

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

**NO MORE STUDIES, PLEASE**

Senator BYRD, in opposing a Burke site for a new Washington airport, suggested a further study by the Civil Aeronautics Administration of possible sites, including the Chantilly region. He told the Senate Appropriations Committee that he thought the Chantilly area should be investigated fully. Apparently the Virginia Senator has not been adequately informed on the CAA search for a suitable airport site. For it is a matter of record that the CAA, over the past several years, has conducted a diligent and comprehensive study of every available airport site in the Washington area, that it has re-investigated a number of sites previously rejected and that it still is convinced that the best site is at Burke, Va.

President Eisenhower based his request for a supplemental appropriation for the Burke project on the expert advice of the CAA, after its long studies of the whole region. The House accepted this authoritative advice in approving the President's request for \$12.5 million to enlarge the Government's holdings at Burke and start construction. To require the CAA to conduct further investigations of sites would be a useless duplication of effort by the Federal Agency—a costly waste of the sort that Senator BYRD has fought so vigorously and well as an economy advocate.

No more studies, no more stalling tactics of any kind, should be permitted by Congress or the administration in this vital airport matter. There have been too many studies and too much stalling already. Meanwhile, air congestion is increasing and the danger of accidents correspondingly is rising. Public safety demands action now to assure an auxiliary airport for Washington. The Senate should face up to this responsibility and end the risky and pointless dillydallying with the Burke project.

**THE BUENOS AIRES CONFERENCE**

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, today in Buenos Aires delegates from the 21 American Republics gather for the first session of the Inter-American Economic Conference.

The United States and our Latin American neighbors have substantial impact on each other's economies. Last year Latin America spent over \$3.8 billion in the United States, purchasing about 22 percent of total United States nonmilitary exports. These purchases encompassed the entire range of our national production. For instance, Latin America bought 28 percent of our exports of industrial machinery; 32 percent of our exports of electrical machinery; 51 percent of our exports of automobiles, parts, accessories, and service equipment; 40 percent of our exports of paper and paper products; and 48 percent of our exports of medical and pharmaceutical preparations. Nor was the industrial sector of our economy the only beneficiary from our trade with Latin America. Of our agricultural exports, the American Republics bought 26 percent of our dairy products, 36 percent of our lard exports, 20 percent of our rice exports, and 23 percent of our exports of vegetable oils and fats.

The immense impact which the United States has upon the prosperity of Latin America by purchasing Latin America's products is well-known. Last year we spent more than \$3.5 billion in buying

about 43 percent of the total exports from the American Republics. They depend on these dollars earned by sales to the United States to purchase many of the vital necessities of life which they cannot or presently do not produce at home.

When we remember that Latin America's population of more than 187 million already exceeds that of the United States, and promises to be double that of the United States and Canada combined within the next 50 years, it takes little imagination to foresee the increasing importance to all participants of inter-American trade.

Commerce, prosperity, and friendship go hand-in-hand. It is my fervent hope that the Conference now convening in Buenos Aires will result not in mere speeches, but in specific developments leading to a reduction in trade barriers, to increased opportunities for an exchange of goods and ideas, and to strengthening the ties of friendship among the sister republics of the Western Hemisphere.

**PROHIBITION OF SERVICE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ABOARD CERTAIN AIRCRAFT — AMENDMENTS**

Mr. SMATHERS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 4) to prevent the service or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial passenger aircraft and military aircraft, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

**ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now adjourn until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, August 16, 1957, at 11 o'clock a. m.

**NOMINATION**

Executive nomination received by the Senate August 15, 1957:

**NAVY DEPARTMENT**

Richard Jackson, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

**CONFIRMATIONS**

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, August 15, 1957:

**FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION**

Jerome K. Kuykendall, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1962.

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

Don Paarlberg, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

**COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION**

Don Paarlberg, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

**ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION**

John S. Graham, of North Carolina, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring June 30, 1959.

John Forrest Floberg, of Illinois, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1962.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Edwin R. Hicklin, of Iowa, to be United States judge for the southern district of Iowa.

**UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS**

Laughlin E. Waters, of California, to be United States attorney for the southern district of California for a term of 4 years.

James W. Dorsey, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia for a term of 4 years.

Frank O. Evans, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Georgia for a term of 4 years.

William Cozart Calhoun, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia for a term of 4 years.

Krest Cyr, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana for a term of 4 years.

John C. Crawford, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Georgia for a term of 4 years.

Millsaps Fitzhugh, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the western district of Tennessee for a term of 4 years.

John Strickler, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia for a term of 4 years.

William B. Bantz, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington for a term of 4 years.

**COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY**

The following nominations for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to qualifications provided by law:

A. Newton Stewart	Robert A. Earle
Max G. Ricketts	Harry F. Garber
Clarence A. George	Karl B. Jeffers

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

THURSDAY, AUGUST 15, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, who art daily blessing us so abundantly, hear us as we now approach Thy throne of grace with prayers of supplication and intercession.

We thank Thee that we may commend and commit unto Thy gracious providence not only our own personal and individual needs and longings but those of all the members of the human family.

Humbly and penitently we confess that we are doing so little to make the struggle of life less difficult for others. We are eager to get and possess the good things of life but reluctant to give and to share them. We have been severe in our criticizing of our fellow men but so lenient and indulgent with ourselves.

Forgive us for being indifferent to the pitiful appeals of the poor and lowly, the weary and heavy laden, the worried and anxious, and the less privileged who are the victims of adversity and trying circumstances.

Grant that we may abound in the spirit of charity and benevolence, of sympathy and service, of kindness and good will, and may we always be willing

to bear our due share of the world's burdens.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

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

#### MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. PASSMAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 9302) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order.

#### VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, it is reliably reported here in the Nation's Capital that there are 8,000 deactivated beds in the Veterans' Administration hospitals over the United States. Many of these beds cannot be activated because of lack of funds. It is also estimated that on any given day there are 50,000 ill and ailing veterans in need of immediate hospitalization who are unable to secure admission to VA hospitals.

These are the men who honorably wore the uniform of our armed services, who offered their lives and bodies to protect the freedom and integrity of this Nation. We are informed that to hospitalize all these veterans would not be in accord with the program of the President; yet, according to the August 14 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, House Republican Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN has warned the Congress of a possibility of a special session this fall if the foreign-aid program is curtailed.

The House and Senate has authorized \$3,367,000,000 for the foreign-aid program for 1958, and amounts variously estimated at from \$55 billion to \$60 billion of the taxpayers' money have already been spent on this program.

It would seem to me that the President should be a little more concerned with the welfare of the sick and ailing veterans than with a program designed to continue to dissipate our resources all over the world.

#### AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, natural gas is being piped into the State of Washington, and its people are beginning to be concerned about legislation pending before Congress which would exempt producers of natural gas from effective price regulation.

The daily press has carried news items quoting the Speaker of the House as stating that H. R. 8525, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, will not be considered by the House during this session of Congress. I trust that this proves to be a fact. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I trust that, should the bill be considered by the House during either this session or the next, the Members will reject it.

The passage of the bill which seeks to exempt producers of natural gas from effective price regulation under the Natural Gas Act could cost consumers as much as \$1 billion annually. The natural gas business is a monopoly. The public interest requires regulation of it just as is required for telephone, electric, and water services. All are treated as public utilities, and natural gas should be included. As a matter of fact, it has been so treated and regulated under the Natural Gas Act for a number of years.

If the pending measure is approved, the 29 million families using natural gas would have to pay higher prices because the bill would destroy effective regulation of them. It is self-evident, it seems to me, that the passage of the bill would result in higher prices. Otherwise, why are the producers supporting the measure?

The proponents of the bill take the position that present regulation under the Natural Gas Act will destroy incentive to bring more wells into production. Past experience indicates otherwise. Producers have been under the regulations of the Natural Gas Act for years without injury to the industry. The industry is booming and profits are at an alltime high. Discoveries of new supplies are at an alltime high, as are present reserve supplies.

The industry has a 27½-percent depletion allowance as an incentive. Furthermore, the Federal Power Commission has ample authority to grant such increases as might be warranted in the future and to encourage new exploration and development.

#### CONVEYANCE TO NEW YORK OF CERTAIN RIGHTS AT FORT SCHUYLER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4609) to further amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not, because this matter came out of our committee, I think the gentleman from

Georgia should make a brief statement in explanation of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States conveyed 26 acres to the State of New York in 1950 for use as a maritime school and historical monument. The city of New York proposes to build a bridge between Queens and the Bronx with one portion of the supports to be erected within this 26 acres. Since this is a use other than for a maritime and historic monument, legislation is necessary to insure that title to the property would not revert to the United States by reason of this use. The bill does not convey any property but merely excludes about 5½ acres from the reversionary rights which the United States has. This bill does not involve the expenditure of any funds.

The other 26 acres of Fort Schuyler were transferred in 1956 from the Army to the Navy. The Navy had been using the property since 1942, first for indoctrination school and later for reserve training.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950 (Public Law 755, 81st Cong.), as amended July 16, 1952 (Public Law 559, 82d Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the people of the State of New York all that portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, in the borough and county of Bronx in the city of New York, State of New York, together with all improvements thereon, bounded and described as follows, to wit: Commencing at a point (latitude 40 degrees 48 minutes 23 seconds north; longitude 73 degrees 47 minutes 52 seconds west) fixed on the south sea wall which is approximately 25.5 feet westerly from an angle in said seawall and running thence in a northeasterly direction 592.5 feet, more or less, to a point on the north seawall which is approximately 196.5 feet westerly from an angle in the north seawall (said line running along the easterly edge of a concrete curb for an 18-foot concrete road running in a northeasterly and southwesterly direction); thence continuing in the same course to the point where said line intersects the northerly exterior line of a grant of lands under water made by the State of New York to the United States of America by letters patent dated May 26, 1880, and recorded in the office of the secretary of state of the State of New York in book 44 of patents at page 604; thence running easterly, southerly, and westerly along the exterior northerly, easterly, and southerly line of said grant to a point in the exterior southerly line thereof which is in range with the course first above described; thence running in a northeasterly direction to the point and place of beginning, intending to include within said bounds a portion of the uplands which were conveyed by William Bayard, Jr., and Charles Henry Hammond to the United States of America by deed dated July 26, 1826, and recorded in the office of the clerk of the county of Westchester, N. Y., on November 30, 1826, in liber 28 of deeds at page 225, and by Charles H. Hammond and Thomas Bolton, one of the masters in chancery of the

State of New York, to the United States of America by deed dated August 25, 1828, and recorded in the office of the clerk of the county of Westchester, N. Y., on December 11, 1828, in liber 33 of deeds at page 296, together with a portion of contiguous lands under water which were granted by the State of New York to the United States of America by letters patent dated May 26, 1880, and recorded in the office of the secretary of state of the State of New York in book 44 of patents at page 604; together with docks, piers, and other appurtenances; together with such easements for highway or other purposes, over that portion of such reservation which is not herein authorized to be conveyed to the people of the State of New York, as may be necessary for the proper use and enjoyment of the portion so conveyed as may be determined by agreement between the Secretary of the Navy and the appropriate officials of the State of New York."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the express provision that if the State of New York shall fail to maintain so much of the military structures and appurtenances presently erected, which formerly constituted the old fort, as a historical monument reasonably available to the public, and if the State of New York shall at any time cease to use the property so conveyed as a maritime school, devoted exclusively to purposes of nautical education, title thereto shall revert to the United States: *Provided, however,* That the construction, operation, maintenance, and reconstruction of a bridge by the State of New York or pursuant to the laws of said State between the Borough of the Bronx and the Borough of Queens in the city of New York, located on, over, or across said military structures and appurtenances or on, over, or across all or any part of the lands described in section 1 of this act shall not constitute a breach of condition or any ground for reversion to the United States of the title to said lands. Such conveyance shall also provide that in the event that title to said lands shall revert to the United States, the State of New York or any public corporation, authorized pursuant to the laws of said State to construct, operate, maintain, or reconstruct such bridge, shall have and is granted an easement in perpetuity to construct, operate, maintain, and reconstruct such bridge on, over, and across said military structures and appurtenances and on, over, or across said lands."

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

"Sec. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that during any emergency declared by the President or the Congress of the United States in existence at the time of enactment of this act, or whenever the President or the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force that the property so conveyed is useful for military, air, or naval purposes or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without charge, except as indicated below, to the full unrestricted possession, control, and use of the property conveyed, or any part thereof, including any additions or improvements thereto made by the State subsequent to this conveyance: *Provided, however,* That the United States shall be responsible during the period of such use for the entire cost of maintaining all of the property so used, and shall pay a fair rental for the use of any structures or other improvements which have been added thereto without Federal aid: *And provided further,* That such right to possession, control, or use shall not apply to that portion of the property described in section 1 of this act on, over, or across which

the bridge referred to in section 2 of this act shall be located or to such bridge or to any structures or improvements used or useful in connection therewith and with respect thereto the United States shall have only such right as it may have with respect to other property not owned by the United States."

Sec. 4. The act is amended by adding thereto a new section, numbered 6, reading as follows:

"Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to incorporate the foregoing provisions of this act in any conveyance made by him or, if a conveyance has been made by him prior to the amendment of this act, he shall make, execute, and deliver an appropriate written instrument amending such conveyance to conform to the provisions of this act."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, strike the proviso beginning on line 13 and ending on page 5, line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided, however,* That it shall not constitute a breach of condition nor any ground for reversion to the United States of the title to said lands if a bridge and viaduct approach with its supports shall be constructed, operated, maintained, and reconstructed by the State of New York or pursuant to the laws of said State between the borough of the Bronx and the borough of Queens in the city of New York, over or across that part of the lands described in section 1 of this act bounded and described as follows, to wit: Beginning at a point distant 975 feet, more or less, easterly from the point of commencement of the portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler conveyed by the Secretary of the Army to the people of the State of New York described in section 1 of this act, measured along a line at right angles to the first course of the above conveyance (which line is hereinafter called 'line A') and (1) running thence in a northerly direction on a line making an angle of 61 degrees more or less with said 'line A' a distance of 965 feet, more or less, to its intersection with the northerly exterior line of the above-mentioned conveyance; (2) thence running easterly along the said northerly exterior line of said conveyance a distance of 205 feet, more or less; (3) thence running southerly along a line 200 feet distant from and parallel to course (1) hereof, a distance of 1,285 feet, more or less, to its intersection with the southerly exterior line of the above-mentioned conveyance; (4) thence running westerly along the said southerly exterior line of the above-mentioned conveyance a distance of 105 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the southerly exterior line of the above-mentioned conveyance; (5) thence continuing westerly along the said southerly exterior line of the above-mentioned conveyance a distance of 120 feet, more or less; (6) thence running northerly along a line 200 feet distant from and parallel to course (3) hereof and in southerly prolongation of course (1) hereof a distance of 240 feet, more or less, to the point and place of beginning; intending to include within said bounds an area 200 feet wide extending from the northerly to the southerly exterior lines of the portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler conveyed by the Secretary of the Army to the people of the State of New York, but excluding therefrom any military buildings and structures and the land upon which the same are presently erected which formerly constituted the old fort. Such conveyance shall also provide that in the event that title to said lands shall revert to the United States, the State of New York or any public corporation authorized pursuant to the laws of said State to construct, operate, maintain, or reconstruct such

bridge, shall have and is granted an easement in perpetuity to construct, operate, maintain, and reconstruct such bridge on, over, and across said military structures and appurtenances and on, over, or across said lands."

On page 6, strike the proviso beginning on line 1 and ending on line 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*And provided further,* That such right to possession, control, or use shall not apply to the property described in section 2 of this act or to such bridge or to any structures or improvements used or useful in connection therewith, and with respect thereto the United States shall have only such right as it may have with respect to other property not owned by the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### VITAL LEGISLATION NECESSARY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to ask a very fair question, and one that I believe is of the utmost importance to the American people and that is, Why have we not legislation on the floor of this House to correct the adverse effect of the Supreme Court decision on disclosure of FBI files to criminal trial defendants?

Why is there not legislation presented to this House to offset the decisions of the Supreme Court in reference to the release of the convicted Communists in California to prevent this happening again?

I want to inject here a part of the testimony of a New York policewoman, testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to the effect that—

The Communist Party has been given a revitalizing shot in the arm by the Supreme Court's decision overturning the convictions of California Communist Party leaders and by other court rulings.

There has been much legislation coming before the House in recent days. Nothing, however, touches the magnitude of the feelings of the American people more than the necessary legislation I have cited above. There is no doubt that we are in the closing days of this session and I, for one, do not like the thought of an adjournment before legislation is enacted making certain that convicted Communists will be jailed and to prevent the disclosure of the files of that greatest of all organizations, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

If there has been security in our country and this security is to continue, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the only responsible organization capable of continuing internal security for the American people. I call upon the chairmen and members of the respective committees to present legislation at once, and I feel certain all of the people of the United States would rejoice at such ac-

tion. Certainly, there would be no question as to passage in both Houses and no further time should be lost.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 196]		
Alger	Hess	May
Anfuso	Hiestand	Marrow
Baker	Hillings	Miller, N. Y.
Barden	Holifield	Morgan
Baumhart	Holtzman	Morrison
Beamer	Kelley, Pa.	Powell
Bentley	Kelly, N. Y.	Preston
Brownson	Kilburn	Prouty
Buckley	Krueger	Robson, Ky.
Bush	Lennon	Scherer
Curtis, Mo.	Long	Sieminski
Dawson, Ill.	McConnell	Siler
Engle	McCormack	Smith, Va.
George	McGregor	Taylor
Gordon	Madden	Whitener
Gray	Mailliard	Williams, N. Y.
Hays, Ohio	Mason	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 378 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9302) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Louisiana whether that is in agreement with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. PASSMAN. That agreement was approved by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 9302, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Fortunately the rules of the House will not permit magicians to come on the floor while we are considering legislation. It may be that before the debate is over some of you will think that the magicians have been in and have left some tricks, because there may be an attempt made to pull certain tricks out of the hat and use certain figures that are positively not in keeping with the record.

May I assure you at the outset that every figure and statement that I use today in defense of what the committee has reported out will be based upon justifications and certified statements submitted to us by many witnesses who appeared before our committee.

I would also like to state—and certainly I would not want to offend anyone, but so that you may have some understanding of the difficult job with which this committee is confronted, this is the most difficult bill to write and report and defend that any Member ever had anything to do with. Never has so much pressure been exerted to indicate a picture different from that which actually exists. Yesterday afternoon, before this subcommittee even marked up the bill to make these recommendations for your consideration, the newspapers hit the streets and said, "The President warns of extra session. Will recall Congress if aid is cut."

That is the caption. That indicates what we are confronted with today.

Mr. Chairman, before getting into a discussion of the mutual security appropriation bill for fiscal 1958, I would like to pay tribute to my able and distinguished colleagues who serve on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations. The members are the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Particularly do I wish to pay special tribute to the able and distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], whose understanding of the complex foreign-aid program is second to none. Not only is he able, but the gentleman from Virginia is completely sincere and uncompromising with right regardless of the pressure or flattery emanating from newspapers or other sources. He is neither easily frightened by threats nor persuaded by flattery. I especially refer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] here because he has been my chairman on another subcommittee for 9 years, and he is my predecessor as chairman on this subcommittee.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I concur in the gentleman's tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee handling the Treasury-Post Office appropriation. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is all that the gentleman says he is.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

So when the gentleman speaks later today, if you are inclined to discount anything that I say, you certainly should not discount anything that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] might have to say.

I should like also to pay special tribute to other members of the subcommittee who supported me, as chairman, wholeheartedly and steadfastly in every point in which they regarded my position as justified by the facts. That is why the bill now before you is one which, in my opinion, is the best bill which could be reported by the subcommittee under the circumstances, and a bill of such nature as is desired by the majority of the Members of Congress.

As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, I speak concerning this program of foreign aid upon the basis of facts and figures painfully extracted through toil and sweat from the many witnesses, some of whom were almost belligerent, who appeared before our subcommittee during a period which extended from April 2 through July 12.

Therefore, I shall submit my case to the membership, relying with confidence upon sound conclusions and wise decisions on the basis of facts established and brought to light during the hearings on the bill before you. It would not be amiss for me to note here, however, that there has probably never been devised in our Nation a more actively functioning propaganda machine than the one which is operated by the advocates of a free-spending foreign-aid program. There are powerful pressure groups pushing this program, seeking spending far in excess of the needs justifiable by the facts of record.

Large numbers of our highest paid bureaucrats and their subordinates are working without letup to convince Members of Congress and the American people that the foreign-aid program is indispensable, and that ever more funds are required to support it. Representatives of numerous foreign nations are exerting extreme efforts to influence larger contributions for their particular countries. And, disappointing as it certainly is, many of our own Nation's big business firms, with profitable contracts through the program, are strong advocates of everlasting, bigger spending foreign aid.

There are 87 nations in the world, and so great has been the propaganda and the pressure for a more widespread, complex, and confusing program of foreign aid on the part of the United States, that there are now in the program, past and present, funds for 67 members of the world of nations. Furthermore, before the ink is hardly dry on the bill that you shall pass for this program, three additional nations will be added to the

total, increasing the number of recipients to 70 nations. With the United States as the donor, only 16 nations in all the world will not be receiving some type of aid under the program.

My colleagues, I ask you to study carefully the chart which is shown here, to ascertain for yourselves that we are appropriating money to Communist nations, to dictatorships, and to other nations we cannot actually rely upon as friends. On this chart is listed one nation or more to whom we offered aid and received, in effect, this reply: "Yes, we are ready to be bought or bribed, but your offer is too low. Raise it to this figure, and we shall do business with you."

The time has come when we must deal with this program realistically. Whether we are going to cast aside principle, and meet the bid, only time will tell.

I have learned through 11 years of experience in this body that in many instances Members of Congress are asked to support a program and appropriate money on faith; and when faith fails, then the element of fear is brought into play. That is why I am so very anxious now for your careful consideration of what the committee has reported and recommended on the basis of well substantiated facts and figures. And I will ask you to give no consideration to anything that I might say unless I can substantiate my claim with facts and certified figures.

The Congress, the executive branch, and the American people were somewhat skeptical of the foreign-aid program from its inception. Therefore, the program was started in 1948 with considerable caution. The Congress determined that the authorization for the program should be granted 1 year at a time. None thought that the program would exceed a period of 4 or 5 years, at the most, or that the total costs would go to as much as, perhaps, \$15 billion or \$16 billion. But, instead, the program has been in effect 9 years, and our appropriations for the single foreign-aid program as carried in the bill handled by the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations have already exceeded \$45 billion.

If you consider the other expenditures of the Defense Department and put them together, the total exceeds \$50 billion.

Mr. Chairman, after the first 2 years of this program it began to get more difficult to sell the American people in the Congress on the idea it was accomplishing its objectives; therefore, the political medicine men in the executive branch decided they could overcome a reluctant Congress by doing two things. First, present the program to the Congress for consideration late in the session, so there would be insufficient time for careful and clear consideration of the request.

If I am accused later of using pressure methods on getting this bill out, let me remind you it is now August 15, we are getting ready to adjourn this Congress, yet we only received the authorizing legislation yesterday afternoon after 4 o'clock. So, who can accuse me of rushing this bill through when you did not give us adequate time to study the bill and bring it to the floor? The pres-

sure is from downtown in withholding facts and in withholding this bill so as to stampede the Congress in the closing days of the session to appropriate money they do not need and that they did not justify.

They just changed the name every time it appeared the taxpayers had grown weary of financing some of these dream schemes.

May I at this point respectfully submit to the Members of the House that it is wise that this appropriation should be left with the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, the members of which have worked tirelessly and ceaselessly and diligently to put some sense into the foreign-aid program.

By consolidating fiscal years 1956 and 1957, for one illustration, we can point to a saving below the budget request in the amount of \$1,868,000,000. And the program was not hurt thereby, but was helped.

I am speaking of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 when we were whipped around, knocked around, talked about, and accused of ruining the program; but notwithstanding that fact we succeeded in reducing the President's budget by \$1,868,000,000. And, lo and behold, this year they had to admit that we gave them too much money last year and they returned \$538,000,000 in military funds. Those are the facts.

You will recall, of course, that it was decided from downtown that the great Fairless committee, composed of some of the best businessmen in America, because their recommendations did not in some particulars meet with the approval of the executive branch, should not appear before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. If I am wrong in that statement, I wish to be corrected.

I think it would be more in order now for me to proceed to the actual facts and figures of the program, because you shall base your vote today not upon the basis of what I am saying here but entirely upon the basis of the information submitted by those people who appeared before our committee in an attempt to justify these large requests. May I say to you that in the past, and I am sure this year, they have been guilty of overstating their needs and without exception in each year their expenditures have amounted to far less than they said they would require in the beginning of the session of Congress.

May I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in this bill the committee is recommending an appropriation of new funds in the amount of \$2,524,760,000, which is a reduction of \$862,100,000 below the authorizing legislation in new funds. What we decided to do in marking up the bill was to reappropriate \$1,450,000,000 that would ordinarily lapse, so the bill was reduced by only \$80,650,000. I wish you would follow me very carefully so that you may know for a fact just exactly what is in this bill. I assure you if I err one time in reporting these figures I do not ask you to support my position.

Now, I wish that you would follow me carefully for the next 3 or 4 minutes. I shall either make my case or the com-

mittee's case in the next 3 or 4 minutes, or it will not be made.

We are recommending for military this year new appropriations in the amount of \$1,250,000,000. We are re-appropriating \$538,800,000, making new funds available for obligation in military alone of \$1,788,800,000.

Now, compare these figures to previous years. In 1956 for military we provided in new funds \$1,056,100,000. In fiscal 1957 we provided \$2,213 million. Some of the most distinguished Members of this great body questioned, unintentionally, of course, the position of the gentleman from Louisiana. They said, "You ruined the program." They said, "Let us get through with this and rush it over to the other body where they can correct our errors." In politics you develop a thick hide. I did not resent that statement. I knew that history would prove my figures to be correct and accurate. What actually happened? They came back this year and said, "Yes, Mr. Chairman, we admit we overstated our needs. You gave us more money than we needed." Even Mr. Hollister, a very able man, said so. The record speaks for itself.

So, what happened? Out of the \$2,113 million we gave them last year, when we had ruined the program according to certain individuals, what happened? They confessed humbly and said, "Forgive us. You gave us \$538,800,000 more than we could spend."

Let us go into the category of obligations, because they must be considered now. I have mentioned appropriations. Obligations for fiscal 1956 for military were \$848,920,000. Now, what happened in fiscal 1957, the year we were accused of ruining the military program? They were able to obligate only \$1,674,200,000. Those figures are accurate, my friends.

Now, let us go to another category, and you must consider them all; otherwise your judgment would not be well founded.

Expenditures: 1956, \$2,572 million for military. Fiscal 1957, \$2,319 million for military. In 1958 they said, "Well, the program now is going down. We admit that we will spend less money. We will need only \$2.2 billion for military."

Now, what are the figures? We represent 170 million American taxpayers who are going to finance this program. If you adopt the bill before you at this time, you will have in military for new obligations and expenditures \$5,512 million. While this is being repetitious, it is worth it. They say that they can spend only \$2.2 billion, but with the new funds they are going to have money available in the amount of \$5,512 million. Taking into account their own figures and the fact that in the past they have overstated what they would spend, even so they will have sufficient funds to carry the program on for 2½ years.

Now, how can any person, regardless of his position, take a valid stand that we have crippled the program?

May I respectfully direct this to your attention: The mutual-security program does not have contacts with outside manufacturers. They procure from the Defense Department, and rightfully so,

of course. And, on what basis? I cannot afford to mention for the record for fear of misunderstanding, and you members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs should appreciate my fairness, but let me state it this way: What is the lead time? The time you can get it off the production line and put it on the boat. As to 77 percent of this military, your lead time is about 90 days. These people have been so accustomed to coming down here and bluffing and frightening the Congress into giving them money they do not need that it just burns them up to see some sense put into this program.

Let us go over to another program. That is defense support. Do not be misled by that term, "defense support." It is economic aid, just as any of the other aid programs. We give those countries the military money, we give them the air bases, and then we give them defense support, with which money they can build roads, buy materials, purchase anything they may need. It is a direct aid to their economy. In that particular item they started with \$900 million. The other body put the figure at \$800 million. The House put it down to \$500 million; but after some discussion, the House went to \$600 million and the bill went to conference. I do not like to use the word "capitulate"; it has an unpleasant connotation. So let us say that our friends from the Committee on Foreign Affairs decided to recede on \$150 million, so they gave them \$750 million for this newly singled out item of defense support that is not now attached to any of the other aid programs.

Your committee, in its wisdom, recommends \$585 million, a reduction of \$165 million. However, we are reappropriating \$36 million, which gives them more money for defense support than was available in the original House bill.

