to fostering activities on them which are repugnant to our own country. Not only is it being done by such programs as these, and particularly the first one mentioned, but those activities which will result under the provisions of the Development Loan Fund. I wish there was opportunity to again discuss the Development Loan Fund, which in my humble opinion is a subterfuge in its rankest form.

I hope there are enough votes to reject the conference report.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman one question. I originally supported this bill with some reservations. Naturally, we cannot have a bill that we all agree with in every detail. But since that time the matter of nuclear weapon agreements has come up in connection with seven countries. Two of these agreements have already gone into effect without our being able to discuss them on the floor. No matter what effort I and others have made to oppose these agreements or to have them discussed and voted on the floor, four other agreements will go into effect on Saturday.

My question is, do you know how many million dollars will be used in this appropriation to implement these agreements?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think that is involved unless it is involved in military money for the NATO organization.

Mr. MEYER. I would assume that several hundred million dollars would probably be involved in providing for this nuclear weapons assistance.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD].

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to commend the House conferees

for accepting the item which was alluded to a moment ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON]. On page 37 there is an item of \$10 million for the World Refugee Year which was not in the House bill. I feel that this is a very important item.

In my public service work I have studied this problem and I can see the urgency of it. I wish to take this time to suggest to the President that he makes certain that this money is available in the work of the World Refugee Year program, a very vital program. I feel certain that that sentiment is expressed by not only the Members of this House but by all Americans, to make certain that we do enter into this program and that we do speak in behalf of those people who are downtrodden and the homeless refugees that have literally been shifted from one place to another. It is only now that a real and a vital program during a peacetime year is being undertaken so that the plight of the refugee is enhanced to the small degree that the plight of the refugee is enhanced to the small degree that these moneys are going to allow.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this relatively modest amount of money which can be the means of substantially reducing the human misery of the thousands of refugees holding on to existence in desolate camps and circumstances throughout our world will be not simply available, but will, at the President's discretion, be actually employed for this purpose. Such action is surely a minimal expression of our genuine concern for those homeless persons who but for geography and the grace of God might include you and me.

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. ADAIR), there were—ayes 81, noes 35.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 257, nays 153, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—257

Addonizio	Barry	Boyle
Albert	Bass, N.H.	Brademas
Anderson,	Bates	Breeding
Mont.	Becker	Brewster
Anfuso	Beckworth	Brooks, Tex.
Arends	Blatnik	Broomfield
Aspinall	Boggs	Broyhill
Avery	Boland	Buckley
Ayres	Bolling	Burdick
Baker	Bolton	Burke, Ky.
Baldwin	Bonner	Burke, Mass.
Barrett	Bowles	Bush

12782

Byrnes, Pa.
 Byrnes, Wis.
 Cahill
 Carnahan
 Carter
 Chamberlain
 Chipperfield
 Clark
 Coad
 Coffin
 Cohelan
 Conte
 Cook
 Cooley
 Corbett
 Cramer
 Curtin
 Curtis, Mass.
 Daddario
 Dague
 Daniels
 Davis, Tenn.
 Dawson
 Delaney
 Derounian
 Diggs
 Dingell
 Dixon
 Dollinger
 Donohue
 Dooley
 Dorn, N. Y.
 Doyle
 Dulski
 Durham
 Dwyer
 Edmondson
 Elliott
 Evins
 Fallon
 Farbstein
 Fawcett
 Feighan
 Fenton
 Fino
 Flood
 Flynn
 Fogarty
 Foley
 Forand
 Ford
 Frazier
 Frelinghuysen
 Friedel
 Fulton
 Gallagher
 Garmatz
 Glaimo
 Glenn
 Goodell
 Granahan
 Green, Oreg.
 Green, Pa.
 Griffin
 Griffiths
 Gubser
 Hagen
 Halleck
 Halpern
 Hardy
 Hays
 Healey
 Hebert
 Hechler
 Hess

Hollifield
 Holland
 Holtzman
 Horan
 Huddleston
 Ikard
 Irwin
 Jarman
 Johnson, Calif.
 Johnson, Md.
 Johnson, Wis.
 Jones, Ala.
 Judd
 Karsten
 Karth
 Kasein
 Kastanmeyer
 Kee
 Keith
 Keogh
 Kilday
 King, Calif.
 King, Utah
 Kirwan
 Kluczynski
 Kowalski
 Lafore
 Lane
 Langen
 Lanford
 Lesinski
 Levering
 Libonati
 Lindsay
 Loser
 McCormack
 McDowell
 McFall
 McGovern
 Macdonald
 Machrowicz
 Mack, Ill.
 Madden
 Magnuson
 Mahon
 Mailliard
 Marshall
 Martin
 May
 Meader
 Merrow
 Metcalf
 Miller
 Miller, George P.
 Miller, N. Y.
 Milliken
 Mills
 Moeller
 Monagan
 Montoya
 Moorhead
 Morgan
 Morris, N. Mex.
 Moss
 Multer
 Murphy
 Natcher
 Nelsen
 Nix
 Norblad
 O'Brien, Ill.
 O'Brien, N. Y.