Let us move along now to the development loan fund. They asked for \$500 million and that figure prevailed all the way down the line. I will have to admit that I gave a little encouragement to the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the effect that if they would not compromise on the \$500 million, we would recommend appropriation of a sizable sum. Now, \$300 million is certainly a sizable sum for this purpose. So we have reduced that item by \$200 million.

Let me give you our reasons for making that reduction. About 2 years ago they came down and said they wanted \$200 million for the President's Asian fund. Oh, what a powerful story they presented in their effort to get that \$200 million; but the committee decided that we had better cut the sum to \$100 million and then apologize at some subsequent date if we had made a mistake and cut it too much. But what actually happened? The \$100 million was unattached for 2 years. They could carry it over for 3 years. Do you know how much they have spent out of that fund to date? They have spent \$6,623,000. They have left available in that Asian fund more than \$93 million. They have not been able to do anything with the money. Those are the facts. Do not be frightened about any statement that you may

read about our hurting this program, or by the awful crying to the same effect you are going to hear before the day is over.

Let us turn to special assistance. They asked for \$250 million and that figure prevailed all the way through the two bodies and in the conference. We reduced it to \$175 million, some of us believing that we had given them too much money. But we decided to reduce the request by only \$75 million.

Let us get into the technical assistance program and see if we can justify the committee's action there. I think we have a very good point. Last year they came before our committee and said that they would like to have \$135 million and also permission to carry over \$1,620,000 that was not really limited to 1 year. We gave them \$136,620,000. They went out and obligated and deobligated and reobligated and deobligated and reobligated—I have said that five times, because that was the number of times that they obligated and deobligated the item in this program. But they obligated only \$124,567,000; \$12,053,000 lapsed because they could not obligate it. I was about to recommend a higher figure and the committee decided to go along with me when the fact was revealed that they have \$165,163,000 in the pipeline. That much is unexpended. You know and I know, I am sure, that if we did not appropriate any money at all for this item, they would not be very badly hurt. But aware of the feeling concerning this item, we allowed \$113 million of new money and \$12 million of carryover, for a total of \$125 million. And I hope we will not have to apologize next year for recommending too much. But I feel sure we will have to make some mention of this as being the fact.

Now here is a puzzler. We looked over the authorization request and we could not find this item; that is, \$25 million for Latin America. Personally, I greatly admire our friends down there, but I asked, where is the justification? We have no justification. Where is the authorization? We have no authorization.

Well, what is it? In questioning witnesses about the Senator's amendment—I shall not call his name—for the \$25 million for Latin America, this is what they say, quoting from page 668 of the hearings. Mr. Snow, one of the Assistant Secretaries of State, was testifying. He said:

This year, again, Senator \* \* \* and those who agree with him in the Senate wished to make a special reservation of funds for Latin American development. It is \$25 million this year, I understand, and it has been put into the special assistance fund by the Senate.

Our position in the State Department has been that we did not consider this necessary.

Mr. PASSMAN. What is that, sir?

Mr. SNOW. We did not consider this a necessary provision to make because the type of loan contemplated by Senator \* \* \* is also contemplated under the new development loan fund, if that is approved.

Mr. PASSMAN. You do not think it is necessary for this committee to include the \$25 million? You believe the program could be carried on satisfactorily without this particular increase?

Mr. SNOW. Yes; I believe so.

If that is the proper way to do things, just because some individual says, "Put me in for \$25 million," and another says, "Mark me down for \$10 million," then I do not believe I will ever understand it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FORD. Is it not true that the executive branch of the Government did not request that \$25 million? The point I am sure the gentleman is trying to make is that the legislative branch in the other body is at fault in this.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thought I had made it abundantly clear that there was no request for an authorization, and I am quoting one of the secretaries that they did not request it.

Mr. FORD. Our subcommittee was unanimous in rejecting the \$25 million?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct. I want to pay particular praise to the full committee for being unanimous in rejecting that item.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. This authorization was certainly approved on the House side, was it not?

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not know what you approved. I am only giving you the testimony. You make the policy; I talk about the money.

Mr. FASCELL. Maybe I misunderstood the gentleman. I thought he made the statement that there was no authorization for this item.

Mr. PASSMAN. No; I said there was no authorization request. You have authorization requests and later you have an authorization. You have no authorization request but you have an authorization; but it was not based upon testimony from downtown. Am I correct?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Now, there is another item here that is also a puzzler. This came down in connection with atoms for peace. When they start talking about a gun, a ship, a pistol, a plane, or atoms, we start shaking and usually give them just about what they want.

But what happened? They came down last year and said, "Here is a little program. We want \$6 million for atoms for peace." I said, "We had better not run too far away from that one," so we gave them \$6 million and thanked them for coming in with the atoms for peace.

Then, they went along for a full 12 months. They could obligate only \$1,550,000. They came back this year and they had \$4,450,000 on hand unobligated, lapsing. So this fine member of the Atomic Energy Commission, a wonderful personality, a great American, came in, and he said, "Mr. Chairman, we want \$7 million this year." So the members of the committee decided we had better have a little talk with the gentleman. I cannot go too much into detail, but it goes something like

this. I quote from page 1091 of the hearings on atoms for peace. Mr. PASSMAN was doing the questioning at the time:

Mr. PASSMAN. Would you approve if this committee and the Congress should appropriate money for all departments, to the amount of about \$74 billion a year, on the basis of the type of justification you have made this morning? Would not you feel a bit uncertain that we did not require agencies to justify their programs?

Mr. VANCE. Yes, sir; you are very right.

So we decided not to recommend appropriation of the \$7 million. But we wanted to be as congenial and as liberal as we could, so we recommended the \$4,450,000 carryover only because of its label, "atoms for peace."

Mr. Chairman, I did not ask for the job of being the chairman of this subcommittee on appropriations. There are many Members who in all probability could do a better job, but I do not think there is any Member who would work any harder or any longer than I have done in trying to know what is in this bill and what is actually needed. As long as I am chairman of this subcommittee, I shall fight and fight just as hard as I can to give these people all the money they need to carry on the programs that our leaders say we should have to protect the security of the United States. But, my friends, are we going to appropriate money based upon justification and upon their needs and upon the facts or are we going to be panicked into giving these departments money that they do not need and that they cannot spend? There are two ways to appropriate money—one is on the basis of justification, using the past record and their own certified facts, and the other is to get stamped into following some person who may be able and sincere, but who does not know any more about this bill than I know about surgery. I plead with you to stand by the recommendations of your subcommittee. I promise you that if we have denied \$1 that they actually need, I will submit my resignation as a member of this subcommittee and I will not conduct the hearings next year. I know I can make that statement and be perfectly safe in coming back here next year, and also knowing that I will have to come in and apologize again for recommending more money than actually needed, unless you approve this bill which is based upon commonsense and based upon what they need, rather than on a lot of headlines that were issued prior to the time we marked the bill. I have consumed a lot of time, but my convictions are deep. As I say, the magicians may slip into the Chamber today and may endeavor to get you to accept a lot of facts and figures that are not in the record and they will try to get you to accept changed figures that have been submitted subsequent to the time of our hearings. If that should happen, I have some letters over the signatures of certain individuals that I would be forced to read to you at a subsequent time.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. As the gentleman says, possibly we gave them more money last year than they needed. But the gentleman also reports that they did not spend all we gave them. So, no matter how much we gave them, they did not spend more money than they needed. Is that the gentleman's statement?

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to be sure you understand that I do not intend to convey such an impression. I am accusing them of purposely losing sleep working up figures that cannot be justified and asking for more money than they need, and which they do not need, you understand, so as to obtain more than they can possibly spend. I challenge anyone to disprove that statement.

Mr. JUDD. But my point is that they did not spend it.

Mr. PASSMAN. They did not spend it because they asked for more money than they needed and they overstated their requirements, and I believe my distinguished friend, Mr. JUDD, knows that.

Mr. JUDD. My point is—was our country injured by the money that we gave them that they did not need or use? My own idea is that when we are in a war—and we are—it is always advisable to have a little extra, in case it should prove necessary. It was not needed last year and they did not spend it. They turned back \$538 million of funds made available for military assistance and in the special Asian fund, as the gentleman has said, there is still some \$94 million that has not been spent. I think they ought to be congratulated for that. That gives me a greater sense of confidence in them.

Mr. PASSMAN. Well, the gentleman from Minnesota can congratulate them, but I am going to condemn them for trying to mislead this subcommittee of which I am the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana has consumed 34 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a total overall of \$3,191,810,000. Why do we have the bill? It is because of our own military situation and the world military situation where we have the Communists knocking at every port of entry in the world, trying to get in and spread their wild doctrines all over the world. They are succeeding in this, beyond the wishes of many of us.

For my part, I think we made a mistake in providing as much money as we did for some of the economic operations of Mutual Security in the early days. Now, however, No. 1 on the picture is military aid. That military aid has to be provided to these people in the poorer countries of the world, on the periphery of the Iron Curtain, so that they will be able to defend their homelands, and so that other persons there, capable of defending their homelands, will keep the Communist program from breaking loose and spreading all over Europe and the rest of Asia and Africa.

Now that is just where we are, but that is just what the military item in the bill is designed to give us.

The next item is defense support. Defense support means the pay for the troops in these border countries. I will name those border countries, so that you may have them in mind to a certain extent.

They are Greece, Turkey, Jordan, Iran, Pakistan, South Vietnam, Korea, the Philippines.

Then we have the situation in NATO where we are obligated to supply certain arms and ammunition to the people there. There is \$175 million in the budget request to set up a fund which would enable them to purchase arms and ammunition for sale to Germany on the installment plan. That is necessary for us to provide, because there is no other nation in the world in a position to provide it. Those two items are the heart of this bill that we have before us.

The President asked for an appropriation of \$1,900,000,000 and the reappropriation of \$538.8 million for military assistance. The budget estimate has been cut down to \$1.6 billion, the size of the authorization bill, plus the reappropriation.

There is \$1,788,000,000 for military assistance in the bill. There is \$621 million for defense support. The two together make a little over \$2,400,000,000. The rest of the bill runs about \$700 million, and is mostly for other things, some of which cannot be provided for in advance.

The figures that the bill was marked up on show \$1,674,200,000 for the military assistance obligations in 1957. But a saving of \$539 million in the appropriation was brought about by a careful review which the head of the security agency had made of all of the items that had been reserved between 1950 and 1956 and carried along. That was salvaged out of those earlier appropriations that they had gathered together, the life of which had been extended down through the years. They used that to buy the things that permitted them to save the \$539 million that was left.

The actual expenditures, including expenditures from those funds last year, ran to \$2,213,200,000. That means that we are giving them a great deal less than they had before, and this for items that are absolutely essential if we are going to take care of our end of maintaining the peace of the world.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I ask the gentleman if it is not also a fact that there is an item of \$175 million in the 1958 obligation picture for the new revolving sales program, which was not in the 1957 picture at all? So that \$175 million more should be included to obtain a fair 1957 yardstick?

Mr. TABER. That has to be added to it. I spoke about that a moment ago. That is the fund which is to be used to buy military equipment to maintain the situation in Germany, to sell arms and equipment to Germany on the installment plan.

That is the reason why I feel that we should not go very much below the au-

thorization figure in approaching our writing of this bill.

I have here a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State dated today, indicating that the \$500 million worth of spare parts, ammunition, and other items that were involved in this picture was procured in this way. That is why I feel that we need to supply more funds for this program. I do not believe that we ought to cut defense support as much as we have. We have cut it \$165 million below the authorization figure. Frankly, I believe the result of that kind of operation will be that we will have to supply a great deal more of our own troops out in other parts of the world than we would have to if we were able to get as many people as possible in those lands to defend their own homeland instead of us having to have our troops there.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on down the line.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he leaves that military figure?

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

Mr. VORYS. There is this statement in the committee report which looks quite impressive, on page 5, referring to the amount which has been cut \$350 million for military assistance. It states:

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,250,000,000 for this item plus the reappropriation of \$538,800,000 (the latest estimate, amount unobligated as of June 30, 1957). This will provide \$1,788,800,000 for obligation during the fiscal year 1958. This amount is \$114,600,000 more than was actually obligated and reserved during fiscal year 1957 and is \$939,880,000 more than was actually obligated and reserved during fiscal year 1956.

That impressed me very much because it was entirely out of line with what my own recollection of what the figures were. I have seen the copy of this letter from Mr. Mansfield D. Sprague, in which he points out that the actual fiscal year 1957 program was \$2,200,000,000 and was not \$1,700,000,000 and what was used was \$500 million that had been programmed someplace else, but which was \$500 million of appropriations that were used in 1957. So it would seem to me the statement in the report may be technically accurate when it refers to obligations and reservations, but it is misleading when it is shown what was actually programmed. The amount was two billion two and not one billion seven.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is just as wrong as he can be. He is looking at the wrong figure. I anticipated this so I have given you appropriations, obligations, and expenditures. The 1958 estimated expenditures were \$2,200,000,000. The gentleman should have another look at it.

Mr. TABER. When they obligate funds out of prior years' appropriations, like they did in this case, over \$500 million out of the 1956 appropriation which are salvaged, they are charged to the

year in which they were appropriated and not to the 1957 figure.

Mr. VORYS. As far as the Congress and the taxpayers are concerned, the operations in fiscal 1957 were two billion two regardless of year they came from. Therefore you cannot plan as if you are going to have the same expenditures, the same program, next year, if you cut it about half a billion dollars. That is what strikes me.

Mr. TABER. That is exactly correct, and that is why we should protect the United States by providing money enough for the President to run the job to keep us out of trouble.

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Will the gentleman please get some type of a letter, some type of a statement, establishing any figure that he mentioned? In committee this morning the gentleman said we had erroneous figures. Will the gentleman please, for the benefit of the committee, get some letter disproving one figure that I have here?

Mr. TABER. Sure, I will get it. The gentleman need not worry about that.

Mr. PASSMAN. I sure hope the gentleman does.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in appearing before your committee, Mr. Benjamin Fairless, of whom we all know and who, incidentally, served as coordinator of the President's citizens advisory group on the mutual security program, in stating that he had had a complete change of heart about the program since the investigation which he recently made at home and abroad, added these words:

I think there are millions of Americans today who are still under the wrong impression about our foreign assistance programs. They think most of the expenditures are in so-called economic giveaway programs, and they do not realize that most of them are in the mutual defense of our country in working together with our allies.

Misunderstanding is responsible for many difficulties in life. It would be tragic, however, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, if misunderstanding by the people, should result in crippling a program which, in my judgment, is vital to our country in terms of national defense and in terms of world peace.

I am sure that if properly understood by the people, there would be no doubt of their support.

Our whole system of national defense is based on the allied forces supported by the military features in this bill.

Seventy-five percent of the total carried by this bill, Mr. Chairman, is for the purpose of that military support.

The total provided for this purpose is only about 8 percent of the funds we make available for our own forces.

It saves us tremendously in terms both of military manpower and of dollars.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, this program has had its shortcomings.

I have lived pretty closely with it from the outset as a member of the sub-

committee in charge of its appropriations. I have traveled around the world and watched it in operation in country after country. I have done my best to cure its shortcomings and to bring about economy and efficiency.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have always supported the objectives of the program.

The program has recently been described as "the most difficult and far-flung operation in the history of the world." There are bound to be shortcomings and it is easy to generalize and arrive at a wrong conclusion as to the program as a whole.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

I want to mention in passing, however, that in my judgment real progress has been made in the right direction during the last 2 years under the leadership of our former colleague, John Hollister, and our former Secretary of the Army, Gordon Gray.

For those who are interested, I refer to page 430 of the hearings where you will find some 14 pages on administrative and program improvements inserted in the record by Mr. Hollister at my request.

I refer also to the testimony of Assistant Secretary of Defense Sprague who succeeded Gordon Gray, commencing at page 325, where the record indicates that no less than \$500 million of savings were effected during the past year by administrative improvements, including the very marked shortening of administrative lead time.

The fact that all appropriations are not obligated is to me a happy change when compared with the practices of the past. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], that it is a basis for commendation and not for condemnation.

#### DROP IN APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

The members will note that appropriations have fallen from a peak of \$7.4 billion back in 1951 down to \$3.9 billion as of today; and that expenditures show a similar trend, falling from a peak of \$5.7 billion in 1953 down to \$3.9 billion today.

#### IMPORTANCE OF PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the importance of this program can be over-emphasized.

It reflects a policy which has been bipartisan in character, adopted in the face of the military might of the Kremlin and its insatiable desire for world domination.

It implements a policy of collective security based on the conviction that with 6 percent of the world's population not only a powerful America but powerful allies are vital to our national defense.

It carries forward a military policy which has compelled the Kremlin, for the time being at least, to abandon military aggression, and to concentrate its efforts in other fields.

It carries forward an economic policy of the helping hand where necessary to nations desiring to remain free and outside the Iron Curtain.

To relax these policies, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, is to play directly into the hands of the Kremlin.

## COMMITTEE ACTION

I am very unhappy at the recommendations submitted by your committee.

Military assistance, slashed \$300 million in the authorization bill, has been slashed another \$350 million, for a total of \$650 million or just about 33½ percent of the original request.

Defense support, slashed \$150 million in the authorization bill, has been slashed another \$130 million for a total of \$280 million below the budget request.

The new development loan fund for which \$500 million for the first year was carried in both versions of the authorization bill, has been slashed 40 percent to a total of \$300 million.

The President's special assistance fund, designed primarily for emergency purposes, slashed \$50 million on the authorization bill has been slashed another \$75 million for a total of \$125 million less than the budget request.

The over-all total has been reduced about \$800 million below the authorization bill and about \$1,300,000,000 below the revised estimates submitted by the President.

It leaves an unexpended military assistance balance as of the end of 1957 of about \$3,700,000,000 and as of the end of 1958 of about \$3,200,000,000, both of which are far below the 2-year level of pipeline normally required by the military.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the able gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. He talked about the percentage cuts. Some of the percentage cuts are 40 percent, 33 percent, and so on. How do these cuts compare with the average cut we made in other appropriation bills heretofore passed by the House?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have not made a computation of all the cuts in terms of percentage, but the cut to which I have just referred of 33½ percent in military assistance is of course far in excess of the average percentage cuts which have been made.

Mr. MORANO. Much deeper?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Very much deeper.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I should like to answer the question the gentleman just asked. The cuts in the other departments run from 2 percent in Treasury to 31 percent in Commerce, but the Defense Department cut was 6.5 percent, and this runs over 25 percent.

## MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of military assistance is primarily to provide military equip-

ment made in American factories by American labor to our allies.

It is to help Korea, Taiwan, and Turkey, maintain more divisions, each of them, than we maintain in the United States.

It is to help maintain some 4,800,000 ground forces, 2,500 combat ships, and 27,000 planes.

It is to maintain them at a cost of something like 3 or 4 percent of what it would cost us if we tried to do the job with American manpower and American dollars.

Surely no one wants our American boys to shoulder the burden that our allies are now carrying for us.

The cut of 33½ percent, in my judgment, is far too drastic.

## DEFENSE SUPPORT

The purpose of defense support is to help certain allies to maintain forces which it would be impossible for them to maintain without assistance.

Korea has 21 divisions. Taiwan has 20 divisions. Turkey has 20 divisions. None of them could support their armed forces without assistance from this country.

I may add, Mr. Chairman, that cuts in this particular item are especially hard to take, because all defense support money is money contemplated for expenditure in 1958—there are no long-term items in it—and because 80 percent of the total requested under this heading goes to 5 countries—Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, Pakistan, and Turkey—which are of such great importance to us in terms of our national defense.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. What does the gentleman think that the Government of Korea, for example, could do if it had to take, as a result of the cuts in this bill, a 35 percent cut in the defense support which is keeping it going. Would it demobilize 7 of its 21 divisions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I assume it would have to demobilize a substantial number of its divisions. It would be impossible for Korea to continue to support all its divisions without assistance.

Mr. JUDD. In 6 years we have spent literally billions of dollars equipping those divisions and training them. They are first rate. Now, are we going to demobilize 7 of their 21 divisions because they themselves simply do not have the funds to pay and feed and house and clothe and supply them? That is what defense support is for.

Or is Korea, as an alternative to demobilization, to run the printing presses and crack up with inflation?

And third, what will happen to the morale of that army if its great and powerful ally which has encouraged it to build up those divisions and which has equipped and supplied them now says, "We will not make it possible for you to keep those divisions in the field." And what good will any of the divisions be, if their confidence in us and their morale are shaken?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. These forces, in my judgment, are in our front lines. I can think of nothing more

shortsighted from a national standpoint than to make it impossible for them to continue to function.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is not Korea a United Nations operation?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman knows that Korea has some 21 divisions and that they are playing their part in the Free World front lines.

Mr. GROSS. What is the United Nations doing to support South Korea?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not know just what it is doing, but we are not talking about that today. We are talking about our own national defense, and the part that our allies play in the front lines in our defense.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the United Nations sharing in the support of South Korea since it is supposed to be a United Nations operation?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I assume it is to some extent, but I cannot answer that.

Mr. GROSS. Why must we take the whole load then; or are we taking the whole load?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. FORD. At the time of the armistice in Korea, we had seven divisions—United States Army divisions in Korea. We now have less than two. Our United Nations allies, likewise, had forces there at the time of the armistice. They have made reductions not much greater, if any greater percentagewise. So they do have forces in South Korea just as we do.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, if the gentleman will yield further, they did not have any troops there in the first place—percentagewise or otherwise.

Mr. FORD. I might say this. Some of the countries that are being assisted by defense support and this program had some of the most valiant and valorous forces in South Korea during the fight.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I will get some time later to answer that one.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman from Minnesota is complaining about the fact that this bill would wreck the forces defending Korea and Formosa. Is it not a fact that this bill carries \$621 million for defense support whereas the House recommendation in the authorization bill only carried \$600 million? Therefore, we have \$21 million more in this bill than the House authorized for that purpose.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, that was a great mistake, I believe, on the part of the House. The \$621 million is still almost \$300 million below the budget request.

Mr. GARY. But this bill provides \$21 million more than the House authorized.

Mr. JUDD. But it still is less than the budget request and the authorization bill.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, we did not give them any more than they need.

Mr. VORYS. The House authorized yesterday \$750 million for defense support. That is the last vote of the House, when they approved the conference report. That is what the House approved.

Mr. GARY. But the House did not approve that amount in the House bill. The House conferees gave way to the Senate conferees in arriving at that amount.

Mr. VORYS. You were asking what the House approved. They approved \$750 million only yesterday.

Mr. GARY. Not as a specific item. They approved the conference report with that as one of the items in it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If I may now say a few words, I would like to say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] that I am reliably informed that the amount recommended in this bill for defense support for 15 nations is \$80 million below that which was requested for only five of them—Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, Pakistan, and Turkey.

I am further advised that the program for those five countries will have to be cut to the extent of 32 percent.

The programs for five other countries, including Iran, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos and Greece, will also be cut to the extent of 32 percent.

Also the programs for four base-supporting countries, Ethiopia, Libya, Morocco, and the Philippine Islands must be cut more than 20 percent.

I hold in my hand a copy of a press release, issued at the White House this morning. It states, among other things, that the President said the proposed cut in defense support will compel almost certainly dangerous reductions in the size and effectiveness of the forces now being maintained by free nations bordering on Communist lands; and, in addition, that it will lead to serious difficulty in the economies of those nations supporting such forces.

Let us return now, Mr. Chairman, to other items in this bill.

#### ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION

The purpose of economic and technical cooperation is to help countries desiring to remain free and outside the Iron Curtain who are not strong enough economically to remain free without assistance.

It is in this field that most criticism has centered in the past. There have been too many projects and too many ill-considered projects. Projects have been based on illustrative programs unsatisfactory to the Executive—unsatisfactory to the Congress. There has been too much personnel. There have been waste and extravagance.

This year the bill provides for a new procedure. It results from the recent investigations made for the President, for the Senate, and for the House.

It provides for a development fund limited to making loans. It is designed to bring about economy and efficiency; to put economic aid on a more business-like basis along the lines of the Export-Import Bank; to substitute loans for grants; to provide financing under which repayment is possible in place of the present system where there is no repayment; to eliminate unsatisfactory illustrative programs; to substitute spe-

cific projects under specified criteria; to base requests for appropriations on known performance in the past rather than on unknown performance in the future.

It offers the possibility, in my judgment, of great improvement.

The original request was for a capital fund of \$2 billion to be accumulated over a period of 3 years, \$500 million in appropriations in the first year and \$750 million through borrowing authority from the Treasury in both the second and third years.

The authorization bill provides for a maximum capital of \$1,125,000,000 to be accumulated over a period of 2 years, \$500 million in the first year, \$625 million in the second year, both in terms of appropriations.

The \$500 million carried in both versions of the authorization bill have been slashed by your committee to \$300 million, in spite of an expenditure for development assistance in fiscal year 1957 amounting to about \$410 million.

The slash is far too drastic.

In his press release this morning the President states that the slash of 40 percent "makes impossible the realization of the important purpose for which the fund was established by the Congress."

#### SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FUND

The purpose of the special assistance fund is to provide the President with funds which he can use if necessary in cases of emergency.

Similar funds have been provided in the past. They have been used only in the case of emergency. They have proved vitally important in such cases as Iran, Guatemala, and, I think, Hungary and Jordan.

Three hundred million dollars was requested, \$100 million for programed items, and \$200 million for emergencies.

The total, slashed by \$50 million in the authorization bill, is further slashed to the extent of \$75 million, or a total of \$125 million, in your committee recommendations, leaving a total of \$175 million, \$100 million of which is already programed.

To quote the President's press release again:

The cut in the special assistance fund will not only seriously affect the funds for such programs as the worldwide effort to eradicate malaria and to aid Hungarian refugees, but it will also seriously reduce the reserve funds hithertofore provided to the President to meet the emergencies which inevitably develop in the world we live in today.

#### TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHER PROGRAMS

I shall not refer, Mr. Chairman, to the technical assistance program or to the other programs, some 15 in number, carrying relatively small amounts and detailed in the committee report.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, that our whole national defense plans are based on the allied forces supported by military assistance and defense support; that failure to appropriate sufficient military funds for this purpose plays directly into the hands of the Communists and compels the utilization of far more American manpower and far more American dollars.

I regret that the committee has made such drastic reductions.

I hope that they will largely be restored before the bill becomes law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has again expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER.]

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations brings to the floor of the House for your approval the mutual security appropriations bill for 1958.

Our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], together with the other members of the subcommittee have spent many long hours in examining witnesses who appeared to justify the amounts requested for the Mutual Security Program for fiscal year 1958. During our hearings we heard 70 witnesses and if you will examine the hearings you will find that 1,159 pages were consumed in recording the action of our subcommittee.

The budget submitted to Congress on January 16 of this year assumes that a surplus will exist in both fiscal year 1957 and 1958. The 1958 budget calls for record peacetime expenditures of \$71,800,000,000. The proposed expenditure increases are distributed broadly and consist for the most part of many small increases. Budget receipts of \$73,600,000,000 are estimated for fiscal year 1958. The people generally do not believe that this budget is consistent with good government and, in order to stabilize our economy and to encourage its sound growth, there must be a reduction in the budget requests for 1958. A casual examination of the budget clearly shows that it is in precarious balance depending upon postal-rate increases and other anticipations which probably will not take place plus the hope for a steadily rising income. Of course, none of this is assured.

When the 1958 budget was presented to Congress comparisons were immediately made of the amounts approved for prior years. For 1957 we have \$60,647,000,000; \$53,124,000,000 for 1956; \$47,464,000,000 for 1955; \$54,539,000,000 for 1954; \$75,355,000,000 for 1953; \$91,059,000,000 for 1952; \$84,982,000,000 for 1951; and \$37,825,000,000 for 1950. Presentation of the 1958 budget caused consternation throughout the land.

Current taxes from all sources are taking a full third of the income of all citizens. Taxes at present rates are taking more than 90 percent of a great many individual incomes and more than 60 percent of the net income of most of our corporations. I for one believe that our present tax rates are approaching confiscation, and I do not believe that our present economy can survive under such conditions. Our dollar value is dropping, and inflation is certainly with us today. Our Federal debt is at its statutory limit, and it requires 10 cents of every tax dollar to pay the interest on our debt. The \$275 billion Federal debt equals the full assessed value of all of the land, buildings, machinery, and tangible personal property in the United States. Our debt is larger than the debts of all other countries of the world put together. Our

Government has reached tremendous proportions requiring some 2,500,000 employees.

The main difficulty faced by Congress in attempting to reduce the budget stems from the fact that much of the money to be spent in the ensuing fiscal year has already been provided by Congress in authorizations and appropriations permitting the purchase of goods to be paid for on delivery and the expending of borrowed funds. This obligational authority prevents, in many instances, reductions where cuts might be justified. Another factor in reducing the budget is the fact that so many expenditures are fixed by basic law. One of the basic arguments for reducing the 1958 budget is that the Federal Government is simply too big and participates in too many things which should be controlled by private industry. Another argument, of course, is that the upward trend of Federal spending is inflationary and if continued will bring on a depression. The people generally were shocked at the amounts contained in the 1958 budget and, in pointing out places where reductions might be made, much was said about reducing foreign aid. Statements to the effect that the United States should get out of the foreign-aid business and look to the needs of its own taxpayers were heard on every corner. With little understanding existing at the present time concerning the Mutual Security Program, or foreign aid as you might want to call it, it is understandable why so many demands have been made that the foreign-aid program be reduced substantially or eliminated entirely. Complete failure on the part of this administration and its predecessors to properly explain the Mutual Security Program to the people of this country is the reason for the major attack on foreign-aid spending at this time. Foreign aid is a vital investment in the Nation's own security, and some of our money expended in this program has produced results.

This is the situation with which we were confronted at the time the President requested \$4,400,000,000 for the mutual-security program for fiscal year 1958. Shortly after hearings were started by our committee, the \$4,400,000,000 request was reduced to \$3,864,000,000 in new appropriations and request made for reappropriation of \$538,800,000 for military assistance. The overall amount requested for reappropriation is \$667,050,000. In addition to this figure, we have \$93,673,000 in the Special Presidential Fund that carries over and requires no reappropriation.

The Mutual Security Act of 1957 as passed by the other body contains authorizations amounting to \$3,637,110,000. The House version recommended appropriations totaling \$3,136,610,000. After conference and upon final passage of the Mutual Security Act of 1957 we have requests totaling \$3,386,860,000.

At present our mutual-security program is divided into four parts—military assistance, defense support, development assistance, and technical cooperation. Under military assistance we have appropriations for weapons, equipment, training, spare parts, and maintenance. Under defense support necessary appro-

priations are made for projects such as highways, ports, and communications. Under development assistance we have appropriations for countries where no substantial military assistance program was in force and pertaining to economic assistance other than technical cooperation. Technical cooperation consists of the sharing of our technical knowledge and skills with other free countries, and necessary appropriations are granted to carry out this purpose.

The program as submitted for fiscal year 1958 seeks to place defense assistance appropriations, both military assistance and defense support, in the regular Department of Defense budget and creates the proposed development loan fund which would be earmarked for use to help finance, independently or in partnership with other public lending institutions or private enterprise, soundly conceived economic development in free countries of the less developed areas. Requests were made for \$500 million in fiscal year 1958 for the development loan fund and for \$750 million in each of the 2 ensuing years to be financed through public-debt authority.

Before taking up the amounts recommended in this bill for the mutual-security program for fiscal year 1958, it might be well to review briefly the purposes for this program and the accomplishments since its inauguration in 1948. From 1945 through June 30, 1956, we have expended \$63,940,975,000 for foreign aid. Our contribution to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency of the United Nations Organization totaling \$2.3 billion marked the beginning of our foreign-aid program. In the year 1947 President Harry S Truman requested Congress to appropriate necessary sums for aid to Turkey and Greece, thereby stopping Communist aggression in this section of the world. In 1948 the Economic Cooperation Act was passed authorizing the European recovery program as proposed by Secretary of State George C. Marshall. Here we have the beginning of the Marshall plan. Next, in order to increase the defensive strength of our allies the Mutual Defense Assistance Pact was passed in 1949. The Act for International Development of 1950 authorized technical cooperation and our Mutual Security Act of 1951 changed the purpose of economic aid. We are presently operating under our Mutual Security Act of 1954.

The Marshall plan prevented a collapse of western and southern Europe and completed postwar reconstruction. Technical and economic assistance prevailed at this time. Here we have substantial incrementation of production, restoration of internal financial stability, the economy of Europe, acquisition of integration of a dollar exchange by dollar savings and increased imports. European imports increased 65 percent, inter-European trade increased 86 percent, and production of agricultural commodities exceeded prewar levels. The Marshall plan was a success.

The Soviet Union with its show of force and threats in Greece, Iran, Turkey, Malaya, Burma, Philippines, Vietnam, and Korea, took us out of the purely technical and economic aid field and com-

pelled us to begin our program of military assistance and defense support.

The mutual-security program is now considered as a vital part of our foreign policy. This is based on the premise that the strength evidenced by the free nations of the world is essential to the preservation of our own freedom. It is an admitted fact that today there is no evidence whatsoever of a change of position or of a weakening on the part of the Soviet Union. Our accomplishments under the Marshall plan are admitted and Turkey, Greece, and so far Jordan are excellent examples of the effectiveness of the mutual-security assistance program.

The plea which we often hear that the mutual-security program is necessary to our national security and must be recognized as a continuing program certainly has not been properly explained to the people in this country. We have expended millions of dollars on several programs since 1948 which have not proved successful. In some instances certain countries receiving our mutual-security assistance have handled their programs in such a loose manner as to bring about charges of graft and bad management. Our people do not approve of this type of management and our mutual-security program has suffered as a result of same.

Our mutual-security program so far has not been operated on a businesslike basis, and this has resulted in confusion and the squandering of millions of dollars.

The attention of our committee has from time to time been called to the statement that collective security is truly a case in which the whole is greater than the sum of the parts, and the instrument which creates the whole out of these parts is our mutual-defense-assistance program. This program consists of two elements—first, the provision of weapons and military equipment to friendly countries; and, second, economic aid which is given to allied countries to compensate their economies for contributions made to the common defense.

People generally in this country do not realize that approximately 85 percent of every dollar expended in the mutual-security program is for materials, supplies, and equipment manufactured and purchased in this country. For a number of years our offshore procurement program was one part of this program which was subject to criticism. This criticism was justified. We have heard charges from time to time of graft and poor management on the part of some of the countries who have been receiving our assistance.

A great many of our people are unable to understand the necessity of the expenditure of millions of dollars for construction of irrigation projects in French West Africa, hydroelectric plants in Iceland, steam-electric stations in Italy, irrigation and power-development projects in Portugal, multi-purpose dams in Taiwan, thermal-power-generation plants in Cambodia and Vietnam, hydropower plants in Korea, flood-control projects in the Philippines, land-and-water-utilization projects in Egypt, irrigation projects in India, Nepal, and

Ethiopia, together with all the other projects constructed to date, totaling 197. These projects were constructed in 42 countries, and a number of them cannot be justified.

Sixty-seven out of eighty-seven countries in the world have received aid of some form under our mutual security program. In fiscal year 1958 10 countries will receive military assistance, 28 countries will receive military and economic assistance, and 21 countries will receive economic aid.

As the leading Nation of the world today we have assumed obligations which in the past were generally provided for by Great Britain. At the beginning of the 20th century Great Britain was acknowledged as the greatest country in the world. In 1900 the British Empire consisted of more than 60 colonies or one-fourth of the globe. In 1939 the British population totaled 563 million but, according to current estimates, Great Britain's population in 1959 will amount to only some 30 million. During the 19th century Great Britain, as the leading world power, developed a great many undeveloped countries of the world. Great Britain's present financial trouble is the result of the "Workshop of the World" being seriously out of date in many respects and with concentration shifting to other countries with newer methods. The burden of the tremendous defense program over an extended period of time has finally taken its toll. As Great Britain loses her empire, the United States is called upon to assist these new countries of the world economically. Both of our countries are now caught in an inflationary spiral. Our assistance economically and militarily to the new countries is to keep them from going behind the Iron Curtain. A total of 19 nations have received their independence since 1945, and their combined populations amount to 700 million people. A great many of these nations, such as Ghana, are in need of roads, schools, sanitation projects, and many other projects which, if granted, will raise their economic standards. The question is just how far can we go with our mutual security program in aiding the new nations of the world. We must stop and take a new look at our entire program.

Can we depend on foreign aid as an instrument of our foreign policy? We are today making an intensive effort to answer that question. During the past few months a citizens committee was sent around the world to ascertain what, if anything, foreign aid is accomplishing. This committee, under the able leadership of Benjamin Fairless, proposes that foreign aid programs be continued at about their present levels with, however, greater emphasis given upon the making of private investments.

We should keep in mind that the cost of maintaining an American soldier in this country is \$3,511 annually. This does not include the weapons, equipment, transportation, and other costs which go into making him an effective fighting man in any part of the world. By contrast, the cost to pay, house, feed, and clothe a French soldier is \$1,440, Pakistani \$485, National Chinese \$142, and a

Turk \$105. The figure of \$3,511 for an American soldier is only about half of what it costs to maintain an American soldier worldwide. The cost of maintaining an American soldier abroad is approximately \$7,100 per capita per year.

In Korea our problem is almost entirely military. Korea is still in a state of suspended war and here the sole hope rests upon the presence of American and United Nations troops on her soil. In Formosa, we intended in the beginning to prevent the island from going to the Communists and this has been accomplished. So far our assistance to Japan has paid dividends. If Japan deserts the Free World, our position in the Pacific would become almost untenable.

In considering our foreign-aid program together with our foreign policy, I am just wondering if our 2,000 foreign-aid projects underway throughout the world today, can be properly administered effectively and if our people in charge of these projects know enough about the countries concerned to carry this number at one time.

Our people know very little about the projects or the purposes of the projects which we have underway throughout the world today. There is considerable distortion and misunderstanding of this entire program. Our people are not adequately informed regarding conditions in the countries receiving aid. Some foreign-aid information is available to the public, but military and diplomatic secrecy prevails in many instances. For instance, the Department of Defense disclosed that from January through December of 1956, our allies received \$1,100,000,000 worth of planes, \$118 million worth of tanks and combat vehicles, \$110 million worth of ships, and \$129 million worth of electronic and communications equipment. The Department of Defense very carefully omitted naming the countries receiving this equipment or any part of same. We have built up a complicated extensive program and disseminated information abroad regarding the United States, but our agencies, such as the United States Information Agency, are not permitted under present law to disseminate information to the people in this country.

Since World War II, we have clearly demonstrated to the world that we can produce and share great quantities of wealth. We have, through the volume of our foreign aid, made many mistakes and squandered much money. If a smaller amount of aid were given after more careful planning the results received would be considerably more effective than the larger amount which we have attempted to administer mechanically.

In making his annual request for mutual security, our President recommended that foreign-aid activities be placed on a continuing authorization basis and that military assistance and defense support be included in the regular budget of the Defense Department. I do not agree with either proposal. It is obvious that the placing of nearly all of the foreign-aid program on a continuing basis is an attempt to remove this annual problem from the public's attention, as well as that of Congress.

Transfer of military aid and defense support to the defense budget is simply a method of attempting to bury the larger portion of each year's foreign outlay. The American taxpayer foots the bill and is entitled to know just what is going on.

The new development loan fund program would start with an initial appropriation of \$500 million for 1958. The authorization act provides for the sum of \$625 million for fiscal year 1959. In other words, the program is limited to a 2-year period. Loans made under this program would be replaceable in either dollars or local currencies, and they would be soft loans. Development loans under the proposal as submitted this year would be made directly to the country, or as a guaranty to private businessmen who are prepared to invest their own resources. Loans could be made to public or industrial banks which, in turn, would make investment capital available to qualified private businessmen or farmers. This money would be used to buy the obligations of new productive business which would later be sold to private individuals to be used to finance activities which support or supplement opportunities for privately financed ventures.

The Fairless report states that loans by the United States repayable in inconvertible currencies of foreign nations are undesirable, and the practice of granting them should be terminated. This report further states that our relations with other countries will suffer from United States control of large amounts of their currencies, and the soundness of the loan device should not be jeopardized by inviting repayment in foreign currencies which cannot be freely spent by the United States. This is in direct contradiction to the proposal of the State Department today.

In reviewing our foreign-aid program over the years we find that in fiscal year 1953 the budget request amounted to \$7,914,000,000 with \$6,143,000,000 approved. The reduction amounted to \$1,771,000,000 or a 22.4 percent cut; in 1954, \$7,689,000,000 requested with \$4,725,000,000 granted thereby resulting in a 38.5 percent cut; in 1955, \$3,510,000,000 requested with \$2,781,000,000 granted thereby resulting in a 20.8 percent cut; in 1956, \$3,530,000,000 requested with \$2,703,000,000 granted thereby resulting in a 23.4 percent cut; in 1957, \$4,860,000,000 requested with \$3,767,000,000 granted thereby resulting in a 22.5 percent cut. Each year great noises result from a reduction by our subcommittee of the amounts requested for foreign aid, but no satisfactory evidence has ever been presented to our committee after the reductions were made showing that the cuts adversely affected the foreign-aid program. The truth of the matter is that the annual multi-billion-dollar carryover of unexpended military economic aid funds indicates just the contrary. This proves that our reductions still left adequate funds for the program.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend the following amounts for our mutual-security program for fiscal year 1958:

	Request	Recommended
	Thousands	Thousands
1. Military assistance.....	\$1,900,000	\$1,250,000
2. Defense support.....	900,000	585,000
3. Development loan fund.....	500,000	300,000
4. Special assistance.....	300,000	175,000
5. Technical cooperation, United States.....	151,900	113,000
6. Latin American economic development.....		
7. Atoms for peace.....	7,000	
8. North Atlantic Treaty Organization.....	2,700	1,500
9. Technical cooperation, United Nations.....	15,500	15,500
10. Technical cooperation, Organization of American States.....	1,500	1,500
11. Joint control areas.....	11,500	11,500
12. Intergovernmental Com- mittee for European Mi- gration.....	12,500	12,500
13. United Nations Refugee Fund.....	2,233	2,233
14. Escapee program.....	5,500	5,500
15. United Nations Children's Fund.....	11,000	11,000
16. Ocean freight.....	2,200	2,200
17. Control Act expenses.....	1,300	1,000
18. Administrative expenses, ICA.....	35,000	32,750
19. Administrative expenses, State.....	4,577	4,577

This bill carries an appropriation of \$15,500,000 for the United Nations technical assistance program. This is a successful program and benefits have been derived by nations throughout the world. The prestige of the United Nations is not on the wane and our people believe in the future of this fine organization. The U. N. as an organization cannot prevent war by means of the General Assembly and the Security Council alone. Programs such as the United Nations technical assistance program, which started in 1950, have played a major part in uniting the nations of the world and through economic and social advancement removed disturbing influences and problems which bring about war.

The total cost of our mutual security program each year is only a small portion of the estimated cost of another war, which in all probability would be the last war. As we continue our struggle for peace, we must remember that the gross tabulation of monetary costs for the United States for World War I was \$66,592,966,000; World War II, \$449,678,266,000; the Korean war cost \$150,878,533,000 making a total for the three wars of \$677,149,765,000.

Democracy and communism cannot coexist in the same world. Our study of history discloses the fact that tyranny and despotism eventually destroy themselves. We know that the world cannot exist on a half-slave, half-free basis and until we have some show of sincerity and positive action on the part of Russia, it would be foolish to let down our defenses. The day of the huge buildup for war has passed and we can no longer wait until we are pushed into war to begin building our strength.

A powerful America carries with it the best assurance against a global war and the best assurance of security in the event of war. To me, preparedness is simply a matter of degree. Our industrial superiority over the Soviet Union is admitted. The fact that we have

strategically located throughout the world some 250 airbases, which can be used to carry the attack quickly, has, according to my opinion, prevented a sudden attack on this country. Our mutual security program has placed us in a position of being able to obtain and maintain strategic airbases completely encircling the Soviet Union.

In developing our foreign policy and in considering our mutual-security program we must realize that the Free World is today threatened by the most dangerous aggregation of aggressive power in our entire history.

In some instances assistance has been granted which works an extreme hardship on segments of our own population. Agriculture is one good example. Assistance to foreign agriculture during fiscal-year 1956 under the mutual-security program totaled \$136,882,000. We have technical-assistance programs in sixty-odd countries and in two-thirds of these countries we have agricultural programs. We have expended over a billion dollars of our money in foreign agricultural programs and in addition to this amount some \$500 million has been expended for agricultural machinery and equipment. This equipment was given to farmers throughout the world who compete with American agriculture. From time to time we hear complaints from our farmers concerning this matter and to me their complaints are justified. During the fiscal year 1956 several million dollars of our money was expended for agricultural machinery, fertilizer, seeds, and pesticides. Under the present budget proposals for mutual security, between \$175 million and \$200 million of the total amount requested will be used to acquire surplus farm commodities under the mutual-security program.

With only 6 percent of the world's population the burdens that we carry today are tremendous. Our mutual-security program requires more study, consideration, and more careful planning. Conflicts in the technical-assistance programs of this country and the United Nations organization should be eliminated. The American people should be informed, not only of the mutual-security program and its primary aims, but should also be informed of the Export-Import Bank loans, International Bank loans, World Bank loans, or loans from any other source financed by this country which are directly or indirectly a part of our foreign-aid program. The amounts involved under Public Law 480 sales and their use in the mutual-security program should be clarified and made a part of the record.

The total sales proceeds under Public Law 480 which have been received from the beginning of this program from March 31, 1957, amount to \$1,044,000,000 equivalent in foreign currencies. Negotiated agreements will provide additional sales proceeds of \$1,053,000,000 making the total \$2,097,000,000. This estimate carries through the month of June of this year. Of this amount of \$2,097,000,000 there have been loan agreements amounting to \$386 million. The sums not as yet covered by signed loan agreements but provided for under

the arrangements made in the sales agreement and ultimately to be covered by loan agreements consist of another \$759 million which makes a total of \$1,145,000,000 which is either already covered by loan agreements or will be covered by loan agreements. Public Law 480 currencies are available under certain restrictions. The restrictions are contained in the law and require us to use the currencies in our development activities in the country where obtained with a loan made back to the country which in turn uses the currencies in the development field. We have the right to approve the project for which the country uses these funds. In some cases these currencies are used for loans to private organizations and in other cases the Government uses them direct.

As of June 30, 1957, there was in the pipeline some \$6,195,000,000 in undelivered materials, commodities, and services. We have on the military assistance side alone \$4,262,000,000 of undelivered military items and services. We can add to the amount in the pipeline the sum of \$1 billion in counterpart funds in other local currencies generated by the mutual-security program.

Our counterpart accounts as of March 31, 1957, for 29 countries totals \$1,062,-955,201.

In order to ascertain the increase in strength of the other nations of the Free World, we might compare the years 1950 and 1956. In 1950 our allies active ground forces numbered about 3½ million poorly equipped men. Their naval forces contained less than 1,000 combatant vessels. Their air forces contained 11,500 aircraft with less than 500 of this number being jets. By the end of 1956 the situation had changed considerably. At this time we have 4,800,000 in the ground forces of our allies, with over 2,300 combatant vessels in their navies, and over 12,000 conventional aircraft with the number of jet aircraft increasing to nearly 11,000. The men in these forces are now well trained and organized and properly equipped.

We have grant-aid programs in 38 foreign countries with military advisory groups located in each country. In 73 foreign countries and United States possessions we have, in addition to military advisory groups, military personnel. In some of the countries our military personnel is small and in others the number runs into the thousands.

The economy of this country and every country of the world must be strong enough and sufficient to provide necessary defense expenditures. In this country 10.1 percent of our gross national product is used for defense expenditures. By way of comparison, we find that France uses 8 percent, Cambodia 11 percent, Laos 36 percent, Taiwan 16 percent, Vietnam 11 percent, and Italy 4 percent.

We have appropriated the sum of \$33,759,850,000 for the operation of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and the Marines for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957. The duplications and tensions among the services in this country are real and costly. Complete unification in our services

would bring about a savings of approximately \$6 billion each year.

In considering our mutual security program we must realize that the Free World is today threatened by the most dangerous aggregation of aggressive power in our entire history. We have made many mistakes in this program since its inception, and, as a result, millions of dollars have been squandered. This program has not been operated on a businesslike basis and such action has resulted in confusion. The question as to whether or not we can depend on foreign aid as an instrument of our foreign policy has not been fully answered. We should also remember that the strength evidenced by the free nations of the world is essential to the preservation of our freedom. I sincerely believe that a powerful America is our best assurance against a global war and I believe that it is to our best interest to continue to secure and operate strategic air bases under our mutual security program for protection not only to ourselves but to the Free World generally.

Our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlemen from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, like my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], who has just left the well of the House, I labor here in the House of Representatives and I sleep better at night because of the strength of the military bases the Free World has today encircling the U. S. S. R. I am, however, at this moment concerned about a statement made earlier in the day by the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and I propose to ask him one question.

Before doing that, however, I wish to read a short statement from the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs authorizing this legislation. The statement is this:

The need for the military assistance program is clear. Our assistance is a vital adjunct to the defense efforts of our allies and to our own defense. \* \* \* If the United States were to endeavor to achieve a comparable defense status from its own funds and manpower, it would be impossible. For example, it costs per year to pay, house, feed, and clothe the average military man of our allies on his own soil, for Turks, \$105; for Koreans, \$117; for free Chinese, \$142; for Italians, \$837; while the comparable cost for a United States military man, without arms, is \$3,511, to which must be added \$3,000 per year for transportation and maintenance, making a total of approximately \$6,600.

That is the cost for an American GI to be sustained abroad.

Now, this is the question I wish to address to my friend from New York [Mr. TABER]: What effect will the cuts in this bill have on requirements for and costs of our own American troops abroad? I know the gentleman discoursed on that subject in committee earlier today. Would he say something about it now?

Mr. TABER. It would be impossible to state, but it costs them just about 10 percent of what it costs us to maintain a soldier.

Mr. CANFIELD. Having in mind the Communist threat at this hour, does it not, perchance, mean also that we may have to send and keep perhaps more American boys abroad?

Mr. TABER. It certainly does.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. It costs the United States today \$6,600 a year to keep an American soldier stationed abroad, so we need the troops of our friends and allies as an economy measure for both American men and American taxpayers' dollars. It means that if we in Congress do not keep these foreign troops standing with us on their own soil, there will have to be possibly an additional draft of American men to fill the gap to man the vital chain of security bases so necessary to the defense of America and the Free World.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is the testimony and the President and Commander in Chief has today emphasized his repeated warnings against these severe cuts he insists are dangerous to our own security. He has also established the cuts to be false economy. No one is more anxious than he to make it unnecessary for more American GI's to be sent abroad.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, to allay any misunderstanding, and if we stay near homeplate and not get out into the outfield we might understand the bill better, we are providing ample funds according to the record. I think it is necessary occasionally to indicate that we are providing ample funds in this bill to do everything that the agency wants to and for a period of about 2½ years.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Is it true that there is \$6 billion now in the pipeline?

Mr. PASSMAN. \$6,195,000,000.

Mr. CHELF. Is it true that there was \$550 million unexpended which will have to be reappropriated?

Mr. PASSMAN. There is \$538,800,000 unobligated in the military assistance program, and \$229 million in the other programs.

Mr. CHELF. And there is an additional \$1 billion of counterpart funds available?

Mr. PASSMAN. Those funds are made available by another bill, and that is true, I understand.

Mr. CHELF. And is there not another \$1 billion also available that is surplus from the sale of agricultural commodities?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is in another bill.

Mr. CHELF. Public Law 480.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. CHELF. In other words, there is available for foreign aid, and military support in some form or another about \$8.5 billion to these 67 countries that are looking to us for support? This is

true if we do not appropriate one dime more today.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable OTTO PASSMAN, upon the manner in which he has conducted the hearing of this subcommittee dealing with the foreign-aid appropriation. I know it has been a difficult task for Otto, since he has not been a supporter of the foreign-aid program. However, in the hearings, I think he was eminently fair, and he has worked untiringly to ascertain the facts in connection with this program, and as the result of his efforts I think this Congress will know a great deal more about the financial affairs of the International Cooperation Administration, which administers foreign-aid funds, than do some of the people connected with that agency.

I have always been a supporter of the foreign-aid program. I voted for it this year. However, the testimony during these hearings before our committee has been very disillusioning to me. I have often wondered just what the long-range foreign-aid policy of the United States was. I think the attitude of this administration in regard to our foreign aid is summarized by a statement made by Secretary of State Dulles. When he appeared before our committee, I was questioning him about foreign loans and suggested that while these might have a temporary beneficial effect upon our foreign relations policy, that when the loans became due and the debtor nations were unable to repay the soft loans, this might cause strained relations with the debtor nation and do nothing but defeat our purpose. In reply to that, Secretary Dulles said, "This will be the problem of some other Secretary of State, and not me." Is not that indicative of the present short-range foreign-aid policy of the United States?

Let me give you two examples of what I consider our shortsightedness. After the outbreak of the fighting in the Near East during the Suez Canal crisis, which might have been avoided but for the needless meddling of the Secretary in their affairs, the United States tried hastily to get control of the situation by cultivating the favor of King Saud of Arabia. He was invited to the United States and was entertained by our Government in a style never before shown a visiting monarch. He has an income from oil wells of over a million dollars a day. How much our Government pays him under the foreign-aid program, of course, is classified information. He has a huge fleet of jeweled Cadillacs, two dozen air-conditioned palaces, and more than a thousand slave girls. On the other hand, his subjects live in abject poverty, filth, and disease, and King Saud spends more for palace furniture and chinaware than he does for public improvements and the welfare of his 7 million people. Will such elaborate gestures to such a man gain us any respect among the Arabs over whom he

rules? While this might give us a temporary advantage in our dealings with the Near and Far East countries, are not we perpetuating a condition where the Communists have a fertile field for propaganda?

Then in the countries that formerly made up Indochina, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia, we are spending large sums of money to support their currency. In South Vietnam it is reported to be \$20 million a month and as I remember the testimony in the hearings on the authorization bill, someone stated we were spending \$400 million a year to support the currency in these countries, although this figure seems large to me. However, this money is not going to the people of the country for their benefit, but it inures to the benefit of the money speculators. Now, the American people have always been ready, on Christian and humane principles, to help others less fortunate than themselves. But today, we have a debt that exceeds that of all the other nations. We are one of the most heavily taxed nations and have a continually rising cost of living. We are asking our people to tighten belts in order to aid many nations which are unwilling to tax their own holders of large wealth. This policy we are asked to support might give us a temporary advantage, but what is going to be the long-range effect of it? This cannot be shrugged off with the statement that "someone else will be Secretary of State at that time."

I realize the foreign-aid expenditure program has potentialities of great benefit to this country and I am supporting the program with the hope that some of its defects may be corrected, and because it is one of the principal methods of this administration in dealing with foreign nations.

As usual, I have heard of the dire consequences that will befall this Nation if ICA is not given every penny it has requested. This is nothing new. I went on this committee 3 years ago and at the end of that first year we discovered this agency had \$620 million unexpended funds, and later, an additional \$268 million was found which they explained they did not know they had. In violation of an agreement with our committee, they reserved \$620 million on the last day of the fiscal year. Our committee cut their appropriation \$750 million, and there was the usual cry that the security of the United States was being imperiled, but when the agency came before our committee a year later, they had not been able to spend all of the money appropriated and had a surplus of \$200 million.

Last year we cut the budget request approximately \$1 billion and there was the same outcry about the security of the Nation but when the agency came before our committee this year, they had a surplus, not a deficit, of a little over \$760 million. We hear again this same complaint that if a penny is cut from the request of this agency dire consequences will result to the world. I wish someone would read the story to ICA of the boy who cried "wolf." I predict that this agency will be unable to spend the

amount of money recommended by this subcommittee this year and that next year again they will demand the moon, and we will find they have not been able to spend all the money that was appropriated this year.

This committee has recommended more money in many categories than this agency will be permitted to spend under the directive issued by the Director of the Budget on June 28, 1957. On June 28, 1957, the Director issued a directive providing that the direct obligations should not rise above the level for the fiscal year 1957. In practically every instance, this committee has recommended an appropriation that goes beyond what the agency can spend. In this connection, let me call attention to a fallacy in the statement which has been reprinted in some of the newspapers over and over again. It is to the effect that Congress authorized this agency to spend only the sum of \$3.3 billion. This agency was authorized to spend the sum of \$3.3 billion and the unexpended sum it had, which would bring the amount to over \$4 billion.

Last year ICA spent only \$3.3 billion. If the Director's directive is followed, the appropriation would have to be over \$700 million below the authorization.

Last year the principal cuts made by this committee are in four categories:

First. For military assistance. This committee recommended that \$1,250,000,000 be spent for that purpose, in addition to a carryover of \$538,800,000 making a total of \$1,788,800,000 available for that purpose. Last year this agency obligated \$1,674,200,000. This means we have authorized or obligated \$114,600,000 more than can be obligated under the directive of the Budget Director.