O'Hara, Ill.
 O'Hara, Mich.
 O'Neill
 Oliver
 Osmer
 Ostertag
 Pelly
 Perkins
 Philbin
 Pillion
 Pirnie
 Porter
 Price
 Prokop
 Pucinski
 Quie
 Quigley
 Rains
 Randall
 Reuss
 Rhodes, Pa.
 Riehlman
 Rivers, Alaska
 Roberts
 Robison
 Rodino
 Rogers, Colo.
 Rogers, Mass.
 Rooney
 Roosevelt
 Rostenkowski
 Santangelo
 Saund
 Schenck
 Schwengel
 Selden
 Shelley
 Sheppard
 Shipley
 Sisk
 Slack
 Smith, Iowa
 Smith, Miss.
 Spence
 Springer
 Staggers
 Stratton
 Stubblefield
 Sullivan
 Teague, Calif.
 Teller
 Thompson, N. J.
 Thornberry
 Toll
 Tollefson
 Trimble
 Udall
 Ullman
 Vanik
 Van Zandt
 Vinson
 Vinson
 Voinwright
 Wallhauser
 Walter
 Watts
 Weis
 Westland
 Widnall
 Wier
 Wolf
 Wright
 Yates
 Zablocki
 Zelenko

McCulloch
 McDonough
 McGinley
 McIntire
 McMillan
 McSween
 Mack, Wash.
 Mason
 Matthews
 Meyer
 Michel
 Minshall
 Mitchell
 Moore
 Morris, Okla.
 Morrison
 Moulder
 Mumma
 Murray
 Norrell
 O'Konski
 Passman
 Patman

Pfost
 Plicher
 Poage
 Poff
 Preston
 Ray
 Reece, Tenn.
 Rees, Kans.
 Rhodes, Ariz.
 Riley
 Rivers, S. C.
 Rogers, Fla.
 Rogers, Tex.
 Roush
 Rutherford
 Saylor
 Scherer
 Short
 Sikes
 Siler
 Simpson, Ill.
 Simpson, Pa.
 Smith, Calif.

Smith, Kans.
 Smith, Va.
 Steed
 Taber
 Teague, Tex.
 Thomas
 Thompson, Tex.
 Thomson, Wyo.
 Tuck
 Utt
 Van Pelt
 Wampler
 Weaver
 Wharton
 Whitener
 Whitten
 Williams
 Willis
 Winstead
 Withrow
 Young

NOT VOTING—24

Alger
 Ashley
 Auchincloss
 Baring
 Baumhart
 Boykin
 Brown, Mo.
 Canfield

Celler
 Forrester
 Gray
 Jackson
 Johnson, Colo.
 Jones, Mo.
 Kearns
 Kilburn

Powell
 Rabaut
 St. George
 Scott
 Taylor
 Thompson, La.
 Wilson
 Younger

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
 Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Gray against.
 Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Forrester against.
 Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Scott against.
 Mr. Baumhart for, with Mr. Alger against.
 Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Baring against.
 Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.
 Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Brown of Missouri against.

Until further notice:
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Kilburn.
 Mr. Johnson of Colorado with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. CAHILL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'BRIEN of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ATTACHMENT AND GARNISHMENT OF WAGES, SALARIES, AND COMMISSIONS OF JUDGMENT DEBTORS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 836) to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions of judgment debtors, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
 The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 7, line 16, strike out debtor and insert "employer-garnishee".
 Page 8, strike out line 19, and insert "section 1104A"); and".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank Judge Kronheim and Judge Walsh, of the District Municipal Court, for their untiring efforts in assisting the House District Committee in enacting H.R. 836, having for its purpose amending the present Garnishee Act.

Judge Kronheim and Judge Walsh called to my attention on numerous occasions the abuses of the Garnishee Act by certain merchants here in the District of Columbia. I have learned after investigation that certain merchants in the District of Columbia were making a collecting agency out of the municipal court under the provisions of the present Garnishee Act. I have never heard of any act on the statute books that has been as badly abused as the present Garnishee Act, and it is a pleasure for me to have a part in amending this act so that the unfortunate poor people in the District of Columbia will not be imposed upon by any Federal act that is on the statute books.

Again, I want to congratulate and thank Judge Kronheim and Judge Walsh for their assistance to my committee in having this legislation enacted. I am reliably advised that the majority of the time of two or three municipal court judges has been utilized during the past few years in collecting claims for the merchants of the District of Columbia under the present Garnishee Act.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF CHAPTER 73—ANNUITIES BASED ON RETIRED OR RETAINER PAY, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 1444, title 10, United States Code, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Fourth Annual Report on the Administration of Chapter 73, Annuities Based on Retired or Retainer Pay, Title 10, United States Code.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
 THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 1959.