Second. For defense support. Our committee has recommended \$585 million for this purpose, and that ICA be permitted to spend the unexpended balance in this fund of \$36 million. This makes a total amount available of \$621 million. You will remember that the House of Representatives in no uncertain terms limited the authorization for this purpose to \$600 million. We are now appropriating \$21 million more than that.

Third. The development loan fund. For this purpose, we are recommending \$300 million. We are authorizing the use of the unexpended balance in this fund of \$52 million for the development assistance. We were presented with a secret document showing the expenditures which were planned under the development loan program. They totaled in round number \$300 million. There was an additional \$700 million for potential improvements which had not been planned. We are authorizing more than the planned expenditures. Included in this \$300 million is \$65 million for public power. We deny expenditures for that purpose in this country, and I have a great deal of difficulty in supporting a program which authorizes money for public power in foreign nations when we deny that great program to our own people. This devel-

opment loan program was thrown together hastily and was ill considered.

I know it will take money and foreign exchange to carry out these projects. I know most of them will require a great deal of local currency and local labor. The host nation should be able to bear part of the expense, and it probably could procure a loan from the Export-Import Bank or the World Bank and from private sources for some of these projects. For instance, if a dam is built on the Ganges River, some of the expenditures will be in local currency, some from foreign exchange. There is a billion dollars in counterpart funds in foreign countries. There is another billion, and the figure might be over \$2 billion before the end of the year, in 480 funds in foreign countries. In addition, the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank intend to make a loan of \$1 billion to foreign countries.

To properly consider the need for our Government to support these expenditures, we should know first what part of them is to be financed by the host country, what by 480 funds, what part by counterpart funds, and the part by loans. The International Cooperation Administration has given us none of this information. That is, of course, because this program was thrown together too hastily. It is clear to be seen that we are appropriating too large a sum for this purpose, but since this is a program very dear to the President, I have reluctantly gone along with his recommendation.

Fourth. The special assistance fund. This fund has been cut from \$250 million to \$175 million. This is because there is the sum of approximately \$93 million in the President's special fund for Asia which can be spent for this purpose. That fund was authorized approximately 3 years ago. Two hundred million dollars was demanded and again we were told what the disastrous effects would be if this amount was not granted. Our committee granted the sum of \$100 million, and in the last 2 years less than \$7 million of that sum has been expended.

The General Accounting Office, the Government Operations Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and, I find, many members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have criticized this agency because of the way in which they have presented their budget and because of their lack of planning. It now has an unexpended balance or carryover of approximately \$6.2 billion. If the recommendations of this committee are upheld, this agency will have available a grand total of \$8,719,000,000. This is more than this agency could possibly spend in over 2 years.

I feel we can get more foreign aid for less money if there is efficient management within the International Cooperation Administration, but it is so much easier for it to come to Congress and cry "Wolf" than it is to practice economy. Make no mistake about it, this agency can operate efficiently within this appropriation, and a year from now I foresee it will come back asking for the moon again, and upon examination of the record you will find they have a large unobligated sum.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I think it well as we go along in this debate, perhaps, to repeat what the factual situation is here in reference to the subcommittee, full committee recommendations and the proposals made by the President and the authorization bill. Let us take in the first instance the outright military assistance portion of this program. The President requested \$1,900,000,000. The conference report or authorization ended up with \$1,600,000,000. In the bill before us today, there is a total of \$1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year 1958 or a reduction of \$350 million. This amounts to a cut of approximately 33½ percent below that which the President felt was necessary for our own security.

In the case of defense support, the Presidential recommendation was \$900 million. The authorization bill was for \$750 million. This bill provides \$585 million plus the reappropriation of \$36 million or a cut of \$165 million—again a reduction of approximately 33½ percent. We all know that outright military assistance, defense support, are directly related to the national security of the United States. In this area then, this bill provides a reduction of 33½ percent in funds which are related to the security of our country.

If I might compare what the subcommittee recommends in what we call non-defense areas. Let me read off some of the programs that are in this category: Technical cooperation, United Nations, joint control areas, the technical cooperation program for the Organization of American States, the U. N. refugee program, the escapee program and the like—in this area this bill does not reduce the Presidential request one penny. I would like to repeat, if I might, what this bill does. Where the security of the United States is concerned in the military program, the reductions average about 33½ percent. But in the so-called economic program—in the programs where you are helping with technical assistance and the like, this bill does not make one penny of reduction either below the Presidential request or the authorization bill.

It is my honest opinion and judgment that we have made the reductions in the wrong areas. If we were to start anew, in my opinion, we ought to increase the funds related to our own security and reduce the funds in those other nonmilitary areas.

If you will turn to page 194 of the hearings, you will see a very, very desirable trend appropriationwise and expenditurewise that has taken place. In 1951, the appropriation for this program was \$7.4 billion. The Presidential request this year for appropriations was \$3.9 billion plus the reappropriation of about \$500 million. Expenditurewise, if you will turn to the top of page 194, you will find in 1953 the expenditures were \$5.7 billion. In 1958, it is anticipated the expenditures will be about \$3.8 billion. So we are getting a better program and a more effective program with reduced appropriations and reduced expenditures.

I think it is well to see what our appropriation and expenditures in this program have done; what results we have got for the money made available.

If you will turn to page 311 of the hearings, you will find that the buildup in the military strength of our allies has been phenomenal—with their help to a major degree, and with our assistance, in part.

Let us take the statement made in the hearings:

However, as a result of this buildup to which we have made a significant contribution, their forces at the end of 1956 calendar year totaled 2,300 competent naval vessels, active ground forces of 4.8 million, and 12,000 conventional aircraft, with almost 11,000 jet aircraft. This is an increase in jet aircraft in the 7-year period of 1,125 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have gotten our dollar's worth out of the assistance we have made available to those who were joined with us in this battle against communism.

It has been stated earlier that it cost the United States about \$7,000 per man per year in the Army. Actually, it costs on an average over \$7,000, particularly if you isolate the men who serve overseas. The \$7,000 figure includes everybody—those serving in the United States and those serving overseas, but if you limit it to the men serving overseas the figure would be substantially higher per man per year.

Let us take as an example some of these countries that we are aiding and assisting through direct military assistance and defense support. First, Pakistan. The cost per man per year here in the fight against communism is \$485. Relate that, if you will, to a cost of something like \$7,000 per man per year for an American soldier doing the same job. Turkey, the cost is \$105 per man per year. Relate that to the cost of an American soldier at \$7,000 per man per year.

It seems to me that dollarwise it is helpful and beneficial to us as citizens and taxpayers to aid and assist those who are willing to have their youth serve with us in guarding the periphery of the free world. If you do not do this it will cost the Federal Treasury far more money to have American boys serve in those outposts. If you do not do this it will cost you infinitely more dollars as far as the Federal Treasury is concerned.

The distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has made the point, and he said categorically that most of the items involved in the mutual assistance had a lead time of 90 days. I respectfully disagree with the gentleman's statement. In the budget presentation on military assistance they asked for \$900 million, plus \$980 million, plus \$345 million for administrative costs, facilities and assistants, and \$175 million in a new military procurement loan program.

The distinguished gentleman from Louisiana was in error when he said most of those lead time items are 90 days. In actuality in the main they are anywhere from a year to 3 years. Let us take several items that are included in this amount that I just mentioned.

There are about 500 new and modern aircraft involved. The aircraft lead time in these items is 18 to 30 months. The cost of these items is something like \$270 million.

Let us take medium tanks. The lead time is 8 to 12 months. There are close to 400-odd medium tanks involved in the amount requested in the military assistance program.

Guided missiles, about a year's lead time at a cost of \$140 million.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I presume that when the gentleman from Louisiana said it took MSA only 90 days or something like that to get the military items it needs from our Defense Department stocks, he was assuming that the Pentagon would have on hand and could spare the items available for MSA. But if it did not have such items of equipment available for the military assistance program, the longer lead time would be required as the gentleman from Michigan mentioned.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? My name was mentioned.

Mr. FORD. Let me make one statement. In the case of those articles where there was obsolescence there is no lead time involved. In these days when they in this program are obtaining important new and different equipment the lead time is practically the same as our own.

I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Assuming that this is all for new, modern equipment 2 years' lead time would be required. But I say we find they have 77 percent of this materiel, and they do have it; but let us assume they do not have any of it, let us say the lead time is 2 years, then sanction for it has to be put in the record.

They say they are going to spend \$2,200,000,000. We have money in this bill to carry them for 2 years, 6 months, and 8 days. So let us not leave the membership under the impression that we are not providing the money needed, because that is not the fact.

Mr. FORD. Let me point out to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana that this so-called unexpended money to which he refers is not just free and loose over there in the banks. It is an obligation against a specific contract, a contract with a supplier, or a contract with the Department of Defense that in turn goes out and makes a contract on a supply item.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. FORD. Just a minute. In this program here we are buying relatively little if any obsolescent equipment and no obsolete equipment; we are buying new equipment; and, as a result, the lead time in this bill is approximately the same as our own lead time in our own program.

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not like to use the time of the gentleman, but let us be sure that we understand this matter. We are granting new funds in the bill of \$788,800,000 to permit them to carry over the obligations referred to in the matter

of \$7,023,000,000; so the military program will have \$5,512,000,000 to spend. That is the amount of money we are recommending, and this is sufficient for 2½ years' supply.

Mr. FORD. Yes, that is true against contracts for the delivery of hardware which is essential for the joint defense of our country and those of our allies.

Mr. PASSMAN. Correct. That will give them 2½ years.

Mr. FORD. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. We do not propose to take it away.

Mr. FORD. This is my time; I would like to yield it as I wish.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. As a practical matter, if we would take away the money from the allied military forces, we would not want to break down what we have already built up. It would be necessary to take the proposed \$600 million military reduction from some place. The funds would have to come from the new weapons programs that are now planned, the very modern items we want our allies to have. If Congress takes \$600 million out of the \$900 million for new and modern equipment, that is a two-thirds cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by repeating something which I said earlier and that I believe is the crux of the whole problem today. The subcommittee recommended reductions of one-third in the budget estimate in the area of military assistance and defense support, which is the area directly related to the defense of America. The subcommittee is submitting to you today a bill with no reduction in about nine programs that have no relationship, not one penny of relationship, to the defense of America. So I say that the committee's approach, policywise, in this matter is wrong and I personally hope and trust that the House will reverse the committee by adopting the several amendments which will be offered to remedy certain defects that now exist.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a clarifying question?

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Does the gentleman include, in the nine programs that he refers to, the United Nations Children's Fund?

Mr. FORD. Yes, I do; although in the past I have supported that program. I do now, but if I have to make a choice I will choose the funds for our national security.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Then, of course, I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the appropriation for foreign aid as embodied in H. R. 9302.

For several months now I have had this appropriation under serious study and consideration as a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the House Appropriations Committee.

I want to compliment our distinguished chairman and all the members of the subcommittee for conscientiously working hard on a most difficult bill. I have never had the pleasure of working with a more devoted group of men.

We have had many witnesses appear before our committee and stress in general terms the need for more and more money. Their justification has practically in all cases been illustrative of what the money might be used for and many times indefinite even as to where it might be spent. I feel strongly that the reins should be tightened and that appropriations should be made only where clear justifications are made so that the Appropriations Committee and the Members of Congress may know exactly what they are doing.

I have attempted to keep an open mind on the bill we now have under consideration.

I well realize the serious condition in which the Free World finds itself at the present time and the part the United States must play in holding back the threatening forces of international communism.

I have listened to all the witnesses that have appeared before our subcommittee and I have studied and restudied all of the testimony that has been offered in favor of this appropriation. In addition, I have made independent research on the subject and have examined very carefully our past record in connection with our foreign assistance program.

Mr. Chairman, after considered study of all facets of this question, I must say that I am still opposed to foreign aid in principle and practice.

I have not been convinced that the tremendous sums of money we have been appropriating, year after year, have been effective in achieving the aims we have been led to believe were vital to the defense of this Nation and the Free World.

Mr. Chairman, we are requested in this appropriation to make available to some 66 nations the staggering sum of more than 3 billion dollars. We are asked to appropriate this tremendous sum notwithstanding the fact that our national debt stands today at the inconceivable figure of \$276 billion.

Mr. Chairman, our debt is \$24 billion more than the combined national debt of the other 84 states recognized on this globe as sovereign nations. Yet, year after year, we are told that we must appropriate more and more money to solve the financial problems of the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of the magnificent part many of our friends overseas are playing in the common fight for survival in a world living constantly in the shadow of unholy communism.

I commend every nation that stands to the defense of its liberties and I am willing to help maintain their freedom within the bounds of reason and commonsense, but I do not believe the answer to the problem facing the United States and the Free World lies in the continued flow of American dollars to the four corners of the earth.

No one will deny the fact that we are caught up in a vicious inflationary spiral here at home. Our people witness a continuing rise in the cost of living and more and more the hand of the taxing power dips into their pockets.

It is high time that the United States face up to the fact that we are in debt and a victim of runaway inflation. The time has arrived when we must face up to the realities of our financial condition and admit that we cannot, as much as we might like to, continue to play Santa Claus to the rest of the world.

Unless our friends overseas have a will to help themselves, no amount of American aid will ever guarantee their freedom, nor will our dollars buy friends and influence people. In fact, our generosity has contributed in a large measure to the current wave of anti-American feeling that now sweeps the world.

American dollars have become so common that they have lost their magic.

It appears to me that some of our friends feel they should receive economic aid as a matter of right.

Mr. Chairman, the money we have appropriated for foreign aid has been used to accomplish many things overseas. We have spent our money on everything from hydroelectric power to sending a jazz band on an 8-week tour through Africa.

Mr. Chairman, one of the tragic things we have done with our dollars abroad is to create an industrial capacity in direct competition with American industry. We have seen the once vigorous American textile industry fall a victim to this unwise policy. The tax dollars wrung from the American textile manufacturers and the public in general have been sent abroad in the form of economic aid to construct textile plants which have flooded the American market with cheap cotton and woolen goods in direct competition with American products. As a result of new textile mills constructed throughout the world, but primarily in India, Japan, and England, our domestic textile industry has been forced to the wall.

The same vicious cycle has worked to the disadvantage of American agriculture and numerous other industries. A large proportion of which are vital to the national security of the United States.

The time certainly has arrived when we should survey the damage that has been done to American industry by our frantic efforts to remake the world in the image of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there is another phase to the appropriation we now have under debate that has caused me considerable alarm. I refer to the nearly unlimited grant of authority we are extending to the President of the United States in the spending of foreign-aid dollars. We are saying to the executive arm of this

Government, "Here is a blank check for \$3,200,000,000—do as you please with it."

It is hard enough for us to maintain a semblance of economic responsibility here at home among the executive departments, and I submit that it is impossible to engage in vast giveaway programs, year after year, and have a clear understanding of where and for what our dollars were spent.

The Congress must cease its dangerous policy of relinquishing its constitutional powers to the Executive. Such a practice was not contemplated in the Constitution, and its continued use can result only in chaos and misunderstanding.

We are told that we must not expect the recipients of our tax dollars to follow our lead in the field of international relations. In fact, they need not be democratic governments at all. Communist Yugoslavia and Poland can adhere to the collectivist principle of government and yet share in our bounty. Our timid approach to our allies can only cause them to lose respect for the United States and the objectives we are desperately striving to reach.

Mr. Chairman, the foreign policy of the United States has been based too long on the premise that we can buy friendship and international security with our dollars.

We have adhered to this false doctrine for so long that it has come to be considered by many in our Government as the only way we can conduct our foreign affairs. Such a policy is dangerous and ineffective. It submits the United States to international blackmail and the contempt of friend and foe alike.

We need a firm reappraisal of our whole foreign policy, with a view to substituting commonsense and a recognition of the realities of the times for American dollars.

I know there are many people in this Government who wish to make foreign aid a permanent part of our political and economic structure. In their desire to raise the standard of living of the underprivileged peoples of the world their ultimate result can be only the destruction of the economic health of the United States and disaster to our own standard of living.

We must maintain, at all cost, the economic stability of the United States. Only through our Nation can the Free World hope to withstand the constant pressure of international communism. A bankrupt United States cannot long survive, and should we be so unfortunate as to see economic collapse in this country, the specter of communism would soon haunt us.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, it is not my habit to appear in the well of the House to urge increased Federal spending, but I am seriously disturbed at the cuts that have been made by this very fine committee on three or more vital items. The first one has been discussed somewhat by my leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]; and as to that an amendment will be offered. I think we should bear in mind the fact that our President,

our Commander in Chief, the man whose integrity and knowledge and experience and character are recognized across party lines—and he is our Commander in Chief—has asked for \$650 million more than appears in this bill and \$350 million more than was authorized just the other day by this House. That money, in my opinion, is of the most vital importance to our defense and welfare.

Some people oppose this bill because, as they put it, it is a giveaway. They say it is in the interest of other people and not of our own. Of course, if that is the fact—and I respect their convictions although I do not respect their judgment, because I think this is a most important feature of our national defense—if those people regard this as a giveaway, then there should be no money in this bill; there should not be a bill at all. There are other people who recognize the great danger in the world today which we are facing, the cold war which in some ways, perhaps, is more dangerous to our ultimate security, freedom, and welfare than some shooting wars have been. Those people oppose the bill because they think that we should retire behind the seas to Fortress America and not spend money in supporting our allies abroad. If their judgment is right, and I do not question their motives but I do question the soundness of their views, because they are contrary to the thinking of all of our greatest military leaders and most of our political leaders on both sides of the political aisle, they should first insist that we bring back the thousands and thousands of young Americans and older Americans and their families and dependents that are scattered around the four corners of the world on what we are now committed to as the defense line of America in this cold war.

I do not pose, heaven knows, as a military expert, although I have had the privilege or the misfortune, as you choose to call it, to have been shot at in a couple of wars and to have served on various fronts in three continents. Nevertheless, the principle is a simple one and can be understood by anyone. We have two main defenses that are interdependent for our Nation that are equally important, massive retaliation with which we can deter aggression by making war unsafe and undesirable to any foe, and to make that work we also must have the shield, the deployed line through which the enemy cannot nibble away, cannot encroach without starting a war. One of our great dangers is that without this deployed line we lack bases and protection for retaliatory forces. A police force might have all the gas bombs and everything else at headquarters, and all its reserves, but if it does not have policemen on the street it cannot maintain order in a town or prevent a riot and we certainly cannot maintain order in the world if the Communist forces could penetrate or freely infiltrate across the borders of the Free World.

So if we must keep this line, if we must keep our people at the front, it seems to me it is incumbent upon us to see that we are not doing too little and too late.

That is a phrase that has not been in the public thought lately but it has a deep significance to many of us that remember the days when we had to drill with broomsticks.

The funds in this bill that have been cut, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has pointed out, are taken away from some of the most important features of our overall defense program. How else could we reduce our standing forces, how else could we afford to reduce Defense Department expenses, if we are going to take away from our allies in the field the things that make our reductions possible?

The record is clear that the dollars we have spent in this military assistance program are perhaps the most economical dollars which the taxpayers spend. In NATO for every dollar we have spent our NATO allies spend \$6.35. Without the dollar that we spend they would not be able to have modern weapons, they would not have what they need and what they must have. As to the dollars in the relatively hard up areas of the Middle East, Turkey, Pakistan, Greece, Iran, and the like, they spend \$2.30 for every dollar that we contribute to their defense forces, and they are most vital if we are to hold the line.

As was pointed out by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], we can keep a Turkish soldier at the front guarding the Bosphorus and the cost of keeping him there is \$105 compared with some \$6,000 to put an American there. One can argue that the American is more modernly equipped, better trained, and perhaps a better fighting man, though the Turks are pretty good fighters, but I can assure you there are a lot of places where it is better to have 60 Turks than 1 American, no matter how good a fighter he might be.

So this is a program that we must maintain.

There has been talk in our committee that the money would not be spent even if it were appropriated, and there has been much misunderstanding and confusion about the letter Mr. Brundage wrote on June 28. I should like to read to the committee the statement made by Secretary Dulles only a month ago, on July 17, before the Senate Appropriations Committee. I think that will clear up the point once and for all, or it should, about Mr. Brundage's letter. The Secretary testified as follows:

As I understand, Mr. Brundage's letter of June 28 was drafted so that it would apply in broad general terms to all departments and agencies. It expressed the President's desire that the executive branch make an effort to keep expenditures in fiscal year 1958 from rising above the fiscal year 1957 level, to the extent that this was feasible. It did not reflect the individual differences which exist among various programs and agencies.

I cannot speak to the budgets of other agencies, but I can say that it is my intention and that of the President to carry out in fiscal year 1958 a mutual-security program substantially along the lines and in the amounts outlined by the President in his message to the Congress of May 21, subject to the appropriations approved by the Congress.

I believed when that message was submitted, as I believe today, that a program

of this nature is necessary to maintain our vital foreign policy interests.

Now, then, the Secretary went on to testify that Mr. Brundage and he agreed with that statement. So how can we dodge this issue by saying it is not necessary to put this money into the program because it will not be used when our Commander in Chief has said he needs more than we have even authorized.

There is another point. It is generally conceded, and certainly the testimony before our subcommittee has indicated that we are winning this cold war. We have made the Kremlin uncertain in its moves. We have demoralized their concept of how they can win. Many a great victory has been a defeat in the end because it was not properly exploited. Why, when this program is working, why at the time it is beginning to make such real strides, should we cut the heart out of it by taking money away from the military assistance and defense support, the programs that are most vital. I respectfully urge it would be false economy and weakened security to cut this fund as it has been cut by our very fine committee in respect to those items that go directly to military defense.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to compliment the gentleman on his good statement. It is forceful and effective.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I favor the restoration of the cuts, as requested by the President. I would like to visit with you for just a moment. I believe it was Will Rogers who once was quoted as having said, "The United States never lost a war and never won a peace." That bothered me until I became a Member of this honorable body. I was concerned as to just what he meant. After being sworn into this body in 1941, the first record vote that I was called upon to make was on the original lend-lease bill of \$7 billion requested by President Roosevelt. I voted for that bill. I did not have much company from my part of the country. That was in 1941. In December of that same year, however, we had Pearl Harbor. Then, what did I see? Practically everyone who had opposed that bill would walk right up and vote without question and without rollcalls for unlimited amounts and for extension of lend-lease time and again regardless of the amount. Why? Because we were in war. Then I commenced to understand what Will Rogers meant. We are a great country. We will go all out and think nothing of expense when we are threatened or when we are attacked. Then we retrench and go the other way when we should not retrench. I got to checking on what had happened after other wars and again I began to understand what Will Rogers meant. Today, in this body we hear the same kind of arguments and the same philosophy against President Eisenhower's request that we heard in 1941. There is no

difference. They argued then about amount. It was not whether or not there should be lend-lease. The question was whether it should be \$2 billion or \$3 billion or \$5 billion or \$7 billion. Very few fought against what the President wanted but opposed the amount.

Now we understand why we never lost a war and never won a peace. Here we are today. Who is better qualified to determine what is necessary in this case than the President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, who is head of the Executive Department that fixes the foreign policy of the United States, subject to the approval of the Senate? Who am I to put my judgment as to the amount up against the judgment of the President of the United States with the facilities that he has at his command?

I do not believe in measuring lives in dollars. I did not believe that in 1941 and I have not believed it since I came to this body, and I do not believe in it today.

I would like to give you a little example of what mutual security does as an economic measure for the United States. For 5 or 6 years I have been a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, which passes on the acquisition of all sites in foreign countries, such as airfields, installations, housing, and so forth. As a member of that committee, I have seen what the expenditure of mutual security money means to the Defense Department.

A few years ago we were requested to authorize the building of a pipeline across a country in Europe, at a cost of a number of millions of dollars. However, once it was built it made a saving. We had to approve the getting of the right of way. It did not cost us a cent. The country across which this pipeline was to be built was willing to furnish the right-of-way and did furnish it, because that country was a participant in this mutual security program.

I can cite any number of instances where we have saved money to the Defense Department of the United States in acquiring installations and property abroad, simply because we have been aiding those countries in another way.

There are those who oppose this because they find some particular case in connection with mutual security where there has been waste or where the money has not been properly used. That takes me back to the early thirties, when I was in the State legislature. We had the relief administrator for Iowa called before the State general assembly. He was put on the grid for the manner in which he was doling out relief. I remember this one criticism in particular. He was giving relief to the family of a husband, a wife, and nine children. He was criticized because the husband was a drunk and did not work. I remember his reply. He said: "Would you permit a mother and nine children to starve because the husband was no good?"

Are we going to risk the security of America and the lives of our future generations and children and soldiers by objecting to something simply because we do not like some little part of it?

In closing I would like to make this illustration. Stephen Decatur, I think it was, once said: "My country, may it always be in the right; but my country, right or wrong." About the foreign policy of the United States I think the same. "Our foreign policy, may it always be the right foreign policy; but our foreign policy, right or wrong."

Think what would happen to the prestige of America abroad if the request of the President of the United States is turned down in this Chamber today. What will it cost us indirectly that we are overlooking in this debate? What is more detrimental to any country, particularly our own, than to have two foreign policies? Here is the President, with the aid of the Secretary of State and the Senate, having set the foreign policy, including mutual security aid. Are we going to set up a different foreign policy in this body and show the world that we are not in agreement, simply because we are at peace and we can argue among ourselves? We would not be arguing for a minute if there were a threat of war close at hand.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I yield. Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman asking what foreigners would think if these cuts are not restored?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. No. I am not asking the gentleman. I think he knows, because he is well informed on everything.

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to answer the gentleman by saying that most foreigners would give us credit for some kind of return to financial sanity.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Probably so.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I think the distinguished gentleman has made a forceful statement. He has stated in simple terms what the issue here is today, and I compliment him.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I think in line with what the gentleman has said, it should be brought out that the system of foreign bases we in the United States have, numbering over 250, permit us to hit any possible enemy in half the time, half the distance, and at half the expense that they could hit us. The gentleman from Iowa is to be complimented for his excellent statement.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise to compliment my colleague from Iowa and say that I am glad to associate myself with his remark. It is my opinion that the gentleman has given us much food for thought and I hope that all will pause to give serious thought to his observations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee met last night until 7:30. We went before the full committee this morning, and we adjourned just a few minutes before the House met, so I have not had time to prepare a manuscript, but I am going to talk to you briefly about this appropriation bill.

In the first place, I want to say that I am behind the committee 100 percent.

An attack was made in the full committee this morning and a charge was made against members of the subcommittee, that we did not approve of the philosophy of foreign aid. "Philosophy" is a big word; but I will say that it was not true as far as I am concerned, because I believe in foreign aid and have supported it since the days of the Marshall plan, which was when I first came to Congress. I believe in it; I try to sell it to my people back home, but it is mighty difficult to sell it to the people when it goes on from year to year and they know there is so much waste and extravagance in it.

But I know we must continue the program; I know we must maintain these bases around the world. I know we must help those people where we have our bases, that we must help them support their military establishments and, unlike Mr. Dulles, who recently said we did not need friends and were not trying to get friends, I think we need friends; I think we ought to have friends around the world. That is one reason I am in favor of continuing it.

But we cannot buy friends, of course, and that it is not what we are trying to do. Had Mr. Dulles said that, his statement would not have been so damaging to our friends; and we do have some in spite of the way he has messed up our foreign policy and our foreign affairs throughout the world; we do have some friends left, and we want to keep them. At the same time, however, the people at home are getting fed up with this program. They are demanding that we hold it to the very lowest level consistent with America's security. We are in the beginning of a "rolling readjustment" as Mr. Martin of the Federal Reserve has said. These are merely milder words for a recession. We must hold spending to the very minimum.

Since I have been a member of the subcommittee that works on this appropriation bill it has been my constant effort, and the committee's effort, to hold these appropriations to the very minimum consistent with our security. I know it is necessary as a part of our national security, but we do not have to give them everything they ask for.

We have shown that the people running this program do not need much of the money they ask for. Actually, some of the folks down in the military division sought to mislead this committee 2 years ago, and deliberately did so. We made them admit it. They took an agreement that had been entered into with the committee, took it back and had a smart lawyer redraw it and bring it

back and then claim it was a memorandum of what the committee had said and not an agreement between the committee and the people downtown who administer this program. As a matter of fact, they had agreed not to obligate some \$400 million. They violated the agreement and obligated this money on the last day of the fiscal year.

You have heard some figures today that bear the same stamp. I am not charging the people who brought them here to you as having anything to do with making up the figures they brought to you, but they are not the correct figures. It is the same group downtown that misled this committee before and enabled us to save this country \$400 million, because we convinced the other body that they had misled our committee and they went along with our cut of the same amount from the subsequent year's appropriation.