Abbt
 Abernethy
 Adair
 Alexander
 Alford
 Allen
 Andersen, Minn.
 Andrews
 Ashmore
 Bailey
 Barden
 Barr
 Bass, Tenn.
 Belcher
 Bennett, Fla.
 Bennett, Mich.
 Bentley
 Berry
 Betts
 Blitch
 Bosch
 Bow
 Bray
 Brock
 Brooks, La.
 Brown, Ga.
 Brown, Ohio
 Budge

Burleson
 Cannon
 Casey
 Cederberg
 Chelf
 Chenoweth
 Church
 Collier
 Colmer
 Cunningham
 Curtis, Mo.
 Davis, Ga.
 Dent
 Denton
 Derwinski
 Devine
 Dorn, S. C.
 Dowdy
 Downing
 Everett
 Fisher
 Flynn
 Fountain
 Gary
 Gathings
 Gavin
 George
 Grant
 Gross

Haley
 Hall
 Hargis
 Harmon
 Harris
 Harrison
 Hemphill
 Henderson
 Herlong
 Hiestand
 Hoeven
 Hoffman, Ill.
 Hoffman, Mich.
 Hogan
 Holt
 Hosmer
 Hull
 Jennings
 Jensen
 Johansen
 Jonas
 Kilgore
 Kitchin
 Knox
 Laird
 Landrum
 Latta
 Lennon
 Lipscomb

NAYS—153

Freedom Filz Buente
12743
2 cys.

Let us either extend the orphans' immigration program for a period of 1 year as it existed previously, in order that we may have the opportunity to study the matter further, or let us provide an amendment that is truly effective.

In my opinion a truly effective amendment would be that of vesting the check of adoptive homes not in the Attorney General, but in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which is primarily concerned with the health and well-being of our Nation and which, with its regional offices and experience in functioning in cooperation with welfare agencies throughout the country and abroad, is best qualified to determine that the right children are placed in the right homes. It is true that innocent children brought here from foreign countries deserve the same measure of protection as do those adopted children born in this country, and it is my sincere belief that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is best qualified to undertake this serious responsibility.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I entirely agree with the Senator from Oregon. I very much hope that the conferees will pay serious attention to the human welfare issue which is involved, and will vest authority in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, if it is to be vested in any Government agency.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the support of the Senator from New York.

The record should show that the Senator from New York is a man who, from professional experience in this field, knows whereof he speaks. I happen to know something about the record of the Senator from New York in connection with the subject of adoption, and I am greatly gratified, and feel that my case has been greatly strengthened by the support of the Senator from New York.

For the RECORD, Mr. President, this is the time for me to say this. I wish to make very clear, in view of some of the mail I have received from my home State, that the senior Senator from Oregon is in no way seeking to prevent the great program of adoption of Korean war orphans which has been carried on by a fine family of humanitarians in my State, Mr. and Mrs. Holt. For the past several years, they have gone to Korea, and have adopted, by proxy for American adoption parents, a large number of Korean orphans, many of whom, as I understand, in fact most of whom, are the children of American veterans who served in the Armed Forces in Korea.

It has been said, Mr. President, because the senior Senator from Oregon has supported the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare program for all adoptions that at least one of the adopting parents see the child before he or she in fact is adopted, that I am undermining this great humanitarian program of the Holts. That is not my intention. However, in my judgment, I have a duty as a U.S. Senator, to look

at adoption policy problems nationwide, and do so without reference to any specific individual program, wonderful as it may be, such as that the Holts have been conducting. I have no doubt that the Holts have been very successful in carrying out the desires of the adopting parents by selecting children the parents probably would have accepted anyway had they seen them in the first instance.

In my opinion the remedy is not to continue the proxy procedure indefinitely, but the remedy is to work out a procedure under which the Holts could bring the children to the United States and give the prospective parents an opportunity to see them before the final adoption is arranged. Thereafter, in a given case if a prospective adopting parent should say, "Well, I prefer not to have that child," every effort should be made to have some other prospective adopting parent see the child and adopt it in the United States.

Mr. President, I think that has such a good procedural merit that it can be worked out. However I do not believe we ought to sacrifice what the evidence shows very clearly is a needed general policy recommended by government officials simply because a magnificent job has been done by way of the proxy procedure followed so successfully in respect to the Korean enterprise. Officials of the Government who have presented us evidence on this matter point out that in regard to other adoptions there have been many cases which have not worked out as well as have the Holt adoptions.

So I am suggesting to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, first, that in the conference he should try to get the House conferees to at least shift the so-called inspection function to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because that is the agency of government which really has jurisdiction over our whole children's program. Second, I should like to have language in some way, somehow, written into the bill, so that the kind of project the Holts are conducting can be carried on procedurally by allowing them to bring the children over to the United States to some central point, such as San Francisco or Portland, and then have the prospective adopting parents complete the adoption there on the basis of their inspection of a given child, and their decision then that the child is one they really want.

If a given child is rejected on this side of the water, I do not think there will be any difficulty in finding many other adopting parents who would be glad to have the particular child. I think the officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are right in the position they have taken that there should be a general rule that at least one of the adopting parents ought to see the child before the adoption papers are completed.

Mr. President, that is the burden of the argument I desired to make for the RECORD, because my position is badly misunderstood in the State of Oregon on the part of those who feel that I should not be raising any question about proxy adoptions.

Proxy adoptions, as a matter of public policy, without at least one of the adopting parents seeing the particular child and agreeing to take it in my opinion lead to a great many mistakes and abuses, to which the Federal officials have already testified.

I yield to the Senator from New York. Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I merely desire to say to the Senator from Mississippi that I favor the Senate bill for a 1-year extension of the articulation of the rules within that time, because we really need to take it under consideration. But I agree with my colleague from Oregon, if we must accept anything from the House, we should certainly vest the jurisdiction in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. I agree, if we cannot have the 1-year extension. That is what we passed in the Senate. That is what I voted for. If we cannot have the 1-year extension of the present program so that we can go into the procedural questions I have raised, then at least we ought to try to get an agreement that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will administer the program.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. KEATING conferees on the part of the Senate.

A NEW KIND OF WAR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as one of the coauthors of the legislation proposed to establish a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy to train citizens in the conspiratorial techniques of communism and the most effective methods to meet this new type of political warfare, I call the attention of Senators to an important article on the cold war struggle written by Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion.

Speaking as the leader of one of our great veterans' organizations, Commander Moore's comments are both significant and enlightening as to the new challenges confronting this Nation.

Commander Moore most capably puts his finger on one of our major problems in the ideological struggle against Communist tyranny, the fact that as a whole, we, the American people, fail to understand the strategy employed against us by the Kremlin leaders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the excellent article written by Commander Moore and published in the August issue of American Legion magazine.

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

WE MUST LEARN TO FIGHT A NEW KIND OF WAR
(By Preston J. Moore, national commander, the American Legion)

No one knows better than a veteran that the methods of waging war do not remain

12744

the same. The man who fought in the trenches in World War I and then as a "re-tread" in World War II found himself fighting an entirely new kind of war. The World War II vet who was called back to fight in Korea learned that the warfare there was different in many important respects, notably in certain strange concepts of strategy.

More than a century ago a famous military writer, Clausewitz, described the changing concept of war in a series of books that have become classics. As a youth Clausewitz had fought in wars that were almost idyllic. Peasants plowed their fields as battles raged a short distance away, and as soldiers died in those battles, burghers in nearby towns carried on their business as usual. But Clausewitz saw that situation changing, and we have been living through the change he predicted and discussed.

One of the key phrases in his works is this: "War is nothing else than the continuation of state policy by different means."

In other words, no longer do two mighty armies face each other on a field and, at a given signal and with a flourish of trumpets, join battle. Warfare is subtler and more abstract, the front is everywhere, and whatever can hurt the enemy is permissible as a weapon.

All of us have seen this terrible evolution of warfare. We are familiar with the way in which Hitler used various kinds of pressure and persecution to force the capitulation of his weaker neighbors. We saw how Japan, without any formal declaration of war, evolved its greater east Asia coprosperity sphere. We certainly have not forgotten how the interplay of political pressures between the United States and Japan culminated in the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. And since the end of World War II we have seen in the actions of the Soviet Union the greatest demonstration of all in the way of brutal, relentless war.

In 13 years we have seen how Soviet Russia has absorbed 17 nations into its bloody empire, and we are well aware that today one-third of all the people on earth—923 million—are now arrayed against us in what the Communists have always referred to as "the final struggle" between communism and the free world. In not a single case did the conspirators in the Kremlin formally declare war against the countries they took over. Instead they employed espionage, treason, sabotage, political blackmail, threats, persecution, murder, and other methods that decent people abhor. Even though their methods are treacherous and evil, they did get results. It is time that we understood those methods and how they are being used against us; to fail to do so is to go under without realizing what happened to us.

Actually, there is no reason why there should be any misunderstanding as to our true relations with the Soviet Union. No one will dispute the fact that Nikita Khrushchev is the boss Communist, and that what he says is law. When Khrushchev tells us that he intends to bury us, he is merely reminding us in a few words of a basic premise of Communist doctrine. Years ago Lenin spelled it out in the following statement:

"Marxists have never forgotten that violence will be an inevitable accompaniment of the collapse of capitalism * * * and of the birth of a socialist society. And this violence will cover a historical period; a whole era of wars of the most varied kinds—imperialist wars, civil wars within the country, the interweaving of the former with the latter, national wars, the emancipation of the nationalists crushed by the imperialist powers which will inevitably form various alliances with each other in the era of vast state-capitalist and military trusts and combines. This is an era of tremendous collapses, of wholesale military decisions of a violent nature, of crises.

It has already begun. We see it clearly—it is only the beginning."

We in America must see this picture just as clearly as the Communist master strategist did, and we must see it in relation to our own personal affairs. This is a matter that we must recognize and help solve as individuals. We cannot pass the buck to the State and go on the assumption that if we allow our politicians to spend enough money on foreign aid and armament, the unpleasant picture painted by Lenin will automatically disappear.

The new kind of war is not fought that way. We cannot—like the peasants and burghers of the 18th century—unconcernedly watch soldiers dying as we plow our fields and engage in trade. We are directly involved in war right now, regardless of what our business is, where we are located, and what station in life we occupy. And keep in mind that it is official—this war was declared when Marxism began, and it is now rapidly approaching the showdown stage, "the final struggle," as various manifestations of war erupt in Berlin, Iraq, Tibet, Latin America, Africa, and elsewhere.