It is said "figures do not lie, but you had better watch the ones who figure." Why, Mr. Chairman, it is the same people trying to confuse you today. I must pay tribute to the gentleman from Louisiana. I have never seen a man who worked as hard or who accomplished as much or who brought to light as many facts as he has dug out from these reluctant witnesses in trying to get at the facts as to the amounts of money that have carried over and in the pipelines and to show what they actually need. He has done a remarkable job. He has been abused for it. He has lost sleep at night, but I pay tribute to him. I understand that after he appeared at the White House with the group the other night many of the Members of the other body who were there called to compliment him on his knowledge of the facts he brought out at that meeting, facts that the President did not know anything about and that the Members of the other body had not heard anything about. I am sure this committee today, this House, is going to follow his leadership.

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

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

Mr. BOYLE. As the gentleman knows, I am a new member of the Committee on Appropriations. Will the gentleman tell the House on this occasion that there is in the pipeline sufficient money, enough to accommodate a similar program for 2 years, 6 months, and 5 days?

Mr. LANHAM. That is exactly true. Not only that, but there is more money in this bill for new obligations than they obligated last year.

Mr. Brundage sent a copy of a letter saying that everything had to be cut back to 1957 obligations to the head of the ICA, Mr. Hollister. Now they try to hedge. Now they go to the Senate and say, "Well, we did not mean that."

Mr. Chairman, you cannot tell these days what the President means. He talks out of one side of his mouth one day and out of the other the next. No doubt, that letter was sent by Mr. Brundage to the head of the organization that administers this program with the President's knowledge, and we are just plain stupid if we give these folks

more money than he is going to let them obligate. That is the position this House is in today.

Mr. Chairman, he treats us like school-children and says if we do not do exactly like he wants, he is going to keep us in after school. He acts like a spoiled child. I know you are not proud of his conduct. He has vacillated, he has been so wishy-washy that nobody knows where he stands. Tomorrow he may be willing to cut this appropriation in half.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Has the gentleman not seen pages of criticism of the President claiming that he does not fight for his program? Then when he fights for his program he gets criticized, as just now, for allegedly threatening or treating like children, those who oppose him. What would the gentleman suggest that he should do?

Mr. LANHAM. I would suggest he make up his mind and stick to it, as old Harry Truman did.

Mr. JUDD. Has he ever shown any indecision on this issue?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, yes. At times he has said we could cut the budget which he sent here, then he said we could not.

Later he ordered his own people to cut it. He has sent out word that the executive departments including ICA cannot obligate any more than they obligated in 1957. Are you going to give him more money and let him make monkeys out of us? I am not.

Mr. BOYLE. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the President of the United States would not have this chore on his hands today if he had defended his budget forthrightly when George Humphrey attacked it so viciously at the time it was originally submitted?

Mr. LANHAM. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BOYLE. Probably one of the most important pieces of legislation to be resolved in this first session of the 85th Congress is the Mutual Assistance Act. The security of the United States should not rest on partisan politics.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1943 was enacted into law on March 31, 1943. Through the years, referred to and styled the Marshall plan, it has demonstrated its effectiveness and vindicated the faith that led to its enactment.

Personally I would like to see the mutual aid program, as it refers to economic education and cultural activities separated from pure military activities.

Economic assistance, increased educational help, and stepped up multilateral cultural activities are no mere gestures of relief. Neither do these activities of themselves serve to perpetuate dictators in unilateral control of subject people in utter disregard of people's aspirations and dreams of freedom and independence.

History demonstrates the futility of evangelizing with the sword. The word "program" signifies some permanence and justifies a longer and more ambitious aim.

It is the essence of such a program that it involves of mutual help and assistance looking to a predetermined mutually helpful and good end.

Mr. LANHAM. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me talk about the development program. I am going along with you on that. I have always supported foreign aid, and as I say, I think it is necessary. So I am going along with you on this development program. But I have my doubts about these soft loans. The head of one of the President's committees that made investigations of this foreign-aid program, Ben Fairless, one of the great men of America, said he did not believe in soft loans. He said that it is better to give it to them as aid and acknowledge that it is aid than to pretend that they are going to repay it.

When it is repaid, it is going to be repaid in these foreign currencies, and they already have \$2 billion of foreign currencies and \$1 billion of counterpart funds that they can use in addition to all of this money that will be put in this bill. But I am willing to let it be tried.

I hope you will support the committee on this appropriation bill. It is ample for the needs of the foreign-aid program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Tunney was not the only fellow that had a problem, I see.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: No significance attaches to the fact that I was yielded time by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], because my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, has a large subcommittee, and they have a right to speak as he calls for them.

But, let me make this clear. All through the full Committee on Appropriations meeting this morning, all through this debate today, I find nothing but a welter and a labyrinth of figures. There is diametric opposition on figures on all sections of this bill from both sides and within the subcommittee itself. I make no comment upon who is right or who is wrong.

But, I remember years ago a famous play on Broadway called *Margin For Error*, and the philosophy for that play dealt with the kind of problem at which this bill from its inception was meant to strike. So, my friends, when you are dealing today with a confusion of figures, dealing with national and world welfare, I submit that this problem goes far beyond that of mere certified public accountants. It goes beyond the value of chief clerks, actuarial funds, and the General Accounting Office. This is not to be an exercise in semantics or the techniques of mathematics.

Many of you, with me, for years have supported the political philosophy, the purpose, and the intent, of mutual security. This bill is misnamed when it is called foreign aid. This is American aid, not foreign aid, and they who have

been the beneficiaries of our aid in the military area have established that. I have listened to these debates for a dozen years. I cast no reflection upon anyone's sincerity and integrity but I submit, Mr. Chairman, for those who are opposed to this bill, for those who want to support the cut as it has been made, I deny to the subcommittee any priority to or any monopoly on honesty or integrity or defense of principle or belief in a law and its purpose.

I do not believe that the President of the United States, regardless of who he is or what party he represents; I do not believe his Cabinet; I do not believe that all of the bureaucrats in or out of uniform, would send to this Congress legislation so fundamental, that would be wrong, in error, misjudged and bad, deliberately or otherwise, if you will, by almost 33 1/3 percent. The original request came in of some \$4 billion. Re-examination resulted in a figure of \$3.8 billion. This Congress cut that request \$500 million. That was not casual. You say that the great Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate did not give attention of integrity and examination the equal of my friends on my own committee? I say they did with integrity and with sincerity and with work just as hard.

Mr. Chairman, I love my friend from Louisiana. I admire and respect him. But this is not a popularity contest. I will vote for the gentleman from Louisiana for anything, but you are not voting for my friend from Louisiana. You are voting for great legislation; you are voting for great good. Am I to balance and juggle figures by the half millions when the committee itself has trouble with the figures? The gentleman from New York, [Mr. TABER], an expert in the business, is the proponent for a set of figures upon which he stands. He is a man of experience.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that this is a bill for the national security and I shall support amendments to restore the authorizations approved by the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, this is probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that will be before us this year.

This is not a partisan question that we are considering today. This program was initiated in the first instance in the administration of Harry Truman and it has been continued in the administration of Dwight Eisenhower.

What we are going to determine today is not whether to save a few dollars. You can save money and at the same time lose security. The few dollars that you might save might be the cause of war and tremendous appropriations which would follow. We cannot look at this as just an economy measure. We have got to look upon it squarely as legislation for the defense of our country. For that purpose I rise to support the bill and the amendments which will be

offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to restore some of these cuts. No one can doubt the enthusiasm of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for economy. He stands before us as a man who is noted for his "pinching of pennies" as far as the Government expenses are concerned. Yet in the hour of need, when the security of his country and the Free World is at stake, he favors the spending of money which will keep us out of war and with effective allies if war should come.

Do we want to send more American boys abroad, or would we, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] well said, rather spend the \$105 for a Turkish soldier so that he can take the place of that American boy as a sentinel?

This is a serious problem before us today. It is one far beyond the saving of money. The people want peace. The American people know if we are to have peace this whole Free World must be strong, not just the people of America.

One more thought. There are two men who are entrusted with the security of this country. One is the President of the United States, the other is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford. These two men know not only the value of our own forces in the Free World but that the opponent who stands hungrily back of the Iron Curtain ready to march if the opportunity presents itself. These two men whom we rely upon for expert judgment say they cannot maintain America's standing and the strength of the world if we cut below the figures the gentleman from New York will offer.

I say to you, it is not a partisan matter; it is not a matter of crimonations between members of committees. It is an American question. I know and you know there are people who might try to gain political advantage because of your vote on this bill. We must not give this thought too much attention. I am proud of America. I believe this great country of ours in the hour of danger, and we are in danger as long as the Communists threaten this world, the American people are not afraid to face it. They are not afraid to spend money if it will bring security for the Free World.

So I say to you, I hope you will put America above party; yes, put America even above your own personal fortunes because I know that in the years that remain for all of us there will be a greater satisfaction if we know that in a tense period, in an hour of great peril, an hour when America called for aid, we had the courage to vote for this money, notwithstanding the fact that it may be unpopular with a few people. And let me say that I am not so sure about the unpopularity of this issue. Some people think it is unpopular to take this stand. They have the right to their own opinion. Local elements in any community may voice that view, but way down deep, let me repeat, the American people want security, they want to keep back the Communists, they want to keep America so strong that we need not fear a war; and that is the price we pay for peace.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the very beginning that I agree with every single argument the distinguished minority floor leader made in this well just a few moments ago. The only thing I disagree with him on is his conclusion. I believe the Members of this House know that I have long been a friend of foreign aid. I have long recognized its necessity. I realize we are fighting a cold war with a ruthless enemy and that we must use every weapon at our command, if we are to win that war. I had the privilege of acting as chairman and sponsor of the first foreign aid bill that came to the floor of the House. That was in 1950. I sponsored the bill for 4 years. I defended it on this floor. For the next 2 years, my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was chairman of the committee and I was the ranking minority member. It has been my privilege to serve on the subcommittee that has handled this bill ever since the foreign-aid program began.

I want to say this—that during the entire time I have been a Member of this House I have never seen a more conscientious, a more dedicated, and a harder working chairman than the present chairman of our subcommittee. He has labored day and night. As a matter of fact, one of my self-assumed duties on the subcommittee has been to try to hold him down so that he would not overwork and overtax himself on this measure. Moreover, I have never seen a Member appear on the floor of this House with a better grasp of his subject and a greater knowledge of his bill. He has the figures at his fingertips and knows exactly what he is talking about.

I yield to no one in my belief in this program—but let me read to you an extract from a letter written on June 28 of this year. It was signed by Mr. Percival F. Brundage, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and was sent to every department of the Government including the Director of the International Cooperation Administration. Here is what Mr. Brundage told the heads of the departments:

JUNE 28, 1957.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The President has requested that all agencies in the executive branch keep the rates of commitments, obligations and expenditures for the fiscal year 1958 at or below the level for the fiscal year 1957, to the extent feasible, and that I inform you of the necessary procedures for achieving this purpose.

Then, he outlines the procedures for the head of the department to achieve that purpose. The best way I know to achieve that purpose is not to appropriate the money. Now, we want to help the President achieve his purpose. Let us apply the letter to this particular bill. The President has requested that all agencies in the executive branch keep the rate of commitments, obligations and expenditures at or below the level for fiscal year 1957. Now, what was the total of the commitments and obliga-

tions in the foreign aid program for 1957? It was \$3,336,526,000.

What did we allow in this bill for the commitments and obligations for 1958? \$3,285,483,000. In other words, our recommendations are just slightly below the commitments and obligations for 1957, which the President says he wants to follow.

But let us look a little further. My good friend from Michigan—and he is a good friend of mine; this is one of the ablest subcommittees that I know of. They have all worked hard, and I do not know of anyone who knows more about this bill than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. Of course, you all know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] never comes to the floor unless he is well informed. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] says that we made a mistake by not cutting some of the other features of the program, but that we cut the military too much.

What were the commitments and obligations for the military assistance program in 1957? \$1,674,200,000. Now, what do we allow in this bill for commitments and obligations for military assistance in 1958? \$1,788,800,000. In other words, for military assistance we have allowed more for commitments and obligations in 1958 than they had in 1957.

But there is one other item. The President says he wants to keep the commitments and obligations and expenditures at the 1957 level. Let us look at expenditures. What were the total expenditures under this bill in 1957? \$3,910,000,000. What will be available for expenditures under the bill that is before you at the present time? \$8,719,760,000. In other words, you have funds available for expenditures not only for 1 year but for 2½ years.

There has been some question about these figures, particularly on the obligations for the military assistance program. All I ask you to do is to look at the table that appears on page 404 of the committee hearings. This table was furnished by the military authorities, showing their obligations for 1957. It shows total obligations reservations of \$1,713,000,000.

I have in my hand a letter from Mr. Shaw, Comptroller of the International Security Administration. This was written on July 24, 1957. It was a memorandum for John Murphy, who is Comptroller of the International Cooperation Administration, and it says:

Subject: MAT, June 30, 1957. Unobligated balance.

The estimate of unobligated fiscal year 1957 funds as of June 30, 1957, included in the fiscal year 1958 mutual security document is \$500 million. Recent reports from employment agencies indicate that the unobligated balance of military assistance fixed as of June 30, 1957, will be not less than \$538,800,000. It is requested that the House Appropriations Subcommittee be advised of this revised estimate.

If you take the figure I have just read to you, \$1,713,000,000, which is based upon the \$500 million unobligated balance, and subtract from it the \$38.8

million additional balance now estimated, you will get the figure of \$1,674,200,000 which has been used throughout this debate by the chairman and other members of the committee on our side of the aisle.

Therefore, there can be no question about the fact that they were the obligations for the fiscal year 1957 and that we are allowing a larger amount for obligations for military assistance for the fiscal year 1958.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman has always had well-considered opinions. I would like to ask him if he has considered some events that have happened between the 1957 fiscal year appropriations and the 1958 fiscal year proposal. There is the Mideast trouble that caused the Eisenhower doctrine to be proposed, that our United States mutual security programs have had to take on and absorb. I, for one, do not want to take a chance of losing the Mideast because of the vital United States interest in oil reserves in this area, the Suez Canal, and the State of Israel, as well as our friends and allies in Turkey, Greece, Pakistan, and other friendly countries.

The United States simply cannot cut the pipeline of aid, because these obligations have been made in advance. You are getting down to the point now where you are going to cut maintenance of proper security forces. What you are really going to do is to cut out \$600 million of the \$900 million of new weapons programed for our allies, cut out delivery of the Century series of planes, and the series of planes that are for use in anti-submarine warfare; you are going to cut out the minesweepers and the rockets and missiles for our allies and the United States foreign security bases. Why cut the program there?

Mr. GARY. Let me say to the gentleman that history does repeat itself. We have here today an absolute repetition of what took place on the floor of this House 1 year ago. Our committee at that time recommended cuts in the bill. We were told we were gutting the program. My good friend, the gentleman from Ohio—and I have his quotation right here in the RECORD in front of me, where he said we were gutting the bill. At that time we were told by the White House that we would wreck the program.

What happened? Instead of gutting the bill and wrecking the program, they were unable to obligate \$667,050,000 of the money we appropriated for them. Can anyone stand here now and say that we wrecked the program when we cut the bill last year?

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

Mr. GARY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not a fact that if not another penny of money were appropriated they would still have enough to keep going at the current rate of expenditure until January 1959?

Mr. GARY. Yes; that is correct.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman will recall, I offered the amendment that cut \$1 billion out of the appropriation last year. I am not one of the extremists. I felt we should make the cut last year and I was glad we did because I felt that we had cut pretty much of the fat out of the program. So this year I mention the fact at this point that it will come

out of the new weapons program if we cut the bill materially; and, as a former veteran myself, I want the new weapons, and at this point I think you are beginning to talk about false economy.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I merely wanted to ask the gentleman who said the program could continue until 1959 if not another dime were appropriated,

what we would use for money to pay for services in the field, to supply the necessary maintenance for troops? You cannot rely on the pipeline for that. We have \$70 billion in our own pipeline for defense but we still pay our troops out of current appropriations.

Mr. GARY. If no funds were appropriated this year there would be \$6,195,000,000 left in the fund.

Leave having been granted, I include the following table:

Military assistance program—fiscal years 1956 and 1957 monthly actual and estimated obligations, reservations, and expenditures<sup>1</sup>

[In thousands of dollars]

Month	Obligations		Reservations		Total obligations/ reservations		Expenditures	
	1956	1957	1956	1957	1956	1957	1956 <sup>2</sup>	1957
July	85,342	50,680		17,143	85,342	67,822	92,274	299,364
August	(21,092)	30,045			(21,092)	30,045	84,345	157,172
September	15,176	34,111		(16,052)	15,176	18,059	79,176	94,358
October	10,192	14,823			10,192	14,823	251,315	160,988
November	62,100	29,535			62,100	29,535	114,018	98,746
December	35,917	27,935		497,734	35,917	525,669	174,486	102,291
January	32,846	33,064		50,874	32,846	83,938	130,536	178,492
February	(95,202)	44,095	147,169		51,967	44,095	91,086	336,777
March	6,323	32,293		95,593	6,323	127,885	297,682	261,509
April	60,296	217,542	315,281	82,854	375,577	300,395	193,873	155,856
Subtotal <sup>3</sup>	191,898	514,124	462,450	728,147	654,348	1,242,271	1,508,791	1,644,657
May	49,348	174,476		57,353	49,348	231,829	312,089	274,421
June	145,224	188,900		50,000	145,224	238,900	751,126	280,422
Total <sup>3</sup>	386,470	877,500	462,450	835,500	848,920	1,713,000	2,572,006	2,200,000

<sup>1</sup> May and June 1957 totals are estimated.

<sup>2</sup> 1956 expenditures exclude reimbursements.

<sup>3</sup> Totals may not add due to rounding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time for general debate has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military assistance: For assistance authorized by section 103 (a) to carry out the purposes of title I, chapter 1 (including administrative expenses as authorized by section 103 (b), which shall not exceed \$23,500,000 for the fiscal year 1958), \$1,250,000,000; and in addition not to exceed \$538,800,000 of unobligated and unreserved balances of funds heretofore made available for purposes of section 103 (a) and section 104 are continued available for the purposes of section 103 (a).

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 11, strike out "\$1,250,000,000" and insert "\$1,600,000,000."

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. TABER) he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us carries a total of \$1,788,000,000 or \$450,000,000 below last year's figures for this item. That is in spite of the fact that on top of the figures of disbursements or obligations that were referred to by the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Louisiana, there were in addition \$500 million that came out of the programs appropriated for the fiscal years 1950 to 1956 to make up those obligations.

I have before me a letter from Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mansfield D. Sprague, who is in charge of this pro-

gram, the letter being dated August 15, and reading as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D. C., August 15, 1957.  
The Honorable JOHN TABER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TABER: I am of the opinion that there has been a misunderstanding as to the dollar level of the military assistance program which was carried out during fiscal year 1957. The amount of obligations/reservations made against fiscal year 1957 funds has been misconstrued as being the entire program in that fiscal year.

It is true that the obligations in fiscal year 1957 were approximately \$1.7 billion. However, this is not true with respect to actual performance. The fiscal year 1957 program totaled over \$2.2 billion, and this program was put into effect—it was put into effect in part, through the obligation of approximately \$1.7 billion in new funds. The remaining \$500 million of the program was carried out by redistributing \$500 million worth of spare parts, ammunition, and other maintenance items from prior year programs to new recipients under the fiscal year 1957 program.

Several countries did not use their equipment in prior years at the rates which had been anticipated and a careful screening of the programs revealed that the pipeline could be reduced for these countries and the resulting savings applied to fiscal year 1957 requirements. It was the use of this previously programed materiel in the fiscal year 1957 program which created the \$500 million saving which was reported to the Congress as unobligated. This \$2.2 billion program was included in the presentation made to the Committee on Appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

MANSFIELD D. SPRAGUE.

Frankly, we are now right in the midst of things. We are about to arm Germany so that she can take her part in holding up the defense of Europe. We have in this item \$175 million for the purpose of supplying arms to the Germans as well as the sale of arms to them on the installment plan. That is in addition to what would be the normal situation. We have on top of that expenditures which are larger, the materials being more costly, than the 1957 funds produced, and which was charged to previous appropriations.

Now, the reduction in the funds is in the neighborhood of \$424 million. That is practically 25 percent of the whole amount that was asked for. If we cut the Army appropriation by 25 percent, where would we be? We would be out the window. Now, that is just about where we will be if we go ahead and cut this item by 25 percent.

As to some of the items that come along later, some of them are cut on a larger scale. The item for defense support is cut on a 40-percent basis. Now, we have got to wake up and appreciate our problem. Some of us who were not real keen for these foreign aid programs, with the economic feature alone, have come to realize that the defense support and military assistance in these items is the key to the whole thing. The only way that we are going to save money is go long that way, because we get along without having so many of our own troops stationed in foreign countries. We get along without wasting such a lot of our own energy and so much of transportation. Ten percent of the cost of maintaining our own troops overseas is all that is necessary to supply arms and

ammunition and to pay and feed the troops over there. Now, that is why we need this money. That is why I am for it. It saves us money and it is needed for the preservation of our national security.

Do you realize the problem involved in sending troops into other countries? It does not make any difference whether they are friendly or not. It results in trouble. Therefore, the only thing we can do in this situation is to see that these people are equipped to take care of themselves in the defense of their own homelands so far as it is possible for us to do it. Now, that is why I have asked to have this amount restored to the amount of the budget estimate, the amount that the House agreed upon yesterday afternoon when it adopted the conference report, \$1.6 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the members of the Committee of the Whole vote for this amendment. It is an economy measure. It is a measure that is necessary for national defense. The people who do not appreciate that cannot be ranged along the line with those who are in favor of economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor at this time because I think I have said enough to convince the people who really are thinking about this; and that is all I ask. I ask that we meet our responsibilities here and do the right kind of a job for the United States of America.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should think it would be much better to stop discussing generalities and raising strawmen to be knocked down, and return to the actual facts. Less than 10 minutes ago I requested the clerk of the committee to call the high officials down at the ICA and verify the figures given to me earlier. They stated that the figures are absolutely correct.

Mr. Chairman, I am very fond of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Certainly he is going to have to carry the ball for the administration. And if you should read the distinguished gentleman's remarks of last year and read the RECORD tomorrow morning, you would have to refer to the date to find out which year's RECORD you read first.

Last year, on July 11, 1956, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said:

Here I feel that I must support whatever efforts can be made to increase the bill at least to the authorization level on the item for military assistance.

That is the same item the distinguished gentleman was discussing this time. But notwithstanding the fact that he made that statement last year, what are the actual facts before us?

Mr. Hollister and the other witnesses said:

We will have to admit that we overstated our requirements and we are having to turn back \$538,800,000 which we do not need.

I thought it would be well to have a letter from some official of the Department of Defense verifying this figure. So it is stated here:

Recent reports from the implementing agencies indicate that the unobligated balance of military assistance funds as of June 30, 1957, will be not less than \$538,800,000.

Let us deal entirely with the facts. Because of the testimony last year and the urging from Members of the other body, when we went to conference, we receded on part of the savings we had effected. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it would be good taste to embarrass the distinguished gentleman from New York. I certainly have no intention of doing so. Nor do I have any intention of embarrassing the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. I am not going to read his remarks unless I am forced to do so. But he made similar remarks last year which certainly embarrassed me.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; I will be happy to yield.

Mr. TABER. I was interested to note that the gentleman failed to realize that the saving was made as the result of the use of the funds that were appropriated for the prior years, and that was the result of a little bit of investigation on the part of bureaucrats, to go out and save some money. That is the thing the gentleman has overlooked, and that is the reason the figures he has used are not a good base.

Mr. PASSMAN. In fiscal 1956 the military could obligate only \$848,920,000. They could obligate only \$1,674,200,000 in fiscal 1957. They admitted that we gave them too much money. But, even so, the majority of the committee decided we should recommend more money for obligation this year than they had for fiscal 1956.

I do want you to give particular attention to this matter. If you adopt this bill, you will have appropriated to the military \$5,512,000,000, which is a money supply, according to your own testimony, that would last for 2 years 6 months and 6 days. This represents a full 2½ years' supply of funds.

Remember, every year for 10 years the military has been guilty of overstating its requirements and has been guilty of overstating the amount actually to be expended. I think every Member of the minority in the Committee of the Whole admits that without exception for 10 years the military has overstated the amount of money it would spend. They say that they will spend only \$2,200,000,000 in fiscal 1958, but we are recommending a total of \$5,512,000,000, including the reservations, which is a 2½ years' supply.

I certainly hope the Members will appreciate the position of the distinguished gentleman from New York, and realize

that he must carry the ball for the administration. But do not become too excited about the figures the magicians may send them nor about the generalities you have been hearing. Go back to the figures every time and you will support this bill.

I wish you would refer to page 404 of the hearings. In the last column, the witnesses state they can spend only \$2,200,000,000. There have been too many figures brought up here that cannot be substantiated. And did you understand that I mentioned when I walked into the well of the House that only 10 minutes before I walked into the well of the House I called the officials down at the International Cooperation Administration and they said, "The figures you are using are absolutely correct."

Earlier today the distinguished gentleman from New York said he was going to provide a letter showing some different figures for this matter. I am still waiting for those other figures.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. TABER. I read the letter in full, and it is right in the RECORD now. I have the original letter right here. I have already read it into the RECORD. I am sorry the gentleman did not pay attention when I was reading it. I tried to read loud enough so he could hear it.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I ask the gentleman from New York if it is true that we are recommending new funds of \$1,778,800,000 in this bill?

Mr. TABER. No; not new funds.

Mr. PASSMAN. I hope the gentleman is not as mixed up on other points as he is on this.

Mr. TABER. There is \$538,800,000 of reappropriations, and \$1,250,000,000 of new money.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does not that add up to \$1,788,800,000?

Mr. TABER. Yes; but that is only part new money.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman from Michigan told me this morning, and he corrected me—I was a little embarrassed, but I was glad to have his statement—that the money lapsed. He said, "You just forget all about that." This is entirely new money; is that true?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I ask the gentleman from New York if it is correct that there is obligated a reserve carry-over in the amount of \$1,723 million?

Mr. TABER. I am sorry the gentleman from Louisiana is more interested in technicalities than in the merits of the bill and in the needs of the Government. That is the meat of the question.

Mr. PASSMAN. No; these are plain facts. Will the gentleman state whether or not it is true that this phase of the program has \$3,723,200,000 carried over from prior years?

Mr. TABER. I do not think it is that much, I do not know, but let me see here in the record for a moment.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am sorry if the gentleman does not know. I do know.

Mr. TABER. We have a statement that the gentleman gave to the committee that we had that amount—yes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Can you say that it is different than this amount.

Mr. TABER. I cannot.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. I thought sooner or later he would admit I was right.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have followed the gentleman from New York down the aisle in the interest of economy—I do not know—30 or 40 or 50 times, time and time again for 10 years. Often when there were but 10 or 20 or 50—many times when there were more than 100, I have heard him vote against appropriations. I have gone with him on his drive to save our own people money. I cannot go along now in giving away all this money to other nations when the worthwhile result has been nil. If economy is good for our own folks it is good for others. Pinch a penny that might help some needy individual here at home, throw down the drain billions for false friends, billions to be wasted abroad, as even he will admit—not me.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose it takes more than an ordinary amount of courage to undertake to follow the gentleman from Louisiana who has spent so much time on this program, a gentleman for whom I have the highest personal respect as a Member of this body. I count him as my friend as I am his friend. I spoke to him earlier about this bill. He said, "Well, now if I give you all you ought to have, will you be satisfied?" And I said, "If you will just let me in on that determination, I will be satisfied."

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am sorry I did not let the gentleman in on it because I am sure the gentleman would have been on my side if I had let him in on the amount.

Mr. HALLECK. I heard what the gentleman had to say since we started this debate. I have read as much of it as I could, and unfortunately for him, possibly, but maybe fortunately for the country, I find myself in disagreement with the gentleman. I want to address what I am about to say to my good friends on the right hand side of the aisle. The gentleman reminisced a bit about some earlier statements about this program and some of the things that have been done and said through the years. Would you permit me to say that not so long ago it was my privilege, at the invitation of President Truman to go to Independence, Mo., his hometown, to participate in the ceremonies there for the dedication of the Truman Library. Senator KNOWLAND went there from the other body and former President Hoover was there. I sat and listened to speaker after speaker tell of the great accomplishments of Mr. Truman and his administration. I felt a little pride in my part in the accomplishment of the things that were stressed there because, as I listened to the speakers, there was a

constant repetition of the great accomplishments for the world and for the cause of peace and freedom which were found in the beginning of the Truman doctrine, the interim aid to France and Italy, the Greek-Turkish aid, the Marshall plan, and the adoption of the NATO agreement. May I remind my friends on the right hand side of the aisle that it was the Republican 80th Congress in which I was privileged to serve as majority leader that we responded to a then Democratic President of the United States. To do what? To resist Communist aggression and infiltration. Yes, and to provide for the security of our own country. Now, as I watched some of these votes in recent years, far be it from me to say that anyone is playing politics with this measure or that anyone is resisting it because our President now happens to be a Republican.