A few weeks ago the biggest and blackest headlines in our newspapers dealt with Berlin, and by the time this article appears in print it is quite likely that Berlin will again be the world's greatest danger spot. Khrushchev has served notice on us that if we want access to Berlin, we must deal with his puppet East German regime; and he has been told without equivocation that this we will not do. The Russian action means the breaking of another treaty, but this is a matter of no consequence to a people who are pathologically insistent on signing treaties of no worth whatsoever. From our standpoint, to give up Berlin would mean the end of the allied position not only in Berlin but throughout the world. It would dramatize a point that the reds constantly try to prove to the rest of the world: that the United States is weak, vacillating, and cannot be counted on. As a corollary, the writing off of Berlin would mean the end of NATO.

While the Berlin crisis was diverting the world, the Communists pulled another coup by seizing power in Iraq. This highly strategic, oil-rich country is now firmly in the hands of the reds, and you may be sure they will exert leverage from this position to bring other Middle Eastern countries under their control. The results could be disastrous to the free world. Europe uses 137 million tons of oil every year, and 85 percent of it comes from the Near East. Any cut in the flow of oil from there would paralyze European industry and cripple NATO.

However, on the credit side there have been two happenings which should impede the flow of the red tide. Nasser is currently unhappy about Soviet moves in the Middle East, and has made some critical remarks indicating that the honeymoon between the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic is definitely over. It is to be hoped that our State Department can and will exploit this rift.

In the Far East the Communists lost a tremendous amount of face when Red China tried and failed in its attempt to seize the Dalai Lama of Tibet. Even the greatest efforts by Mao Tse-tung's armies were unable to keep the spiritual leader of the Tibetans from gaining sanctuary in India, and the brutal action of the Red Chinese in seeking out the Dalai Lama's followers and in destroying their ages-old lamaseries has made a profoundly unfavorable impression, notably in the Orient. Even Nehru's limitless tolerance toward the reds has been put to a strain, particularly since his own people are in an uproar over the outrage.

In Africa events are shaping up which strongly indicate that we can expect much trouble there. The issue is presented as a reaction from colonialism, with new nations

emerging. Ghana, formerly the British Gold Coast, has become independent; as has French Guinea. Nigeria becomes an independent nation next year. The Belgian Congo, a major source of uranium, has exploded into a civil war between whites and blacks. The Mau Mau seem to be back in the business of bloodletting in Kenya and Tanganyika, and there are disturbing rumbles from the French Sudan.

We can sympathize with any nation which wants its freedom, but all too often the people of these new nations are not prepared for nationhood, democracy, and law. That, however, does not stop the hellbent rush for national freedom, and in this rush they are being prodded by outside agitators. Those fellows are helping to develop a strong anti-white-man complex which can cause a great deal of trouble for us in the future. The same Communist agitators cause us trouble in another way. As the new nations emerge they invariably look to the United States for help. If we do not come through with sufficient foreign aid, the Russians move in with big promises and at least some token assistance, usually in the form of loans to permit the purchase of Russian goods. This in turn creates more mischief because with the Russian goods come Communist technical advisers who specialize in subversion of various kinds.

In our own backyard, Latin America, we have plenty to worry about. In Venezuela, we witnessed the humiliating spectacle of a Vice President of the United States being stoned and spat upon by a howling mob which had been stirred up by the reds. In Mexico an ambitious strike which was planned to cripple the country was fomented by reds, and the Mexican Government courageously showed where the strike had originated by kicking two Soviet diplomats out of the country. In Cuba, we find ourselves in a dilemma. Fidel Castro insists that he is not a Communist, but he is equally insistent that he is going to be independent of both the East and the West. Some of the people surrounding him, who seem to be preoccupied with exporting revolutions, are certainly not reassuring. Meanwhile, executions go on in Cuba, popular elections are years off, and there are charges that the country is being used as a base for operations against other Caribbean countries which are anti-Communist and on friendly terms with the United States. Elsewhere in Latin America there is political turmoil as the Communists busy themselves stirring up hatred of the gringos when they are not in a position to manipulate the governments themselves.

There was a time when many people thought that the Russian people themselves could be counted on to side with us in case of trouble with their rulers. No people was ever more harshly treated by the men in the Kremlin than the Russian people themselves. Millions had been purged and millions more had suffered in slave-labor camps. It seemed logical that, given a chance, the Russians would rise and overthrow their brutal masters. But from all accounts there is a different feeling in the Soviet Union today. The image of Stalin is gone and Khrushchev is not hated as his predecessor was. Also, the Russians are beginning to get some of the consumer goods they had been promised for many years. By American standards they are not getting much, but visitors to the Soviet Union report that the people seem content.

Probably most important, however, is the fact that the Russians are beginning to take pride in the Communist regime. They see material evidence of Soviet scientific progress in such things as their sputniks and Lunik, their massive armament, their nuclear bombs, and their excellent planes. They no longer feel that they are looked upon as a backward people, and they are showing more enthusiasm for the idea of catching up with

and overtaking the great United States of America. They have a timetable for this. By 1965, they are told, their production will be ahead of any European nation, and by 1970 they will surpass the United States of America.