I would not think that. I am not charging that. All I am saying is that I trust my friends on the right side of the aisle will respond to this President as we responded then, to carry on this program that is heralded by many as having been a great accomplishment for the cause of freedom and liberty all over the world.

Some people may say that the need for this program has gone; that it is all give-away.

Now, if you think that the Russian Communist conspiracy is not a real threat to our security, then, of course, you ought to be against this whole program. But how can you come to any such conclusion as that? I do not see how any of us can. I think the threat is real. Let me ask you, when our boys who were being shot in Korea, were the Communists firing real bullets at them? You know they were firing real bullets, and our boys felt it. So I say that the very threat that existed earlier is still with us; and with it all, the development of airplanes that fly faster, and the development of missiles with greater range.

Now, what is this program all about in respect to this military assistance? It is to build the offshore defense of the United States and the free world. It is as simple as that. We are past the time when we can draw back to our own shores and say, "Here we make our stand."

Much of the money here involved would be going to Korea to maintain those divisions. Did we fight in Korea to lose what we have there? Other parts of this money would go to Formosa. We all voted for the Formosa resolution. Did we mean it, or are we going to welch on it? Are we going to say to our friends and allies there that we are going to back out? The money involved in this act will adversely affect the development of our defense in Turkey, in the Baghdad Pact countries that are literally on the periphery of the Russians. The cut of some \$600 million that has been made from the original request, I am informed, would have to come principally from the money that was allocated in this program in the first instance to modernizing the weapons of our friends and allies in those important places.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALLECK was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALLECK. The NATO countries the same way. They are the countries and theirs are the forces that will first act and will first come under the gun in the event of real Communist aggression. They are ready to stand. They want freedom. They want liberty. They want peace. But they will not continue to stand with us if we begin to welch on our obligations.

I have heard our distinguished Speaker say many times, as we have voted money for national defense, and even for this program, that if we are going to err we ought not to err on the side of too little. Rather we should err on the side of having too much. We must strengthen the national defense. Let me say to some of you who are going to support this cut that it will be something like some other votes that have been made in the past. If we do not get into any trouble it is fine. You will save some money. But you let trouble break out and you will look back on this day when you refused to grant the funds to modernize the weapons of our allies while the Russians are modernizing theirs; you will look back and wish you had not so voted. I do not predict that trouble will break out, but who knows whether or not it will break out?

There are some figures that I think are correct. When we started the military assistance program in 1952 and 1953, we appropriated \$5.7 billion in 1952, and in 1953 we appropriated \$4.2 billion. Now these appropriations have been coming down progressively, except for one period when large unobligated balances were being absorbed, so that we had a sharp drop in the new appropriations needed.

Just compare those figures with the \$1.6 billion that this amendment seeks to reestablish in the bill. I say it is a reasonable amount and ought to be agreed to.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? This is very serious business to me.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that; it is serious business to me, I may say to the gentleman. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I know that it is, but may I refer the gentleman to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 17, 1951, where his side of the aisle had offered a motion to recommit the bill to take out \$350 million. That was during the administration of President Truman, the President the gentleman praised so highly a moment ago.

On that roll call I observe that the gentleman from Indiana voted to take out the \$350 million; and evidently the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Herter, had not been so completely dedicated either, for he, too, voted to recommit.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. PASSMAN. I wanted to clear up that point for the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says this is serious busi-

ness, and it is. Apparently that was the appropriation for the fiscal year 1952. Is that right?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. HALLECK. That year for military assistance we still had \$5.7 billion.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman from Indiana will yield—

Mr. HALLECK. I do not yield further. What I have said here about the overall aspects of the various aid programs, and the actions of those of us who originally brought them into being cannot be disputed by anybody. If anybody can dispute it let him stand in his place.

Mr. JUDD. Well, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to conclude this. Actually, there were times when some reductions were offered, and for some of them I voted, but if you will look at the overall figure of this program, for the same 1952, you had new appropriations of \$7.2 billion, and you had a carryover of \$9.8 billion.

In 1953 you had \$6 billion of new appropriations, and a carryover of \$10 billion.

So what I am saying cannot be disputed, and that is that we have been progressively reducing these large carryovers. That is what the people of the country have wanted; that is what I have wanted; but I do not want them reduced to the point where the very security of our own country is endangered.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. There is this further factor in connection with the vote of August 17, 1951. It was in July, the month before, that the Communists had asked for a truce in Korea, and our President at that time, Mr. Truman, was in the process of negotiating a truce, exchange of prisoners, and so on. The military threat was greatly reduced, or at least it seemed to be. Does the gentleman see anything in the international picture today similar to that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALLECK was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HALLECK. It does seem to me, if I may say so, with all respect to my good friend from Louisiana, that when he goes back to 1951 to find that one vote involving \$350 million out of a \$5 billion appropriation, for which program a lot of us went down the aisle—and may I say that in the country from which I come, such an attitude was not too easy—but I think it was a poor way to respond to what I had to say.

Let me say just this further to my friends on my side of the aisle: We have a great President of the United States who, if he knows anything—and he knows a lot—but if he knows any particular subject it is the one with which we are here dealing; and he has associated with him some of the ablest people in this whole field.

As far as I am concerned, I think these requests have been pared down in line

with other requests that have been made; and, as far as I am concerned, I am going along with that position. I trust that on both sides of the aisle, for the security of our country, Members will not want to be pinching pennies.

I say the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very glad to hear my good friend the gentleman from Indiana refer to the days when this program started under our former President, Mr. Truman. As I stated a few moments ago, I had the privilege of acting as chairman of this committee at that time. I want to say to the gentleman that not a single time did our committee ever bring in a bill that we did not recommend certain reductions in the request of the President of the United States. I voted to cut the President's request at that time and I am voting to cut it now. My very dear friend from New York voted with me on those occasions and I am sorry that we are now on opposite sides. We handled this program together and we usually voted together on those measures.

Let us look at the record. I am going to refer to one or two instances. Let us turn to the year 1947. There was an amendment to cut \$150 million from funds for relief of war devastated countries. The bill was requested by President Truman because of imminent closing of UNRRA operations and would have authorized \$350 million for food, medical supplies, and so forth. The vote on the amendment to cut the funds was Democrats for, 35, against, 128. The Republicans voted 190 for the cut, 36 against.

Now, let us look at the Korean aid bill back in 1950. We are hearing a lot of talk about Korea. There was a motion offered to kill the Korean aid bill, in the form of a motion to recommit. The bill authorized \$60 million in economic aid to Korea. The motion was defeated by a vote of 190 to 194. Fifty-eight Democrats voted to kill the bill and 173 voted against killing it. One hundred and thirty-one Republicans voted to kill the bill and 21 voted against killing it.

Then on passage of the bill 170 Democrats voted for passage, 61 against and 21 Republicans voted for passage, 130 against.

Mr. Chairman, that is the record.

If I thought that the action of our committee or the action of this House today would in any way cripple the program, I would be on the other side. But what I have tried to do as a Member of this House is to vote consistently to maintain adequately those programs which are necessary for the defense of the country but not to appropriate any more than is necessary.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. How much money do they have in the bank that they have not obligated or have not spent as a balance on this program?

Mr. GARY. Unobligated \$667,050,000.

Mr. RIVERS. How much of a balance do they have overall?

Mr. GARY. The unexpended balance in the overall program is \$6,195,000,000.

Mr. RIVERS. Six billion dollars on June 30, then \$2 billion plus, that makes \$8 billion plus. Is there anyway on earth they could spend that in any one year?

Mr. GARY. Oh, no.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Two points: First, is it not incorrect to give the impression that money in the pipeline is available for spending for other purposes than those for which it is committed?

Mr. GARY. No.

Mr. JUDD. That money is at work supporting contracts already entered into.

Mr. GARY. It is not available for obligation, but it is available for expenditure. That is the money that will be spent this next year.

Mr. JUDD. It is already committed.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. For things in process of procurement.

Mr. GARY. It is either obligated or reserved, but it is unspent. That will be the spending for next year and they estimate the expenditures for next year at \$2,200,000,000.

Mr. JUDD. The other point I want to make is this. I myself did not vote against that bill for economic aid for Korea to which the gentleman referred. But those who did vote against it were right. Many of them were against it because it was merely economic aid. They correctly presented the argument that to give insignificant economic aid without military aid to Korea with the Communists right on the 38th parallel would be throwing the money away. That was what it proved to be. So the Members who voted against that bill were the ones who were right. I voted for it for reasons I explained at the time. I was not willing to give that new republic no chance at all. But subsequent events proved that those who opposed it were not opposing sound mutual security. They were just being realistic in opposing a waste of money.

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

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how is that time to be divided? Are the members of the committee going to take it all? It looks like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to divide the time among those Members who were standing.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Do Members who have already spoken on this amendment also have the right to speak under this limitation?

The CHAIRMAN. They may.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just a moment. If a point of order is made against it, may they speak twice?

The CHAIRMAN. They may rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that the members of the Committee realize just exactly what we are doing at this time. This is really the most important amendment and the most important item in the bill.

There has been reference made to the three or four billion dollars in the pipeline, and statements have been made to the effect that we might not make any appropriation at this time and there would still be vast sums unspent in this program. Well, I think the membership should realize that even though that is true in one sense of the word, it would not provide any funds, for instance, for supplying rations, equipment, the needed arms, and the modern weapons this year to our allied friendly forces that are holding the line in Korea, Taiwan, in NATO, and elsewhere. That pipeline money is obligated for equipment and projects for the future, and if we should use that approach, we might just as well say that we should have appropriated nothing for the Department of Defense this year because we have got something like \$70 billion in that pipeline. The principle is exactly the same, and what we will be taking away or reducing is weapons and equipment and the needed facilities which no one but us can supply for the several million friendly troops that are holding the shield line from behind which we are to operate if we are to maintain our security in the world today. Certainly, we are doing a great disservice—to the people I am thinking about, the Americans who are out on that line now—we are doing them a great disservice if we withhold from their allies, their friends, the people on whom they must rely, the warning systems and the modern weapons needed at the earliest possible moment for their own mutual security. We would delay their receipt of such weapons as the Nike, Honest John, Matador, or similar missiles; and retard modernizing of aircraft and the activation of F-100 fighter squadrons that our allies need, and without whom our own men and women who are now in the front lines would be hopelessly outnumbered.

This money is vital, according to our President. The bill as reported is \$650 million less than he asked. I do not see how in all conscience we can let it pass with such a radical cut when the people whom it will hurt most will be our devoted soldiers, sailors, and airmen who are out in the far corners of the world, dependent upon the support they get from friendly local troops. If we are go-

ing to economize anywhere—and heaven knows I believe in economy—I do not think we should economize at the point where our greatest military leaders say we get the most for our money, the best dollar value. We get that by keeping these forces there, without whose help, if they did not have the modern weapons we must supply them, they would not be able to share with us the responsibility of protecting the free world.

We are all on a ship together. Whether we like it or not, the free world is like a vessel in a storm. And surely we should not quibble about whether we like all the members of the crew. These peoples of the free world are tied in with us and if the ship of freedom sinks, we are all going down together. It is very cheap to worry about handing a needed rope, or a cup of coffee to a member of the crew, because you do not happen to like him when the ship is in peril. I do not think we can afford to economize at this point when the best military brains, including our great President, say that this is a place where money is most needed in our program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that all of us realize how much the United States depends on the mutual security program. It is not something that we can take or leave alone, feed or starve, at will, or abandon whenever the spirit moves us.

The mutual security program has been built into our foreign policy and our defense strategy. Our defense strategy depends on overseas bases and the cooperation of foreign allies. We have entered into military commitments with other nations which they are living up to at great risk and cost to themselves. Our foreign policy is directed toward preventing any more territory any place in the world from falling under Communist domination.

The evidence we have clearly indicates that the majority of the American people favor these objectives. I am sure that nearly everyone knows that the "fortress America" concept would not work. Our people recognize that it is vital to the future of our country that we develop and maintain satisfactory relations with the newer nations of Asia and Africa.

My point is this: We cannot have the foreign policy or the defense strategy which we now have without foreign aid, and we cannot do the job which we have set out to do without providing the funds to finance it.

We might have chosen a small-scale foreign aid program or none at all. We have not made that choice. The President has submitted to the Congress his recommendations for a diversified and complex program. The Congress has authorized him to go ahead with it. If we do not provide the money to carry it out, we do more damage than if we had drastically curtailed or remodeled the program in the authorization.

It is comparable to telling the President that we want him to have a tractor rather than a horse-drawn operation and then refusing to give him enough gasoline to run the tractor.

What has been accomplished by our mutual security program?

Hon. Mansfield D. Sprague, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, answered the question in these words:

It is impossible for us to estimate what military strength the other nations of the Free World would now have were it not for our military assistance program. However, we can get some indication of the contribution which the program has made by looking at the progress of our allies since the beginning of the mutual effort. In 1950, our allies' active ground forces numbered about 3½ million men, mostly ill trained and poorly equipped. In their naval forces were fewer than 1,000 combatant vessels. Their air forces were equipped with about 11,500 aircraft, of which fewer than 500 were jets.

By the end of 1956, there were 4.8 million men in the ground forces of our allies—an increase of 37 percent. In their navies were over 2,300 combatant vessels, an increase of 139 percent. Their air forces were equipped with over 12,000 conventional aircraft, and the number of jet aircraft had increased to nearly 11,000—22 times as many as they had in 1950.

Moreover, the men in these forces are much better trained and organized than the troops of 1950 were, and their morale is at a much higher level. They have better equipment and support facilities. Their air forces have many more and better airfields and improved communications and early warning systems. It would have been impossible for our allies to make these vast improvements in the size and effectiveness of their forces had it not been for the military assistance which the United States has provided. The importance to us of the buildup of these allied forces committed to the defense of the Free World is particularly well illustrated by a contrast of its cost to our own defense expenditures during the same period. From 1950 through 1956, the United States spent on its domestic defense program, including the cost of carrying on the Korean action, approximately \$254 billion. In these same years, the total of our military assistance program plus the defense expenditures of our grant-aid allies and of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, amounted to \$124 billion, or about half of our aggregate expenditure.

After having made these outlays, the United States today has Army forces of over a million men, an Air Force equipped with almost 27,000 aircraft, and a Navy with almost a thousand combatant vessels. Our grant-aid allies and Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have built up for the defense of the Free World active ground forces of over 5 million men, air forces with over 27,000 planes of which 12,500 are jets, and naval forces with 2,500 combatant vessels.

We cannot know how much the strength represented by these allied forces would have cost the United States if we had to create it entirely with our own resources. If our allies had not received our assistance in developing that strength, however, it seems clear that for its own security, the United States would have had to make much greater defense expenditures. Furthermore, we would be obliged to maintain many more men under arms, with a considerably larger proportion of them overseas. And with all of this we would not have as much defensive strength for our efforts as we have today.

What would be the cost to the United States if we did not have a mutual security program? This question was put

to Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Here is his reply:

The military capabilities and contributions of each of our allies are carefully considered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in developing our war plans and in appraising the specific United States force levels required to execute those plans. There is no doubt that these force levels of the United States would have to be expanded at greatly increased costs were it not for the Free World forces supported by the military assistance program. In fact, our entire military program and present strategic concepts would have to be radically revised.

Much of our strategy hinges upon the continued availability of military bases in places where we may have to defend against aggression. In some cases, we establish and operate them with United States forces; in others, we provide military assistance to nations which maintain bases of potential value to the allied defense effort. Where possible, these bases are protected by indigenous military forces. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that an adequate overseas base system is essential to the successful prosecution of Free World military strategy. Here, then, is a definite link between our prospects of victory if war is forced upon us and the military assistance program.

If we were to go on a military Fortress America concept (which as I have said is not technically feasible at this time although it may be at some future time), it would cost a tremendous amount of money, much more than we spend now. But the worst disadvantage of the adoption of such a concept is that the rest of the world would gradually swing to the Communist side and we couldn't live in the world that was left.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. We will get into trouble if we try to follow past votes of various Members for guidance on this bill, because the gentleman from Louisiana, who is championing this bill on the floor, voted against the authorization for it, the fundamental policy of it, only yesterday. If you want to look at a significant past vote, however, as to what happens when the chips are down and we are in a fight and wish we had some allies, look up the vote on July 18, 1950, on this same military defense assistance program. We were in the Korean war then and wished we had some others fighting beside us. The vote on that bill was 366 to 1. The one was Vito-Marcan-tonio. If the gentleman from Louisiana was in town, I am sure he was one of the 366.

Let us bear in mind that this military aid program is fundamentally an economy program. It costs us \$6,600 to maintain an American soldier overseas without a gun in his hands. Our contribution by this program is less than \$500 a year per soldier to help arm and maintain 4,800,000 allied troops in places where our joint chiefs think they ought to be for our mutual security. This cut we are trying to restore would mean that those troops who face right across the border the Red Chinese and Russians will be facing them with World War II obsolete weapons while their Russian foes opposite have modern weapons.

We have to use the first \$980 million of this amount to maintain the forces in being now. These figures are in the record and cannot be disputed. Even with the restoration we have left only \$520 million to take care of shipping, administration, and operations that are estimated to cost \$345 million, and that will leave us only \$175 million for the new weapons, to equip these faithful allies of our, although we need \$900 million for this purpose.

This cut, which will gut our military program, should be restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I share the concern my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] expressed a few minutes ago as to whether he and I have been walking up the center aisle with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to no avail. I have joined the gentleman from New York in voting for economy time after time in this House, but if there is any economy in increasing this bill by something like \$350 million, I will eat the paper that he wrote his amendment on. He apparently is for economy at home, but ready to dish out the dollars to foreigners.

A previous speaker asked this question, "What will the foreigners think of us if we do not restore the cuts?"—cuts the committee wisely made in this bill. My answer to that is that foreigners will begin to have some regard for the sanity of the Congress of the United States if these cuts are sustained.

Something has been said to the effect that we must vote this money in order to support NATO. Let me ask some of you: What has become of some of the money we have already spent on NATO? We have spent \$7 billion on France, and I doubt that France has more than one or two combat divisions in NATO today. French troops are in Algeria fighting a war against the natives and using our equipment to do it. They are not in Europe ready to combat communism. Where are the British? They are threatening to withdraw more of their already meager forces from NATO. All you have in NATO, after spending billions upon billions of dollars on countries that were expected to supply troops, is a skeleton force. This amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is anything but economy. It ought to be defeated and I certainly intend to vote against it and any other amendment to increase spending under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and those members of his subcommittee who have worked long and hard to reduce the spending under this bill to something resembling fiscal sanity.

I think I know something of the pressures under which the gentleman from Louisiana has worked, and he deserves the highest commendation of those Members of the House who have long been convinced that the American people cannot forever support the appropriation each year of billions of dollars to be handed over to foreign countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, one of the most unfair arguments that has been made against this bill, not by any Member of the Congress but by others, is that it is either dollars or your boys. There is nothing fair about that argument—it is not true—it is a false plea—an appeal to emotion—not to reason. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], asked: Have we sacrificed in vain the lives of those who died in Korea? My answer, "Yes we have." We sacrificed them in World War I, in World War II, in Korea hundreds of thousands because we stuck our national nose into the business and policies of every other nation that got itself in trouble. That is why they died and that is why more of them will die unless we change our policy. We all know that we can destroy ourselves by spending just as we can by becoming involved in war. What have we gotten out of this policy on which we have spent billions—sacrificed our men by the thousands? At one time, well back in Revolutionary days when our country so far as the world picture then existed, was nowhere near as powerful comparatively as it is today, we won our freedom; did we not? What has gone wrong with us? Have we lost courage, determination? Ever since this policy has been established, we have been paying tribute to other nations with the idea that we will get their friendship and their help if need comes. Read the history of the world from the beginning, from the writing of the first word, and you will find every other nation except our own Nation, always when the chips were down has gone on in favor of the policy which would in the opinion of its leaders be most beneficial to their own nation, not to some other nation. Remember the old saying—millions for defense and not a cent for tribute? We have thrown that into the wastebasket. Today we cringe in fear—hide behind the false propaganda that our national existence depends upon the good will of those to whom we pay tribute. The doctrine of fear advocated, encouraged and augmented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Dr. Judd], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], and others has frightened us year after year until we have come to believe that our only salvation and our only safety is in trying to buy the friendship of someone who in time of trouble will bail us out. We have gone back to the policy of King George, who, was it not, hired the Hessians to come over here in an attempt to deny our ancestors the right to freedom. Let us thank God that Washington and those who fought—many until death—had the courage, the determination to resist—to fight on. Some of us were here when Japan was asking and got scrap. We were then talking against sending scrap to Japan. Some may remember that we said it would come back. And it did. The result to our men. And now we are sending material abroad and if another war comes along because

of our meddling and sticking our national nose into the affairs of other nations the munitions we are sending over now will come back to kill our own men. It is doubtful if we have a single friend anywhere on earth who will be a helpful friend if war comes. We enabled Russia to become a world power—she is today our enemy. We take the same risk when we aid them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the advocates of the restoration of these funds come to the floor with mixed records of support for foreign aid. There is no need to review the record. I think most of us know how we voted in the past, and we are generally familiar with the records of our colleagues who have spoken here today. I sympathize with the members of the Committee on Appropriations because on examination of the record, it seems clear to me that the administration has not effectively justified what it has been asking for. They, perhaps, remember how easy it was to get through the Middle East resolution in this Congress just a few months ago without any justification. I was opposed to that action. I did not think the emergency was such that the House should have rushed to pass that resolution as it did. In any case, the direction of the policy and intent of the administration, as indicated in their present request for this appropriation, is clear enough to justify the House in restoring the funds which have been taken out. The administration must take some responsibility for the difficulties in which it finds itself today. We know that in the interest of balancing the budget in the past they drew out of the pipeline. The Democrats criticized them and called the reductions misleading. We were right. So today, when the Republicans are asking us to restore strength in the pipelines we should remember what we said a few years ago and vote consistently with the position we have taken in the past.

I suggest to the Appropriations Committee members, especially those who have taken a stand against the so-called performance budget, that what they are really doing today approaches a performance budget procedure. They are refusing the administration the right to project its program. They say there is 2½ years' supply in the pipeline. Is that enough to meet the emergency, or a 5- or 10-year Russian plan? If they are opposed to a performance budget they should be opposed to the action they are advocating today.

When we are dealing with appropriations we are dealing with something different from authorizations. If the House wishes to take a position for bargaining with the Senate on an authorization, that is one thing, but appropriations are something else. These are primarily and fundamentally the responsibility of the House of Representatives. We should pass an appropriation bill which is as accurate as possible—without anticipating compromise.

Such action protects and strengthens the integrity of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, this House has a great responsibility, in my judgment, this afternoon, as it has had on many other occasions. Our responsibility, in my judgment, when you think the matter through coolly and calmly, and look over what we have accomplished in the past, would direct us to support the present amendment; to write sufficient funds back into this appropriation bill, to serve notice to the world that we still have confidence in the President of the United States and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the men who have the responsibility of coming to this Congress and telling them honestly what they think they should have in funds and for what they will use those funds in the defense of this country and the Free World.

In my judgment, if we do not restore these funds, there may come a day, if we pinch off through appropriations the nations of the Free World, when this will be the most extravagant saving of a few hundred million dollars, because it may cost us many more millions of dollars to undo the wrong of a mistake that we may make here today.

I hesitate to put my judgment against the judgment of the President of the United States, with his lifetime of military service, and the men around him who say this appropriation is absolutely necessary; men who undoubtedly know more about the necessity for it than we can learn here in the Congress.

We have kept the peace of the world, in my judgment, because we have been as liberal as we have been in assisting other free nations of the world on the periphery around Russia. Let us not weaken now at this critical time.

Let us not weaken in this critical time; let us make certain that we continue to draw the noose tighter around Russia, forcing her closer to the orbit of world peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, probably everyone on an important vote like this, to give more rather than less for military assistance to our allies, makes up his mind on the basis of his estimate of the seriousness of the situation our country faces. I am sure those who favor the deep cut in the committee bill are convinced it will not injure our country. They are patriotic; that is the last thing they would want to do. Likewise, we who want to have the cut eliminated and the amount increased, do so because we believe strongly that our country may be injured and our long-term security endangered if we do not restore the full amount authorized. We too are patriotic, and we believe the threats our country faces are of very grave nature.

First, may I say that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is adopted to restore the \$1.6 billion which was in the conference report, it is still \$300 million below the President's budget estimate or request.

So we are not being careless with money if we adopt this amendment. It is the minimum.

Just a few weeks ago we appropriated \$34 billion for our own defense establishment. And there were only a few votes against that gigantic sum. What do we get for those \$34 billion? We get 125 air squadrons, approximately 1,000 naval vessels, and 21 land divisions.

What would we get under this bill if we were to give the President the \$2.8 billion he asked for—\$1.9 billion for military aid and \$900 million for defense support? We would get another 125 air squadrons, more than 2,000 additional naval vessels, and 200 land divisions.

That is, by appropriating in this bill less than 8 percent of our own defense budget, we would double our air strength, we would triple our naval strength, and we would increase our land strength more than 10 times.

Can anybody suggest any other place where we can spend defense money with as great return for the security of the United States as by this program? For that reason I urge that we support this amendment. It does not provide the full amount requested, but it is the least we ought to provide, if we want to take no chances with our national security.

If, as the gentleman from Louisiana has predicted so many times, the President does not need it all, then it will not be spent—and no damage will have been done. If, on the other hand, we provide less than is needed, we may be placing our country in mortal danger. I am not willing to accept such a responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, waste in the foreign aid giveaway program is nothing new. It has been going on ever since President Harry Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson started this program 10 years ago.

In Truman's time \$7 billions a year were spent on this program. The waste then was greater than now when under Eisenhower the program has been reduced to about \$3 billion a year.

I remember the Korean aid bill which has been mentioned here earlier today during the debate. The Truman administration had an idea that the South Koreans should not be rice growers and farmers. They wanted to make them into industrial workers. To do that they asked many millions from Congress to industrialize South Korea. I voted against that proposal.

One of the Truman administration schemes for industrializing Korea called for building plywood plants there. Paul Hoffman, then the head of ECA, was to carry out this proposed plywood plant program.

Under the Truman-Acheson plan United States taxpayers' money was to be used to build plywood plants in South Korea and more American taxpayers' money employed to equip these Korean plywood plants, built with American dollars, with modern plywood machinery. Then to top off the giveaway more American taxpayers' money was to be used to

buy plywood peeler logs and to give these logs free to Korea.

This democratic scheme called for giving Korea free, fully equipped, plywood plants and then also the raw material on which these plants would operate.

The Korean war came along and killed this absurd foreign giveaway scheme of the Truman administration.

My vote against using American taxpayers money to build and equip plywood plants in South Korea and then to supply these plants free logs for the operation of these plants was an absurdity. I thought I was right when I voted against this proposal. I still think it was the right vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to restore these United States defense funds.

There is no doubt that the security of the United States should not depend on partisan positions. As a matter of fact, both President Eisenhower as well as former President Truman have given very strong statements for the full amount of this security program. Likewise Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State; likewise Adlai Stevenson, the former candidate of the Democratic Party for President, much to their credit, have risen above partisan politics and favor the current mutual security program.

May I also add that this bill will have a reducing effect on the operation of local United States defense production facilities engaged in plane and defense production. In this particular amount there are planned new weapons such as over 400 aircraft and some of them F-100's, P2V7, and S2F antisubmarine aircraft; 17 destroyers and minesweepers, all with the latest electronics and weapons; over 350 tanks; and equipment for 16 battalions of guided missiles and rockets.

Why do you not want our own United States forces and those forces who are allied with us modernized and put into condition so that when these forces stand beside our United States young men they are able to take their part?

As has been stated here, this program is solely to protect against a serious threat which is continuing. Let me say to you that I believe the military is not the place to cut this bill. We members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have worked on this program over a period of months. We cut the program deeply. Then there has been House action on it with some further small cuts. Then a conference which sustained many of the cuts.

When it comes to the Committee on Appropriations of the House setting the foreign policy, instead of staying within the appropriation limits, I think it is time that we members of the policy committees should oppose such a course. Under the Reorganization Act, it is the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House to implement the message of the President when he sets a national foreign policy and mutual security program which have been

agreed upon by both the House and Senate, and I might say by both national conventions of 1956.

I ask any of you who come from an aircraft district or a defense production district whether you want unemployment in your district next year when these cuts will be made? I do not believe you will want to contribute to such a result.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DENTON yielded his time to Mr. PASSMAN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, so much has already been said that possibly I can add very little to this discussion. But my mind goes back to the days when a former President of the United States, Mr. Truman, pointed out the necessity of helping our foreign allies if they were to be in a position of strength to carry on this conflict against communism, our common enemy. Many of us then responded. We put our country's best interest first and above all else. We were not acting altruistically, but in our own enlightened self-interest—the safety of our country.

Time and time again the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member, of the House of Representatives, comes to the floor of the House with authorization bill after authorization bill, and hardly anyone in this House votes against such defense authorizations. Only a week or so ago we brought before the House a bill authorizing \$1,600,000,000, and I do not recall that anyone raised their voice in opposition to it. Included in that bill were provisions for large funds for an overseas preparedness program in the struggle we are now carrying on throughout the world in a defense setup that will best guarantee our own security and promote the cause of freedom.

I have asked myself in all sincerity, Why do Members of this House vote for \$34 billion for the national defense of our country, vote for authorizations and appropriations for overseas projects that we have and continue to build and then turn around and say we do not want to implement them. I cannot find the answer unless you have determined that our defense strategy, designed to prevent war and, if war comes, to keep it away from our shores, is all wrong. Perhaps you have determined we do not need allies abroad with military strength to resist communism, but that we should rely solely on ourselves, which would involve a defense program costing many, many billions more and not be near as effective.

I believe we are making a serious error in taking away the military support funds so necessary for our own defense, in cooperation with our allies in their defense in coordination with ours in the battle against communism.

I do not quarrel with any Member who has contrary convictions. But if you are opposed to this whole defense program, then you should so vote. Otherwise I ask you to vote for these defense appro-

priations embodied in this mutual-security bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NATCHER yielded his time to Mr. PASSMAN.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill before us. I have carefully studied the issue at hand, the appropriation of funds for the continuation of the mutual security program, and I cannot give my support to it. I do not believe that this program is any more than a giant giveaway program. I do not believe that we have or can be successful in buying the friendships of the people of other nations. Time and time again we have seen those very people whom we tried to help become unfriendly to us because of our aid. On the other hand, we have watched those to whom we have given economic aid become dependent upon our aid rather than strengthening their own economy through our assistance, and becoming economically independent. So, we have been unsuccessful on both counts—that of buying friends, and that of helping these countries become economically strong and independent.

The program of foreign aid began during World War II, and was then strictly a program of lending—not a program of giving. We were not trying to win friends—we were merely fighting a war and trying to save ourselves. This was the beginning of the giveaway—the lend-lease program. Since that time the program has changed from one name to another—namely, the Marshall plan, the Truman point 4 program, the mutual security program, and the Eisenhower doctrine.

Every time the taxpayers of this country have questioned the value of the foreign aid program, the program assumes another name. Every time they begin to question the effectiveness of the program in light of the waste, extravagance, and corruption that has been publicly revealed in the administration of the program, the Congress is asked to reduce the program. However, instead of a reduction, the responsibility of the administration of the program is shifted to another agency, or a new agency is created to administer it.

Even now the taxpayers are not satisfied with the mutual security program. They continue to object to giveaway of billions of their dollars to foreign nations, while our own economy suffers. Recently the American people began such a clamor about this program, its cost and its ineffectiveness, that the President of the United States took to the airways in an effort to regain their support of his so-called mutual security program. From all reports it appears that the President was not successful in his appeal for their continued support of the foreign aid giveaway. The taxpayers are alarmed, and I am alarmed, over the fact

that we continue to build up a national debt that we cannot pay—a debt we must leave to future generations for payment if it ever is to be paid, while at the same time we continue to pour annually billions of dollars into the economies of other nations.

My constituents, as well as people from all over the Nation, are concerned over the rapidity with which the Congress is asked to spend money, and does spend money, while at the same time it continues to cut down on the revenue of our Government. We have reached the time when the taxpayers are demanding to know how long these spending sprees will continue. Ten years ago the Marshall plan was formulated. The American taxpayers were then told the job of rehabilitating war-torn Europe would take only \$17 billion and 4 years. At the end of those 4 years and that \$17 billion, where were we? We were just getting started in the foreign aid business. Where are we now? After spending over 60 billions of American tax dollars, we do not have the mutual security the proponents of the program said we would, and now we are told there is no end in sight for the program. The American people have been more than generous with the peoples of foreign nations, but they want to know now where this program will take us and how much more it will cost us.

Many Members of Congress share the skepticism of the people insofar as this program is concerned. Various committees of the House have tried to investigate the claims of waste in the foreign-aid program, they have sought to determine its effectiveness and they have sought to evaluate its benefits. But, these committees have received little assistance from those persons who are responsible for the program. At the same time, other persons who have been associated with the program have frequently maintained that the American taxpayers' money is being squandered and thrown wildly away. The horrible truth is that when waste and extravagance in the program are brought to light and are documented we hear no word of explanation or apology from any responsible persons in the administration.

Mr. Chairman, when we have documented proof of waste and extravagance in any program, I cannot condone such waste by voting funds to continue the program. When we reach the place in any program where we derive only doubtful benefits from the expenditures of billions of American tax dollars, then I am compelled to vote against that program. These are only a few of my reasons for voting against this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, certainly I am confused over what is happening here this afternoon. Could it be that I was poorly indoctrinated into how to undertake my work here in the Congress? When the Committee on Ways and Means assigned me to the Appropriations Committee it was my understanding that the committee was to have the witnesses appear, the members were

to question those witnesses and consider their justifications, and then allow the amount of money that the majority of the committee and the full committee and the Congress decided should be needed to operate a certain program. If I have been incorrectly indoctrinated I am wrong, but if we are supposed to act according to facts and upon the basis of the justifications presented to us by the department heads, then I am on solid ground.

There has been too much dealing in generalities all day long. It seems to me the Members just will not get back to the actual figures. I am going to support this bill. I am going to vote for this bill, and I am going to recommend that all Members do so, because the policy has already been established and I am not trying to fix policy. I want to provide the President the money to carry out the commitments; make no mistake about that. But there have been efforts to confuse the members of this committee ever since I have been a member of the committee. Particularly have I observed such actions during the 3 years in which I have been chairman of the subcommittee. I was somewhat ashamed of it myself in 1956. I thought I had better pull my flag down and go home; that I was trying to act in a big show; but nevertheless I worked, and I worked hard, and I worked long, and I tried to be just as searching as I could.

Then one evening just before we were ready to report this bill, a letter came down to the subcommittee. The letter said, "You take this, and we take this." I said, "That is a rather fair trade." But, during the next 6 or 7 hours Mr. Stassen conferred with the Director of the Budget. He must have locked the door and put the key in his pocket. The Director of the Budget was prevailed upon to obligate 22 percent of the annual appropriations after 6 o'clock in the evening, because they were to telephone me at 6 o'clock on June 30. That was one of the, shall we say, "cleverest" tricks that they ever tried to come up with. Well, they later admitted it. Then we went to conference, and we were being pushed around by certain individuals about ruining the program, and a messenger came in and said, "Somebody has something to tell you right away." I went out and they said, "The Air Force found out it owes the mutual security program a little over \$3 million, and they have a check." So I presented that astonishing fact in conference. The place became just as quiet as at a funeral. We regained our position.

Let us stop dealing with generalities and get down to basic facts. Believe me when I tell you this: We are doing no wrong to the program with this bill. I do not believe there is a Member of this House who will say that he, or she, can prove that these recommendations are not adequate to carry on the program that is planned under the present policy.

I most respectfully direct your attention to the fact shown all through the hearings; it is in the justifications—that show they can spend only \$2.2 billion. Now, do not let anyone confuse you. You do not spend money when you

obligate it. You merely obligate it and place orders, and you spend it when a check is drawn. But, all of the money that you have for the program, in the amount of \$5,512,000,000, is for expenditures. Now, it is true that some \$3 billion has already been obligated, but the total to be spent is \$5,512,000,000. So, if this Congress were adjourned and we should not come back here for 2½ years, when you arrived back in Washington after that 2½ year vacation, under the present program there would still be a little money left to be spent.

Now, let us face up to it, and stop building these straw men and knocking them down and building others, and dealing in these generalities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I want to say that there are several of us standing, who have tried to make it crystal clear that we believe the funds recommended are entirely inadequate, particularly in view of the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana declines to take into consideration some \$675 million in his figure for estimated obligations in 1957.

Mr. PASSMAN. I have taken all the factors into consideration. I want the gentleman to understand—and I know you are not going to get me off base on this—that this portion of the program has \$5,512,000,000 for which checks are yet to be drawn. And, you can draw it for anything for which you have an order. You can cancel the planes and you can cancel the guns and buy something else. You know and I know that there is \$5,512,000,000 under the bill which we have submitted for your consideration.

I hope that you will vote the amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. PASSMAN.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 123, noes 172.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Defense support: For assistance authorized by section 131 (b), \$585,000,000; and in addition \$36 million of unobligated balances of funds heretofore made available for purposes of section 131 are continued available for the purposes of that section: *Provided*, That not less than \$40 million thereof shall be available for Spain, exclusive of technical cooperation.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood: On page 2, line 17, strike out "\$585,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$714,000,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the nature of this amendment, I ask

unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I observe in this House a strange and extraordinary juxtaposition. Although I am pleased to see you are not confused, out of an abundance of caution may I explain what I mean. Now instead of criticizing my friends to the left for their magnificent and courageous vote on the amendment of the gentleman from New York, may I say I welcome them to the fold after their many years of dereliction. But, Mr. Chairman, I look to my colleagues on the right. I saw dozens of you who stood where I stand for 15 years and belabored my friends to the left for their evil. Now, do you fall into that same pitfall at this late date? You did—you did. This is your baby. Dare you say it, nay? This is yours. Do you make this a bastard child? Now, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of emphasis, I urge you—do not consider me facetious. I had hoped at least 50 more of my friends to the right would have been with us. Now, listen to me on this please. If you will excuse me, you on my left are entirely capable of taking care of yourselves. I have no doubts about my friends on my right. May I say this. All right, forget what you just did on this last amendment. That is over the dam. But this amendment is defense support. Do you know what that is? This is defense support, my friends. Let me read to you what that means in the language of the subcommittee's report. I do not like to read things. I hate to admit it, but I could not say this any better myself. Let me read it to you:

For fiscal year 1958, there is included under this heading "Defense support" only that aid necessary to enable a country to raise and support military forces for the common defense and to assure the maintenance of United States military bases abroad.

You cannot vote against this amendment. Let me show you why. My beloved friends on this subcommittee—and they are a great crowd—but, listen, they are merely asking you to substitute their opinion on this matter. This is a matter of: How many dollars? Do you want to gamble? This is not Las Vegas, with all respect to my friend the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY]. Are you going to stand at the green table here? Are you going to gamble with this? You cannot do this. Let me point this out to you, Mr. Chairman—the money in this bill. My friends will come down here and they will say, "Oh, look, look at the unexpended balances. They lied to us, these military charlatans, they did not tell us the truth." I have served on the subcommittee for Defense Department appropriations and I have been through these witnesses, the ones they are talking about, for 10 years. I know the good ones from the bad ones. It may be possible even in this House. There is a little question about those things sometimes. I would not say that—could be. Now these men will talk about unexpended

balances. They will talk about unobligated funds. They will confuse with this financial terminology. This is not to be a debate in fiscal semantics—not at all. The Russians say democracy means this. Americans say democracy—the same word—means something else. You know what you can do with figures and statistics, and how they have been described. You cannot use a margin for error on a bill of such merit and debate figures.

I simply say this: I do not quarrel with this subcommittee. I believe deeply in the purpose of this bill since it was first born. I believe that these figures submitted by the Appropriations Subcommittee will not do what should be done in the pipeline. I do not think I or the subcommittee could ever decide what the necessary figures are. I do not know. I submit not a man in this room knows how many dozen millions of dollars will be necessary in Turkey or in Greece. If war should break out tomorrow you would all be praying that on the Balkan border would be the Greeks; on the Iranian border would be the great fighting Turks. Who do you have in Korea? You want the Taiwanese, you want the Philippines, you want all over that great perimeter of this world, you want those eager, willing little nations. This is the best support. I am asking that you restore these funds that were asked for in your authorization bill. No more. Say to these people: "We will hold up your right hand while you die, while we get ready if necessary to join you." They man the barricades against communism if it attacks. This is the first line, and I want you to give them every dime in the pipeline, unexpended funds, unobligated dollars. Do not be misled by these certified public accountant mumbo jumbos from the General Accounting Office. This rises above that. This is for the world. This is the leading Nation in the world and a leader must lead or quit, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for clearing up the generalities so that I may be afforded an opportunity to get right down to the facts and figures.

In this particular item there is unexpended a total of \$1,288,196,000 as of June 30, and it is obligated. You cannot do anything about it. What actually happened with reference to the defense? The Members of the House on the Foreign Affairs Committee stated, in effect: "I would not get too excited about that item. The Appropriations Committee will take care of it. It is getting a little late"; they were kind of flattering me a little. But let me give you the facts on this particular item.

The House passed \$500 million, and after a delay of 2 days under some parliamentary maneuver, an amendment was offered, and was adopted, to in-

crease the amount to \$600 million. Then the measure went to the other body, and they had originally passed \$800 million for this item, and the House \$600 million, increasing the sum by \$100 million before it went over there. When this item came back to the House it had been raised to \$750 million.

Your committee has recommended that you appropriate more for this phase of the program than the House originally had agreed to authorize—\$621 million in addition to the \$1,288,196,000.

Now, if you please, you are looking at one item of about \$585 million; but if you will move down to the bottom of the page you will discover that there is shown \$36 million, representing money appropriated last year which they could not use, that lapsed; so we thought we would just take up that \$36 million. Thus, this makes the amount \$61 million, which is \$21 million more than the sum the House agreed to when the authorization bill was passed some 10 days ago.

This information is accurate. No one is going to be able to get any figures other than these, because this is a new item as such. We have had no defense support. You have had a lot of these items, but this time this is defense support only, and that means economic aid; it is a case of merely taking off the calico and putting on the silk.

I ask you to defeat this amendment. We know that with \$1,288,000,000 already available and an appropriation now of an additional \$621 million, the total is more than \$1,800,000,000.

I do not believe seriously my friends on the left are going to oppose this recommendation. Too many of them have agreed prior to this afternoon that \$600 million is all that is actually needed. So I certainly hope you will vote down the amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. As a matter of fact I had an amendment at the Clerk's desk requesting that the sum be increased to the full amount of the authorization.

I am also glad to observe that the RECORD will show that on defense and mutual security matters the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself have voted almost identically.

Let us look at the facts in this case. The President's request for this item was \$900 million. The authorization which we passed yesterday calls for the sum of \$750 million. The amendment which I intended to offer would have made this item in the appropriation bill \$750 million. It would have been in addition to the \$36 million which is re-appropriated in the bill.

I am convinced beyond any doubt that this item is as important to our defense program as the other item which we just voted on. Let me just take one argument which was made in the previous amendment which is not applicable here in opposition to the amendment. We have heard about the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget limiting expenditures and limiting obligations in fiscal 1958 to the amounts in fiscal 1957. In that particular case this letter is not applicable because the amounts they are requesting for obligation and the amounts they intend to expend are below the figures in each instance than those in fiscal 1957. So we can forget the suggestion, we can forget the argument they made in reference to the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

If you will turn to page 435 of the published hearings on this appropriation bill you will find listed all of the countries which are included in the funds for this year and, in addition, some of the countries which have received funds in past years.

Mr. Chairman, in the program for the fiscal year 1958 there are 15 countries included. Some of those, and they are listed, are Spain, Turkey, Taiwan, the Philippines, Korea, and others. But let us for a moment, if we may, take one of the specific cases which I think illustrates the importance of this program beyond all doubt.

In August 1953 a truce was arranged in Korea. We expected those beyond the truce would abide by the terms of that agreement. We ourselves and our United Nations allies have. But as time went by they did not. They built airfields, they moved in modern aircraft. Finally it got so desperate that about a month ago our military leaders said, "We have to do something or our own forces and the forces of our allies are in peril," as they are. As a consequence, we are now moving in new military equipment. But if we do not approve this amendment, it would be foolhardy, in my judgment, to move in new aircraft and move in modern military equipment because by a reduced figure in this instance you will be pulling the rug out from underneath those who are serving there and in effect destroying the effectiveness of the equipment which we decided less than a month ago was essential for the defense of our forces in that area. You can go to some of these other countries which are mentioned here in this list on page 425.

Let us take Spain. It is my recollection that in the defense appropriation bill for military construction over the years we have made available funds for 2 Air Force bases and 1 Navy base in Spain amounting to something over \$300 million. Are we by any action on this bill today in effect going to make economic conditions in Spain such that it would be unwise for us to man and use those bases in Spain? The economic condition of Spain today is not what we would like it and any unwise action that we take on this provision in the pending bill may well lead to greater deterioration.

Let us take Taiwan. We have invested millions and millions of dollars. We have supplied equipment for some 500,000 or more allies of ours among the Chinese Nationalists. If we reduce this sum to that which is included in this bill we in effect are pulling the plug on the investments we have made heretofore.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why 1 year, 2 years, 3 years we go boldly forward and take the bit in our teeth and say this is a good program, and we man, equip, and train those who are fighting with us, and then all of a sudden we decide we better pull the plug and back out, losing the benefit of our investment, losing the benefit of our strength and boldness.

Take Turkey, a country on the border of the Communist forces for a good many miles. We have installations in Turkey which are of the most vital importance, not necessarily places for our troops to be, but installations which are just as vital and essential to our security as a barracks on the frontline in some of these other countries. Turkey has been a staunch and steadfast ally of the United States. It is a good investment dollarwise, and if we do not provide sufficient funds to keep their economy strong, to help them man the forces that they are providing along with us, we in effect are destroying the effectiveness of the installations, of which there are none more important to our own security, installations which are relatively close to the enemy whom we detest, whom we hate, and who, we hope, is defeated. And why we, in this instance, cannot go along with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to help in a small way the protection of those installations and the manning of those stations is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FLOOD. Is it not a fact that 80 percent of the funds about which the gentleman speaks goes to the fighting nations, the 6 nations that he just mentioned, to troops on the line?

Mr. FORD. That is correct. It involves land forces, air forces, and sea forces which are of great importance to us in this great struggle.

Mr. Chairman, as I close, let me say this: This recommendation by the subcommittee of \$585 million is 34 percent below that proposed by President Eisenhower. It is 34 percent below what he recommended. This recommendation by the subcommittee is 20 percent below what was authorized in the bill that we approved yesterday. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania takes it up within \$36 million of what the House of Representatives recommended yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, I hope and trust that the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Could we reach an agreement on the amount of time necessary to finish this amendment?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, you are not going to hurry anyone by yelling "Vote." I will tell you that. Could the gentleman from Iowa and the Member from Michigan get at least 3 minutes? Those in support had an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Further reserving the right to object, we have not objected to these extensions of time. I would like to have at least that much or a little more.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this requires any great argument. I just want to point out one or two salient facts. You probably will remember when we had the authorization bill on the floor, this House voted first to reduce the Defense Support funds to \$500 million. Subsequently it voted to raise that amount to \$600 million. When the authorization bill left the House it left with a figure of \$600 million in it for defense support. It is true that in conference, the amount was raised to \$750 million. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio stated a few moments ago that the House approved that amount. The House approved the conference report and that was one of the items in it. I dare say if that particular item had been brought before the House alone the House again would have voted for \$600 million.

What does the committee recommend in this bill? It recommends \$585 million for Defense Support plus a carry-over of \$36 million, which makes a total of \$621 million, or \$21 million more than the House approved in the authorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anything further needs to be said on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult to rise in opposition to so distinguished a colleague as my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], who lives in the district adjoining mine. He said something about our duty to defend military installations. I wonder if the gentleman has forgotten that on February 16, 1955, in an official report we were told that we had 950 military installations throughout the world outside continental United States. Just how many of those 950 can we successfully defend? Are they all a source of strength or an outpost which will fall with all its materiel at the first attack?

One other point. A policy may be judged just as we judge an article of merchandise after we have used it and tested it. How long have we had this Marshall plan as it has been enlarged or amplified? How many billions of dollars

have we put into it? What has been the result? We will remember what the top Russian said not long ago, that we could spend ourselves into—what was it? Something like dissolution. That is one way to destroy ourselves, by spending. Do you remember what the President said not long ago? He said practically the same thing. That is one thing they agreed on. A warning against excessive spending. But not understanding we go on and on. But let me go back. What has been the result? I have no personal knowledge about what has happened abroad. I know little, if anything, about our financial ability. So I will take the word in this instance of our great President who warned against wasting our resources. I will not vote to do it as would this bill. In spite of all the praise of Ike by my colleague I still do not think he is any better President than was George Washington, or has he any more knowledge of the fundamental, basic principles of national life or security. What did he say, and what did his Secretary of State say earlier this year? Those who advocate this continued spending and who have gone along all the way, what did Dulles and Ike admit? They told us the first of the year that we were worse off on the national stage in the national sphere than we ever were before. That came after two wars, after the spending of uncounted and uncountable billions, which no one can locate.

If you want more of it, that is your business. I want none of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we might be led to believe by statements of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] that these particular funds are strictly for defense, that is, defense in the terms that most Members of the House apparently think of it. I want to read from the hearings on this bill. Mr. Ford is addressing a question to Secretary of State Dulles:

Mr. Ford. In other words, this proposal will replace in part defense support, and in part outright grants for economic assistance?

Secretary DULLES. It will replace the part of what is now called defense support which is really a misnomer, because it is really for economic development, and has no particular relationship to defense.

Now I want to read from another document, the report on United States foreign-assistance programs, prepared at the request of the Special Committee to Study the Foreign Aid Program, this being a committee of the United States Senate. The report covers southeast Asia, including Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Burma, and Indonesia.

I read from the report, and listen to this, for this is where your defense support money goes, in part:

There is one situation requiring prompt action and immediate correction. Conditions which existed at the time may have justified the United States decision to support the currencies of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, at the arbitrary rate of 35 piasters or other local currency to the dollar. Today that figure is utterly unrealistic, as becomes apparent when we examine the need for monetary re-

form in Vietnam. The added and unnecessary cost to the United States taxpayer is approximately—

Listen to this, for this is defense support money—

\$20 million a month.

This is American taxpayer money going down the drain. Continuing to read from the report:

This money is not going into public treasures; it is going into private pockets. Of even more importance, the faith of the newly freed people of the area in the integrity of democratic government is being shaken by the spectacle of the undeserved enrichment of a favored group.

That is defense money we are talking about. That is what you want to increase by the pending amendment, looting the pockets of American taxpayers to the tune of \$20 million a month to stick it into the pockets of money speculators and profiteers in Saigon, Hong Kong, or elsewhere in Asia.

You can vote to increase this if you want to. I am opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just spoke is entirely in error if he wanted the House to understand that defense support in this bill, the amount we are talking about, includes any development assistance, long-range economic aid. There is a new definition of defense support this year. I call the attention of the Committee to page 5 of the committee report, which shows that "there is included under this heading only that aid necessary to enable a country to raise and support military forces for the common defense and to assure the maintenance of United States military bases abroad."

Of the 15 countries that obtain defense support we have military bases and installations in 8. Seventy-five percent of this will go to the 5 countries bordering Red China or Russia, Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, Pakistan, and Turkey. It will go to support 2,100,000 men under arms in those 5 countries. Defense support will go to support the economies of countries that are poor economically, but rich in spirit and in determination, to face and fight, if necessary, the Communists who lie right opposite their borders. Defense support is an essential part of the system that makes us able to secure the economy in our own defense that is represented by this program. You have had pointed out to you the fact that in these poor but brave countries, it costs far less to maintain a soldier than it does for us to maintain one of our men. We do not pay all of the costs of the maintenance of their soldiers. The committee cut this amount to about 33½ percent or roughly a third below the amount requested. The amendment now proposed will still leave it \$186 million below the \$900 million originally requested. So the pending amendment is not an extravagant amount. It merely restores the amount the House approved on yesterday, and I beg the House to approve it again today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the new obligational authority requested by the President in his budget message for fiscal year 1958 was \$73.3 billion. The authorization for mutual security that has been enacted into law is \$3.3 billion, or 4½ percent of the total budget. The amount of \$2.5 billion reported by the Appropriations Committee is 3½ percent of the total budget.

When foreign aid started in 1949, our gross national product was \$257.3 billion. Foreign aid in that year was 2.4 percent of the gross national product. Our gross national product is now estimated at \$424 billion. At the same time our foreign aid expenditures have gone down so that they are now slightly less than 1 percent of our gross national product.

Critics of the mutual security program call it a giveaway program. This characterization is apparently based on the unfounded assumption that the United States hands out checks each month to foreign governments much as it pays the Federal employees.

Nothing could be further from the truth. In the period from April 1948 to June 1956, more than \$29.7 billion was expended under the mutual security program. Twenty-three billion dollars, or 78 percent, was spent in the United States for our own commodities. More than \$2.5 billion of cotton, \$1.7 billion of bread grains, about \$1.8 billion of machinery, \$382 million of coal were bought in this country with mutual security funds. To ship the nonmilitary purchases overseas, ICA and its predecessor agents paid more than \$884 million to United States shipowners—74 percent of the total ocean freight expenditures for nonmilitary aid shipments. In addition, hundreds of millions of dollars were paid to American personnel, contractors, and universities for services in connection with the program.

Economic assistance does not build up injurious competition with American industry. In the earliest stages of development, the basic facilities, such as roads, bridges, health programs and education offer no competition to United States industry. In later stages of development the output of goods and services are consumed principally in the country itself. The introduction of American methods and machines provide continuing markets for American products.

Our own industrial growth is dependent upon the industrial development and health of other countries. Production for foreign aid is intertwined with production for normal commercial channels. A dependable estimate is that about 600,000 individuals here at home are dependent upon the mutual security program for their employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN].

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a great deal that has gone on today and a great deal of what went on yesterday. This Chamber is a source of ever-developing mystery for me. Yesterday I heard Members on both sides of

the aisle join in a sort of unprecedented praise for the conferees on the authorization bill. You will remember that the other body receded some 21 times; we receded 4 times, and came to agreement on 6 other items. The situation had deteriorated to such an extent that Members of the other body were prone to levy some accusation at us. In other words, for a moment we seemed to have the other body on the run.

The gentleman from Virginia, whom I respect and admire very much, has just made the point that this amendment calls for a restoration of defense support back to what the conferees agreed upon and that that was too bad, because that was over what this body originally voted. Has it not occurred to you that with our conferees operating so effectively they would not have come out with that figure unless there had been some very good reason for it?

Could they have been so right yesterday and so wrong today?

I think the answer is that they were right in giving sober reflection to this particular item of defense support. It is something that the gentleman from Michigan has so very well said, that we could not play around with. This is in a sense even more important than military assistance, because this is a defensive dike that is needed even before we can consider using retaliatory forces. This supports Libya, Ethiopia, Morocco, Spain, and the Philippines where we have military bases, and it helps support over 2 million troops in Taiwan, South Korea, and Vietnam.

We follow the proceedings in London and we hope our negotiators are going to do a good job; but I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that at this particular time we may be involved in some unilateral disarmament if we cut this item of defense support.

I urge the support of this amendment in particular.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] for 3 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I do it because of the security of the United States. When this Congress can appropriate money, a little over \$700 million and keep in the field over 2 million troops of our allies, to me it would be shortsighted not to do it.

This defense support is not economic aid. You heard the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] speak of supporting the currencies of various countries. He was speaking of currencies that were being depreciated because of the fact that the budget of those countries contained so much military expense that it is using up many of the commodities in the country and, therefore, causing inflation. So, in order to keep those troops in the field we must supply them the wherewithal to purchase fuel, uniforms, and provide local installations. We must make up in the economy what has been taken out of it, or the economy and the country will be imperiled by inflation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? We have inflation in this country, too.

Mr. FULTON. Under the good Eisenhower administration policies, of which this is a part, the gentleman is in error, there is a Government budgetary surplus.

We have heard that there has been a move by some of our allies and friends to cut their troops and defense. We cannot start a retreat of the United States forces and security. That will pull down our allies as well. For defense support, the original authorization request was for \$30 million for Europe, that is Greece and Spain, and I am sure none of us wants to cut them; the Near East, Southeast Asia, and Africa, \$202 million; the Far East and the Pacific, \$663 million, in order to keep defense troops in the field. Unless we make available to our allies the necessary equipment, unless we help sustain them, and help our allies keep their troops in the field, we are engaging in unilateral disarmament of the free world, and this will be the signal for our friends and allies to do likewise.

So I ask you to consider for the security of the United States of America what the House Foreign Affairs Committee recommended after we had studied this matter for many months and in many hearings. We are interested in economy, but this is not the place to cut, where it vitally affects the security of the United States and the Free World.