In this race with the United States they are competing with Red China. The Chinese are in fact being driven far more brutally than the Russians are today, and they are being given an outlet for the resentment they must feel. The United States, they are told, is the enemy of the Chinese people, and if they don't work hard and make their country strong, the American imperialists will invade their land and slaughter them with germ warfare and atomic bombs. So they are taking what is called "the long leap forward," and this exercise is keeping them busy, literally, from sunup till far into the night, building an economy that by the year 2000 will have to accommodate an estimated 1.59 billion Chinese.

I don't have to emphasize the danger that this population pressure represents to us and to the world generally. There are some wishful thinkers who say that the big danger is to Soviet Russia, but I think differently. There is no sign of friction between the two nations. Years hence Russia and China may turn on each other, but that will come only if they are able to vanquish the West. In that case, like jackals, they could tackle each other over the spoils.

Since the new kind of warfare does not necessarily mean marching armies or firing of guns, most Americans are not aware of the true situation. They may arouse themselves when a flight of Mig's blasts down an unarmed American transport and murders American men, and they may become indignant when the Soviets insult us when we inquire about the bodies of the murdered airmen. But we forget quickly and turn back to the sports pages and television screen.

While the Communists use violence and brush-fire wars where those things serve their purpose, the main battles of this war are now being fought on other fronts—economic, psychological, and moral. And it is high time that all Americans received some basic training in these things so that they can understand exactly how the enemy employs them in this strange new warfare.

Obviously the Soviet Union is not paring down its military might. There is no hint that the Red army is being reduced in size. The Red air force, from all accounts, is being steadily augmented. The Red navy's far-ranging fleet of hundreds of modern submarines is being increased. And we know that the Russians are far advanced in the nuclear and missile fields. In short, the men in the Kremlin many propagandize for peace and peaceful coexistence, but they are ready to smash us militarily if they think it possible that they can do so without our retaliatory power destroying Russia.

We would be foolish indeed to give them any reason to think they could do so. Therefore our only possible course is to keep building a powerful and balanced military force which can defend this Nation and devastate the Soviet homeland if Khrushchev should ever dare to launch an attack against us or the allies to whom we are committed.

Military power costs money, a lot of money, and this means big budgets which, in turn, mean high taxes. We have to make sacrifices to maintain this power, but the only alternative is the sacrifice of our freedom.

Although military force is not being employed at present against us, other pressures are being built up. One of these is what Khrushchev had in mind when he challenged us to a trade war.

As I stated earlier, the people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are being exhorted in every way to beat America in production. This is not just for national pride

nor to give the peoples of those countries more of the good things of life. This production is wanted for a trade war. Khrushchev has challenged us to this war and says that he will beat us at it. If he does, he will be well on the way to defeating us. Molotov explains why in a statement he made in 1946:

"We are not fighting America as yet," he said, "but once we have deprived her of her markets, crises will follow and cause confusion. After we have taken her markets in Europe, expelled her from Asia and elsewhere, she will have no market where to dump her merchandise. She will curtail her production, and there will follow unemployment. Our opportunity to square accounts with America will be at hand."

What are we doing to meet this threat? In the 5 years from 1950 to 1955 we had an unparalleled growth in this country. Even so, we were beaten by many countries. Germany led with an annual growth of 10 percent. Japan was second with 8 percent, and the Soviet Union was third with 7 percent. Actually, the United States of America turned up in the bottom half with a rate of growth of only 4 percent. Ahead of us were Canada, France, Netherlands, and Italy. But what has happened since then is even more shocking. The Soviet rate of growth has jumped to an estimated 9 to 11 percent in the past 2 years, and our own rate of growth has stood still. Is it any wonder that Khrushchev boasts about licking us in a trade war?

In their calculations for this new kind of warfare, the canny Communists count heavily on a weakness they attribute to us which they call "decadence." In Communist literature there is frequent reference to the "decadent bourgeoisie," and the Communists look upon them with contempt as weaklings who are no match for their so-called Soviet man.

Unfortunately, cynical men such as Khrushchev do not have to look far to find evidence of this kind of weakness. They recognize as a sign of decadence, or weakness, the way in which some businessmen will do anything if they can make a profit from it. In the late 1920's and early 1930's, for example, the Reds desperately wanted diplomatic recognition by the United States for their shaky regime. A good case can be made for the thesis that if we had withheld this recognition we would not today be facing the Red colossus that threatens to bury us. One of the arguments advanced for recognition was trade. The Communists and their apologists in this country insisted that with recognition we could expect a tremendous and highly profitable volume of business with the Soviet Union.

The American Legion, I am proud to say, did its best to prevent the Communists from achieving this great diplomatic triumph, but the pressures were too great. The papers were signed in 1933, and the Soviet was thereby given another lease on life. And I might add that the promised trade with the Reds never materialized.

Not long ago the Red line was baited once again with promises of big business. This was when Khrushchev sent the wily Anastas Mikoyan to this country to sound us out on a new deal, and while doing so to give the United States a sound drubbing in the psychological war that is going on between this country and the U.S.S.R. The Americans who promoted the trip may have had the naive idea that it would show him our strength, but what it really did was demonstrate to the subjugated peoples, the neutrals, and our allies that some Americans probably are as decadent as the Reds say we are.

Years ago Lenin made the cynical observation: "When we Communists are ready to hang the capitalists, they'll try to outbid each other for the sale of hemp to us."

The truth of that saying was proved by the way in which Anastas Mikoyan was wined and dined by some of our so-called best people. Here was a man who had ruthlessly purged working people, and he was being honored by some of our best known labor leaders. Here was a man who had boasted of robbing banks, and he was being treated with deference by officials of some of New York's largest banking houses. Here was a man dedicated to the overthrow of the free enterprise system, not to mention the United States, and he was being given standing ovations by some of America's foremost industrialists.

Here indeed were capitalists and others, competing to sell the rope that the Communists would need for their hanging.

What was back of this shameful spectacle? Mikoyan was tempting these people with hints of trade. The U.S.S.R. needs many things, and would like to get them from the United States. Never mind if those things, such items as chemical plants, would eventually be used to destroy us. The important thing was that profits could be made out of this kind of coexistence. But Mikoyan subsequently let the cat out of the bag when he told Under Secretary of State Dillon that he wanted \$300 million from the United States to make the purchases he had discussed with the businessmen who had done him such honor. And when Mr. Dillon politely rejected the audacious deal, Mikoyan turned the true face of communism toward him. According to the press, it was not a pleasant face.

But let it not be thought that only certain members of banking and business circles are afflicted with weaknesses that the Reds can exploit. Because of selfish, unrealistic, and unsound thinking with regard to production, we are making it increasingly easy for Khrushchev to make good his boast that he can beat us in a trade war.

In this country we once went on the theory that the more that people produced, the more money was available for wages, improvements, profits, and so forth. Henry Ford demonstrated this when he set up his assembly lines to make the Model T. By turning out a lot of cars, he was able to pay his workers an unheard-of salary of \$5 and more a day. Our economy became geared to mass production, and the flood of goods that poured from our factories not only gave us a standard of living that was the envy of the world but made it possible for the allies to win two World Wars.

But there has been a change in our thinking. Now the policy of certain highly influential labor leaders is to insist on producing the absolute minimum for the greatest possible wages, plus various and sundry fringe benefits. This would be bad enough in normal times, since it would mean high prices; but faced as we are with a trade war with friends and avowed enemies, this sort of boondoggling can lead to national suicide. Unless there is a return to some basic fundamentals of production and sound economics, we are going to find our goods priced out of markets around the world. This could bring on still another aspect of this new kind of warfare, one the Reds have confidently predicted: a crippling depression that could turn our country sharply into orbit with the Soviet Union.

Certainly capital and labor are not the only offenders. The actions of these two groups have their counterparts throughout our entire economy as millions of people strive to get something for nothing. This may give these people a temporary advantage, but it is the Communist hierarchy which will gain the final victory if we continue in this way.

Specifically, what can we do to fight this new kind of war? We must first of all put our faith in divine providence, just as our Founding Fathers did when they threw down the gauntlet to the British in the

Declaration of Independence. It is no accident, to use a Communist cliché, that the Communists fight religion. They recognize it as a mortal enemy which must be destroyed lest it destroy them. Lenin laid down the dictum: "We must combat religion—this is the ABC of all materialism, and consequently Marxism." Let us not throw away this weapon so greatly feared by the anti-Christ of the Kremlin.

And let us make greater use than we have of patriotism. Americans have too long been too sensitive to the sneers of self-styled intellectuals who label love of country as "flag waving." Quite often these people are actually scornful of the flag itself, rather than what they choose to mock as "flag waving." And some of them have given their loyalty, for whatever it is worth, to the blood-red banner of socialism.

The end result of our shamefaced attitude toward patriotism can be found in a study of brainwashing made by Army Maj. William E. Mayer. He studied the case histories of a thousand of our soldiers who had been captured in Korea and found that many of them were so weak in their patriotism that they succumbed easily under pressure from their Chinese interrogators.

A Chinese intelligence report found in North Korea in 1951 gives further evidence of what is wrong in certain quarters. Here is what the Red Chinese said about some of the men they captured and studied:

"The American soldier has weak loyalties to his family, his community, his country, his religion, and his fellow soldiers. His concepts of right and wrong are hazy; opportunism is easy. He underestimates his own worth, his own strength, and his ability to survive. He is largely ignorant of social values, social tensions, and conflicts. There is little knowledge or understanding, even among U.S. graduates of American political history and philosophy, of the Federal, State, and community organizations; of States rights and civil rights; of safeguards to freedom, and of how these things supposedly operate within his own system."

This is a terrible indictment of the men who succumbed to Red brainwashing, but it is an even greater indictment of those educators who offer students intellectual shoddy instead of the truth.

In this new kind of war we can take another lesson from the Founding Fathers, this time from Benjamin Franklin who assured his fellows: "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately." Recognizing that we are in a war, we should show the enemy a united front. I do not by any means counsel unthinking conformity, but we must not allow ourselves to be split assunder by false prophets who are trying to divide us.

There are, unfortunately, many such people among us, and their ringleaders have recently been authorized to go their way without much hindrance, war or no war. But let us recognize them for what they are—fools at best, or traitors at worst. These are the people who suffer from a strange myopia when the Soviet Union is concerned, but who showed amazing clarity of vision when other countries menaced world peace. They had no illusions about Mussolini when his legions marched into Ethiopia. When the Japanese seized Manchuria, they were quick to recognize where that aggression was likely to lead. When Hitler's troops started to overrun Europe, while at home he conducted diabolical persecutions, they called for retribution—but only after the Hitler-Stalin Pact was broken. But when the Soviet Union commits the most unspeakable atrocities against humanity, these people are either silent or they raise their voices to excuse and condone the brutalities of the Kremlin. Consistently, of course, such people viciously attack any and all who oppose communism. I am proud

that the American Legion rates high on their list.

Such people are entitled to their opinions, even when their expressions come close to being treasonable in view of the war in which we are engaged. But there is no reason whatsoever why these pro-Communists and anti-anti-Communists should be given the prestige and prominence that is often accorded them, and their propaganda, by our press and our broadcasting systems. The best they merit is a form of quarantine in which the Red virus they hope to spread can die out harmlessly without being disseminated to further infect and weaken Americans.

Recognizing that we are engaged in war, one in which every conceivable weapon is being used or threatened against us, we must be prepared to make sacrifices. However, this time it is essential that the burdens be borne more equitably than they have been in the past. We cannot have people enduring privations in order to create a specially privileged class such as the infamous black-marketeers of World War II. Taxes will have to be high, but let us make certain that the money isn't wasted by selfish politicians on extravagant Utopias or in personal empire building.

We need the best we can get in the way of armament, but we cannot afford the waste, stupidity, or chicanery exemplified by vast stockpiles of equipment that is worthless for one reason or another. Production for defense is vital, but such production should not be used as an excuse for management to make inordinate profits or for labor to demand outrageously high wages. Where foreign aid is necessary, let us make sure that the billions being spent will benefit our country. We cannot afford at this time the luxury of keeping an army of bureaucrats abroad or of providing vast slush funds for foreign politicians who may be of doubtful value to us in this new kind of warfare.

There are many more things which have to be done, and done properly, and it is the responsibility of every American to take an active interest in what is being done and how these things are being worked out. To repeat what I said earlier, in a war like this we are all active participants and we cannot delegate to others the job of winning it. What, specifically, can an individual do? Maybe a good way to answer this would be to try a routine that the Communists use in a distorted manner—self-criticism. Communists and prisoners of the Reds are required to engage in extensive soul searching with the idea of learning their weaknesses and how they can overcome these weaknesses.

The basic idea has much to recommend it, and you might give it a try. You may discover some weaknesses within you of a type that the Communists count on and hope to exploit. Discovering them at this stage, you will have the opportunity to correct them without having an armed guard to assist in the process at some future time—in the event we fail in this new kind of war.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS REQUIRING AFFIDAVITS OF LOYALTY AND ALLEGIANCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 819) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1959 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of loyalty and allegiance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bush] for 3 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Texas.

I wish to observe that I support the Kennedy amendment to the National

Defense Education Act Mr. President, and for the benefit of those who will read the RECORD I wish to ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point a letter from the president of Yale University, A. Whitney Griswold, to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in which President Griswold states very firmly his views in opposition to the oath which is required by the act as presently written.

In addition to that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Joseph C. Palamontain, Jr., of the Department of government, Public Affairs Center, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., in which he sends me a protest signed by nearly all of the members of the Wesleyan faculty. I do not ask that all of the names be written in the RECORD following this resolution, which they have all signed, but that the resolution itself be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

YALE UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
December 19, 1958.

HON. ARTHUR S. FLEMING,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I commend your statement as reported by the Associated Press on December 15 concerning the affidavit and oath required by the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

It seems to me that there are four main reasons why those of us who participate in the educational process, whether students or teachers, dislike such measures; and that if these reasons could be more generally understood it might help matters. The first reason is that we recall many instances in the long history of the educational process in which it has been distorted and disrupted by forces operating under the shelter of test oaths. This knowledge has imbued us with an instinctive dislike of such oaths that is not unnatural in the circumstances and should be understandable to persons familiar with history. Moreover, our instinctive dislike is fortified by reasoned objections such as that of the Supreme Court in *ex parte Garland* in 1867 when the Court declared "All enactments of this kind partake of the nature of bills of pains and penalties, and are subject to the constitutional inhibitions against the passage of bills of attainder, under which general designation they are included." In our eyes such measures are at best odious symbols, at worst a potential threat to our profession.

In the second place, as you yourself have pointed out, it is hard to understand why anyone should believe such oaths to be efficacious as public safeguards. Far from deterring real transgressors, they offer them a convenient cloak for their intentions and transgressions. In this respect they are worse than futile. They tend to alienate the good will of the loyal citizen without gaining a corresponding advantage in protecting the public against the actions or intentions of the disloyal. They give the public a false sense of security which, if it became too literal and too strong, might lead to our undoing.

Thirdly, it is our conviction that belief cannot be coerced or compelled. On this principle the Russian novelist, Boris Pasternak, whose treatment by his own government with respect to the Nobel prize has been the object of indignant protest in the United