I hope you will support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is recognized to close the debate on the amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall be just as brief as possible. This is, in effect, economic aid. I will read where some of the items for defense support will be spent and you can make up your mind whether or not it is economic aid: Agriculture, natural resources, industry and mining, transportation, labor, health, sanitation, education, public administration, community development, social welfare, housing, general, and miscellaneous items. That is only a part of the list. If that is not economic aid, I will have to get a new Webster's.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state for the benefit of the Committee that your committee is recommending that you appropriate \$21 million more than the Committee on Foreign Affairs asked for when the authorization went over to the other body. They agreed to \$600 million. We are appropriating \$585 million plus, or a total of \$621 million.

With what we are recommending there will be \$1,909,000,000 for defense support.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to vote down the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. FLOOD.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 113, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Development loan fund: For advances to the development loan fund as authorized by section 203, \$300 million, to remain available until expended;

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 3, line 2, strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert "\$500,000,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. All it does is to restore to the new development fund, the figure which was carried in both versions of the authorization bill and in the conference report approved by the House yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, as I think we all appreciate, that the chief criticism of the mutual-security program has been in the economic field.

There have been too many projects. There have been too many ill-considered projects. They have been based on illustrative programs that have been unsatisfactory all around. There has been too much personnel and resulting waste and extravagance.

What happened last summer?

As a result of criticism, various committees of investigation were appointed on behalf of the President, on behalf of the Senate, and on behalf of this House.

As a result of the investigations, the administration came up with a brandnew program in the field of development assistance.

It provided for a fund which is limited to making loans.

It was designed to bring about increased economy and efficiency, to put economic aid on a more businesslike basis, following in general terms the principles of the Export-Import Bank.

It was designed to substitute loans for grants, to provide financing under which repayment would be possible as compared with the present system where there is no repayment.

It was designed to eliminate the unsatisfactory illustrative programs, to substitute specific projects under specified criteria and to base appropriations in the future on known performance in the past rather than on unknown performance in the future.

In my judgment the plan offers the possibility of very great improvement.

To operate this plan, there must be a capital fund, as in the case of a bank. You cannot operate from day to day. You have got to have a fund in respect to which you can plan long-term loans.

The original request, as you will recall, was for a capital fund of \$2 billion to be derived over a period of 3 years. As a result of the authorization bill there is a maximum authorization of \$1,125,000,000 to be accumulated in 2 years, \$500 million at this time and \$625 million a year hence subject, of course, to appropriations.

The \$500 million figure, which, as I say, was carried in both versions of the authorization bill and in the conference report approved only yesterday has been slashed by your committee to \$300 million, a slash of 40 percent in spite of the fact that there was obligated in fiscal

1957 about \$410 million in the field of development assistance.

I think the cut is too drastic.

I merely suggest restoring the \$500 million to the fund, the figure all along the line up to this time.

In closing I quote again from the press release from the White House this morning in which it is said that—

The President states that the cut proposed in the development loan fund, a 40 per cent cut, makes impossible the realization of the important purpose for which the fund was established by the Congress.

We had better determine whether we are going to have any development assistance or not. If we are, the development fund, in my judgment, deserves a fair trial as a part of the overall program; and we had better give it sufficient funds to operate with.

The funds will not all be obligated in the next 12 months. But they will allow the fund to make long-range plans, which is the fundamental objective of the fund.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I must not trespass upon the patience of the House any longer. There is \$300 million in this special development loan fund. That is more than many of the Members wanted. In addition thereto, there is \$96 million in the Asian fund. So there are adequate funds to carry on this program. And, of course, they remain available until expended.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the committee will vote down this amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding to me and in an effort to cooperate with him in closing the debate as early as possible I shall not move to strike out the last word or seek any time. I realize the gentleman has good reasons for asking us to proceed with dispatch.

I am sure the House, with the lengthy debate that we have had on this and other issues that have been presented, is prepared to vote on the amendment. I had prepared an amendment somewhat similar to the one offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], although mine carried \$400 million as representing a more reasonable cut, representing only a 25 per cent reduction in the authorized figure. However, it seems to me that the committee cut is too drastic and I hope Members will weigh the arguments advanced by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I will support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the loan development fund is an exceedingly important new approach to the problems of strengthening the economies of the new nations now struggling to maintain independence and to make a contribution to the cause of freedom.

The Soviet Government is challenging us in a new economic competition. In the last 2 years that government has aided a selected group of undeveloped nations to the extent of \$700 million. The United States must counter these Soviet efforts.

We can succeed, not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid, but by making newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations. But they must have help in a way that preserves pride and confidence. Loans, not grants, should be our policy.

We have a proven experience in this field and should welcome the competition. One way to win is to inaugurate the loan fund with an adequate appropriation.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important elements in the mutual security program is the development loan fund. It is intended to provide the foundation on which we will build our relations with the peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the world. It provides the basis for shifting our economic aid operations from a grant basis to a loan basis.

I am convinced that if the development loan fund operates as it is intended, it will make the world 20 years from now a better and safer place for all of us to live in.

But we have to give the fund a chance to work, and I do not believe that the appropriation in this bill is large enough to permit it to work.

I am fully aware that the development loan fund will be slow in getting into operation. It is desirable that this should be so, and it is intended that the fund will be administered with deliberation and caution. I know that not very much of this appropriation will be spent the first year.

Nevertheless, we need an appropriation of \$500 million at the beginning. We need enough so that we can enter into firm commitments with a large number of nations for a large number of projects.

We do not want to say to the people of the underdeveloped areas of the world, "Bring us your small problems and we will help the few of you which we select." We want to be able to say to all of these people, "We are your friends; we are ready and able to help; look to us first."

We need an appropriation large enough to encourage the underdeveloped countries to come to us and to begin to plan and work with us. We intend to go slowly, to be sure that planning is carefully done and that we do not build faster than the necessary social and legal adjustments will permit. We want to disburse the money slowly, but it is vital that when we open up for business we have the resources to do the job. If negotiations proceed slowly the first year, we can make adjustments in the appropriation for next year, but we should have a chance to start on the right basis.

At this point I want to read into the RECORD a letter I recently received:

INDEPENDENCE, Mo., August 8, 1957.  
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,  
United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CARNAHAN: I am glad to give you my views on the development loan fund. I think it is an excellent proposal and deserves the strongest support.

If we are to keep the billion people and many new nations in the underdeveloped areas of the world on the side of freedom, we must help them in their efforts to move forward. The development loan fund is the most practical idea to do this which has been advanced. I regard it as a valuable and necessary supplement to the point 4 program of technical assistance.

As you know, the essential ideas involved in the loan fund have been developed on a bipartisan basis in a number of studies by able private citizens, by the Senate Special Committee on Foreign Aid and by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The fact that the specific proposal has been advanced by the Eisenhower administration should not lessen the support of any Democrat for it. I have always taken the position that the mutual security program—which is absolutely vital to our own security—should be supported on a wholly nonpartisan basis. I believe that in this matter President Eisenhower also supports that bipartisan attitude.

I hope that on this program Democrats in the Congress will also lay aside all partisanship and support it vigorously—especially those Members on whom I could always rely for traditionally strong backing of sound foreign policy measures.

I particularly hope that they will support the 2-year provision agreed upon by the conferees. It seems to me to be a perfectly sound method of financing this sort of a loan fund over a bare minimum period if the fund is to have the assurance of continuity it ought to have.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, sometimes people say that these loan programs are giveaway programs. May I remind the House that out of \$15 billion of loans and credits since World War II we have been paid back already in principal and interest \$6,170,000,000, "which ain't hay," and which shows that this loan program presents the possibility of putting our foreign aid on a more businesslike basis.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. Will the gentleman advise the Committee whether or not there appeared before his committee any witnesses who testified as to a specific plan of operating this so-called development loan program?

Mr. PASSMAN. I might state that they did not. I might further state that Mr. Fairless, when he appeared before

this committee, recommended strongly against this type of loans, and I think he said in the hearings, you might as well have a box of rocks as the soft currency. Mr. Fairless did not appear before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but he did appear before our committee and he said he recommended against the soft currency loans and that they should be discontinued immediately. The membership understands that this is not a loan.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That answers my question. No one appeared before our committee to justify a plan, and that was the purpose of my question to the gentleman from Louisiana. There is no plan, no program, and yet they are asking for \$500 million—for what? For soft loans. Soft loans are gifts in disguise. The gentleman from Ohio said a moment ago that a fine record had been made on this loan program. But, I think the gentleman from Ohio would agree with me that that kind of loan is a different kind of loan than what is proposed in this program. I agree with the gentleman that we have had a fine record, but this is not a loan program. It is a giveaway.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am, indeed, grateful that in its great generosity, the committee is according 8 minutes for a discussion of the part of this bill of appropriation that has to do, not with the means of killing men in war if necessary, but in helping them to live in peace by building into healthy economics the lands in which they dwell.

I do not know how much we are getting from buying arms, and scattering them among the nations of the earth. I doubt that nations live alone by arms. What we do we justify by our will to protect the security of our Republic from men of evil hearts.

But, I do know there is hope in economic development of lands less favored than our own and I believe that the redevelopment-loan program is thoroughly sound. But how can you convince anyone in 2 minutes against his own inclinations and I am fearful prejudiced against what is proposed by confusion with a program it is intended to replace?

So I turn back the remainder of my time in order that other Members may have ample time to express themselves. The committee has shown such amazing liberality by voting a total of 8 minutes of debate that there is at least 1 second of time available for each Member to get his argument across, provided all desire to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, of course, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] well said, these soft loans are giveaways in disguise. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] spoke of the repayment record on the \$16 billion in loans already made by established international lending agencies. As long as we shovel the dollars out all over the

world, they will pay something on the loans, but cut off the dollars and watch what happens. The Export-Import Bank, according to an item in the papers recently, reports that they put out a billion dollars in loans last fiscal year alone. How much of the American taxpayers' money do you want to hand out to nations all over the world? Let us see what the Secretary of State thinks about this soft loan policy. You have read it in the papers, but let me refresh your memories. In questioning Mr. DENTON before the Committee on Appropriations, this is the testimony:

Mr. DENTON. What I am thinking about you are accomplishing it now, but what will be the effect when the loan comes due and you cannot pay the soft loan. Will we accomplish our purpose then?

Secretary DULLES. I do not know. That will be a problem for some other Secretary of State, not me.

Now, if the Secretary of State has no more confidence in this soft-loan plan than to give that kind of an answer, I want no part of it. That is like saying it makes no difference how much money we spend today as Members of the House of Representatives, we will load it onto the backs of future generations to pay for our folly. We discharge our responsibility simply by voting for the spending. That is the attitude of the Secretary of State, and I am opposed to this amendment to add another \$200 million to this bill for the purpose of making uncollectible loans because I have at least some responsibility to the people I represent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the charge that these loans are soft loans is not new. From the beginning, some have made the same charge, namely, that nothing will come back. Yet it is out of some \$15 billion worth of just such loans that more than \$6 billion has been paid back. If future Secretaries of State will have the problem of collecting these loans, please remember that the present Secretary of State has the problem of collecting on loans made by previous Secretaries of State. That is the normal procedure in our country and the collections have been good.

Now, why is this development loan fund proposed? Not to increase the number of loans, but to improve the methods of making them. It is designed to correct the things which get such criticism here in the Congress.

Our military aid is for the purpose of strengthening the armed forces of threatened countries so that they can hold back the enemy and defend their own independence; defense support is to enable them to maintain and keep in the field those forces which we have spent literally billions of dollars to arm. But at best, all these do is to buy time. For what? Time for the economies of those countries to be developed so that they can get on their own feet and each year provide more and more of their own support, the support we now are furnishing.

Those who object that they are on our backs are the very ones who should vote for this development loan fund. It pro-

vides the best hope of getting them off our backs, so that we will not have to appropriate these large sums every single year to keep them going.

Some complain because they are not able to support themselves; yet when we come along with a sound proposal to make it possible for them to support themselves the critics are equally against that. If you do not want to increase defense support, then you ought to vote for this amendment and increase the capital of the development loan fund. If you do not want an adequate loan fund, then you ought to expect to appropriate large amounts for defense support as far ahead as one can see.

Again, if the ICA does not spend all the money it has for loans by June 30, it is accused of having asked for more than it needed; if it does make, by June 30, all the loans it has money for, then it is condemned for having made some that are not adequately considered. That is inherent and inescapable in the procedure we have been following. Do you not want to correct that bad situation?

I was grateful to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], when he assured us last week that he would go along without fiscal year limitation on this development loan fund. The fund, like a bank, has to have initial capital that it can count on. It cannot loan out all its capital in less than a year. It has to know what it has—I hope \$500 million, but if the gentleman's bill prevails, at least \$300 million that it does not have to loan by June 30 of next year, or have it revert to the Treasury.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. And the bill was reported on that basis.

Mr. JUDD. That is one step ahead; that is real progress, and I appreciate it. Now I hope the gentleman will take the next step and provide an adequate amount. I have no idea whether it will be able to work out suitable projects on which to loan \$300 million by next June 30, or even \$250 million. It needs time and continuity so that it can operate more like our Army engineers; they can take time to study each project carefully, analyze it without having to meet a deadline. This fund ought to have enough capital for long enough time so that it can make a loan when the managers are convinced it is sound or necessary; and not make the loan unless they are convinced it is sound. We want them to make loans on the basis of individual projects—not country-level programs, as heretofore. We want to get them in a position where we can judge them by past performance, not by general promises or plans for the future.

I agree that probably between now and next June 30, it may not make many loans, probably not more than \$300 million. But they cannot make any loans intelligently unless they have a long-range program with assurance of adequate funds. If we are against waste and want economic aid to be on a businesslike basis, we should vote for this amendment to increase the capital to \$500 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 101, noes 149.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Technical cooperation, general authorization: For assistance authorized by section 304, \$113 million; and in addition not to exceed \$12 million of unobligated balances of funds heretofore made available for purposes of section 304 are continued available for the purposes of that section;

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Page 3, line 5, strike out the figure "\$113,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$139,900,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I hear the voices demanding a vote and I know what the fate of my amendment will be. Yet I cannot permit this part of the bill to go by without offering this amendment and without commenting even briefly in support of it.

Throughout the debate today we have heard speaker after speaker express concern about lessening the military power of the United States. The preceding amendments, with the exception of the one pertaining to the development assistance fund—and debate on that amendment was limited unduly—have sought to restore slashes in the military potential of ourselves and our allies. The defense support amendment, even though it offers some economic aid, places emphasis, too, upon supporting the military. No mention at all has been made of the fundamental might of the United States, namely, our spiritual values, the truths which we hold dear.

What is the most effective way to fight communism? Is it on the lines with belligerent troops facing each other? Is it the might of armies and the most advanced weapons? Certainly, this is important, for military power is essential to restrain military aggression. The fact remains that we want peace and the world wants peace. We must never lose sight of the fact that our goal is peace, and we must not permit the impression to be conveyed to the peoples of the world that we are not a peace-loving people. With peace as our standard, we wage the most effective type of war against communism.

And that is the purpose of my amendment—to wage war against communism in men's homes, in their local communities through peaceful efforts designed to eradicate poverty to the greatest extent possible, to eliminate the feeling of discrimination.

Our spiritual values have made our Nation great, not only in the eyes of Americans but in the eyes of the peoples of the world. Our Declaration of Independence is a symbol of freedom for

the world. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," stir the peoples of other nations as well as all Americans. We make a mistake when we believe that in the battle for men's hearts and men's minds, a favorite phrase for all of us, we permit the eternal truths of America to be forgotten. This is a battlefield where victories are as important as military victories.

I firmly believe that much of the difficulty we encounter in the world today arises through our own overemphasis on military power. We have searched for bigger and better bombs. Now we are looking for a clean bomb. So much emphasis appears to be on weapons. We have not talked enough about helping the underprivileged peoples of the world achieve the freedom which they seek and the elimination of the grinding poverty under which they live.

My amendment protects the point 4 program, the technical assistance projects under which we send soldiers of peace among the peoples of the world to work with them in the fields, to administer to their ills, to improve their communities, and to fight famine. This program has proved to be a major weapon in America's anti-Communist arsenal. Through this program, we send shirt-sleeved diplomats abroad to work with the people and to propagandize the good will and help of America where it counts most—on a person-to-person basis. Incidentally, this is exactly where the Communists are working—among the downtrodden people.

This program is being expanded this year to include six new countries—Argentina, Burma, Ghana, Tunisia, Morocco, and Libya. It moves the point 4 program where it should be: among the awakening peoples of Africa, an area in which the United States has a critical interest. If the committee's reduction stands, this program—America's message of peace among the peoples of the world, will have to be curtailed. Let us not jeopardize our best foreign aid operation in the name of economy.

This program is the material embodiment of the truths which America holds to be self-evident. I urge approval of my amendment.

#### FOREIGN AID PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment.

Information supplied the Committee on Foreign Affairs showed that our Government is engaged in more than 2,100 projects around the world. These projects utilize United States technicians, equipment and supplies and include the training of local citizens. More than 3,500 Americans are employed directly by ICA in its overseas posts. Add to this about 1,700 who are employed by United States contractors paid from ICA funds. With few exceptions these Americans and their families are living in a local environment quite different from our own. They are people with professional training who, in their conduct and attitudes, project American ideas at the grassroots level. I have seen some who I think do not measure up to their

responsibility. But I have seen far more who reflect the greatest credit on our country and the programs in which we are engaged.

Similarly, the Congress and the country have been told about the shortcomings of some projects. But no committee, and no Member, has made a detailed study of each of the more than 2,000 projects. The criticism leveled against a few projects, much of it magnified disproportionately by those who are against the whole program, should not obscure the solid accomplishments which many of us, in our visits abroad, have witnessed. What is most needed in a proper evaluation is a sense of balanced appraisal that weighs the intangibles as well as the tangibles. It is the more elusive intangible elements that often throw light upon the results.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT

The President is to be complimented on his unusual public appeal to the Congress to vote substantially all the money he has requested as essential to the security, peace, and prosperity of the Nation. Unless this sum is forthcoming, the President, out of necessity, may have to call Congress back for a special session to provide more money for the economic and military buildup of the Free World against the continuing Communist threat.

I am pleased that the President recognizes the importance of the mutual-security program to our peace and security. But I regret that he has not maintained a vigorous and persistent educational effort with the American people. Nonetheless, we must not weaken or abandon a program which has already strengthened the world economy, brightened the future for free people and enhanced the security of democratic nations.

International communism is constantly probing to discover and exploit weak points within the free world. We must be prepared to meet this challenge whenever the liberty of free people is jeopardized by our common enemy.

We are all aware of the problem and needs of the friendly nations in the various areas of the free world. The free world looks upon our Nation for leadership and the consequences of what we do or fail to do with respect to the mutual-security program reach far beyond our own national frontiers.

The world today is one in which we and our friends cannot relax our collective efforts for stability and security. There is no basis for any hope that the long-range objectives of international communism for world domination have been abandoned.

It is my conviction that this program is a fundamental and essential aspect of the conduct of our foreign policy today. It was begun 10 years ago by Americans of all parties, all races and all occupations. This is not the time to abandon this program when international communism threatens our national security.

I strongly urge the executive branch to submit their recommendations for next year's mutual security program not later than February so as to avoid further delays in this very important legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 103, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

United Nations expanded program of technical assistance: For contributions authorized by section 306 (a), \$15,500,000: *Provided*, That the United States contribution to the 1958 calendar year program shall not exceed 33.33 percent of the United Nations program;

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: On page 3, line 11, strike out "\$15,500,000" and insert "\$9,450,000."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, on this page of the bill there are three technical-assistance programs for which funds are appropriated. The first is the United States program, the second is the United Nations program to which this amendment refers, and the third is the technical-cooperation program for the American States.

In the United Nations program the bill now before us has this proviso:

*Provided*, That the United States contribution to the 1958 calendar year program shall not exceed 33.33 percent of the United Nations program.

The other nations have contributed to this program the total sum of \$18,900,000 for the calendar year 1958. Obviously the United States contribution under the very language of the bill is limited to one-half of \$18,900,000 which is \$9,450,000, the amount contained in my amendment. It is a matter of simple arithmetic and the extra \$6 million should not be appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUDGE) there were—ayes 63, noes 145.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 3, line 15, after the word "program" strike out the semicolon, insert a colon, and add the following:

"*Provided further*, That a reasonable amount of the funds provided herein may be used for the underdeveloped areas of the United States of America where women's wearing apparel is made from feedbags, such funds to be made available to and distributed by the University of Pennsylvania."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman reserve it, please?

Mr. PASSMAN. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will not take but one minute. I came across an item the other day that reads as follows:

UNIVERSITY PARK, PA.—Clothing specialists at Pennsylvania State University say women annually convert more than 100,000 cotton bags into dresses. The 100-pound feedbag, which contains 1½ yards of reusable fabric, is the most widely used for home sewing.

Mr. Chairman, if a report reached this country that 100,000 women in some foreign country were wearing feedbag dresses, I have no doubt that some bureaucrat in Washington would immediately organize a small army of dogooders, and arm them with a few million dollars to see that they were equipped with the latest style cotton dresses.

It occurred to me that out of the \$15 million here being appropriated to the United Nations that perhaps we might take care of the 100,000 women in those underdeveloped areas of the United States who seem to be wearing feedbag dresses.

I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Special assistance, general authorization: For assistance authorized by section 400 (a), \$175,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$5,000,000 shall be available for Guatemala;

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Page 3, line 18, strike out "\$175,000,000" and insert "\$250,000,000."

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the hour is late but I would appreciate it if the committee would pay attention because this is, I believe, a serious item, and I would not have brought it up this late in the evening if I did not think it was of national importance.

The amendment I have offered can be briefly explained as follows: The special assistance fund payable to the President to take care of emergencies and contingencies that may arise in the future, as well as some already programed, the request was made for \$300 million. The Congress in its wisdom, in the bill passed yesterday, authorized \$250 million. The present bill carries only \$175 million of which over \$100 million has already been programed.

This is a fund provided the President. It is for emergencies and it has special features. It is to take care of things that have to be done on short notice. Probably the most dramatic effect of the similar fund that has existed in the past was that it made it possible for us to save the situation in Iran and in Guatemala, just a few months ago. The President, in this bill, would have less than \$75 million to meet contingencies or sudden emergencies. The money will not be spent if the emergencies do not arise. Certainly we can trust the President to use the funds only when they are needed.

The release that has been circulated here from the White House today says that:

A cut in this special assistance fund will seriously reduce the reserve funds hitherto provided to the President to meet emergencies which inevitably develop in the world we live in today.

In the past we have had \$250 million in that fund. I think it would be most shortsighted and perhaps foolhardy to limit that important feature of this bill.

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

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that in the \$100 million that is already programed is aid for countries like Tunisia, a new republic just getting started; Israel, Afghanistan, Guatemala, Bolivia, and various other Latin American countries, and the Hungarian refugees?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Yes; and the very important malaria program. There are many things that might happen in these coming months where the ability to spend considerable sums immediately might be vital to the national safety. So I hope this amendment will be approved.

Mr. JUDD. And the gentleman's amendment restores to the President only what he has had each year for all these years and which has never been misused.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Not only that which he has had and which has never all been spent, sometimes very little of it spent. Two hundred and fifty million dollars was authorized only just yesterday by the Congress and I see no excuse for reducing it at this time. It cannot be spent unless the President decides it is in the public interest and I am sure we can trust his judgment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the President's special fund last year was for only \$100 million. It is not clear why they should request such a large amount for the fiscal year 1958. In the fiscal year 1956 the President requested \$200 million for the Asian fund. We cut him down to \$100 million. He has had it for 2 full years and they have only been able to spend \$6,327,000.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. If the gentleman will yield, does not that show that the fund would not be misused?

Mr. PASSMAN. Does it not also show that they do not need that much money?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill may be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 3, line 19, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear right from the start that my amendment will not increase the appropriation by even \$1. It merely earmarks \$10 million of special assistance funds for Guatemala, the only country in the history of mankind that was able to throw off the Communist yoke.

In this connection, I can well remember the conversation I had with our Ambassador to Guatemala at that time, Jack Peurifoy, loved by all of us on Capitol Hill. Well do I remember his saying to me: "John, we must never, never permit Guatemala to fall in Communist hands again. If we do, it will be disastrous."

Let us think about the critical chain of events in Latin America within the past year and a half. The Presidents of Panama and Nicaragua, violently anti-Communist and strongly pro the United States, were the first to be assassinated. Then came the tragic assassination of Carlos Castillo Armas, the President of Guatemala, by a fanatic Communist. His assassination has been deplored by the entire Free World. In the United States, particularly, we have felt that in the assassination of the President of Guatemala we lost a great friend, a vigorous anti-Communist, and a champion of the free way of life. It is essential that the United States demonstrate not by words, not by eulogies, but by deeds that we still believe in Guatemala although her great hero has fallen. The ideals and principles of what he liked to call "the new life" must be perpetuated. Last year the Congress in its wisdom specifically earmarked \$15 million in grant-aid funds to Guatemala and the same amount was appropriated the year before. The adoption of my amendment will make it clear to the courageous and freedom-loving people of Guatemala, that the United States is determined to help them successfully complete the Guatemala experiment initiated by President Carlos Castillo Armas. The entire world is watching this experiment, this attempt to prove that only through the free way of life, and not through communism can people achieve their happiness.

While my amendment is \$5 million less than the amount made available last year, I want to make clear the legislative intent in offering this amendment that should more aid be requested and should it be essential to carrying out the democratic programs of Castillo Armas, then an additional sum will be made available by use of the emergency fund of the President or by some means of transferability.

The destiny and future of Latin America and the United States are one and the same. This is the fundamental basis of the inter-American system. In that system Guatemala stands out as a beacon light of hope not only for the entire Free World but for all those people behind the Iron Curtain who yearn for freedom. If we can assist in making the Guatemala experiment work, we will be dealing the forces of communism a se-

vere blow. Latin America constitutes a great prize to the Communists which they would like to win. Having won it they would dominate it ruthlessly and crush it. But they will not succeed if we demonstrate to the peoples of Latin America that we are their true friends and if we demonstrate particularly to the people and to the democratic Government of Guatemala that in this hour of their bereavement we stand with them in the battle against communism.

Because of the psychological impact the unanimous adoption of my amendment would have in Guatemala, I urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I am not going to oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think it is good and sound. However, I should like to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that we will immobilize still more of that emergency fund which my amendment sought to increase and which the House just voted down. We are putting the emergency fund in a straitjacket. I wish the gentleman's amendment had provided for additional funds to take care of it.

Mr. FOGARTY. I can say to my friend from Maryland that I think that can be straightened out in conference. The main point here is to increase this appropriation from \$5 million to \$10 million, because of the outstanding example they have set for all freedom-loving countries all over the world in the past 2 years since this money has been made available.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I want to compliment the gentleman on offering this amendment. He has made a fine statement. I associate myself with his statement and support the amendment. It ought to be accepted by the Committee.

Mr. PASSMAN. The committee is agreeable and accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 5, after line 22, insert:

"Sec. 102. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not heretofore authorized by the Congress."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that five of the appropriation measures, which we have passed this year, contained language similar to this amendment. I do not know why it was not included in the bill, as reported from the committee.

Years ago, either the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] or I or someone else had to offer amendments on the floor, but in recent years the Commit-

tee on Appropriations has been in the habit of putting that language in the appropriation bills as reported from the committee.

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

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I have polled the committee by whisper and nod and I do not find any objection to the amendment. The committee accepts the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of someone on the committee. On page 5, we find administrative expenses for the Department of State \$4,577,000. Will the gentleman tell me what that appropriation is for?

Mr. PASSMAN. Let us discuss the two of them together, administrative expenses, the ICA as well as this. Generally, it is for the top echelon, and if we are going to spend billions of dollars, do you not think we ought to give them sufficient money in the administrative end of it to do a good job and employ the proper type of personnel?

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me the State Department has requested an appropriation in every supplemental and deficiency appropriation bill that has come before the House. I wonder if there is any liquor in this \$4,577,000?

Mr. PASSMAN. I will say to the gentleman that the State Department has requested no funds for that item in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. As I recall, there was an appropriation of \$800,000 for representation allowances or liquor, in the regular State Department appropriation for the last fiscal year and yet we find officials of the Department raided their emergency funds to buy liquor here in Washington. I was just wondering if that was the purpose of some of these funds.

Mr. PASSMAN. I wish to assure the gentleman that this item is for administrative expenses.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the habit of irresponsible spending of other people's money is more contagious than Asiatic flu and its incidence among Federal bureaucrats is far more general than this much dreaded epidemic is apt to become. Regardless of the economy-mindedness of agency heads, it is very difficult for them to understand and control the details of administrative allocation of appropriated funds.

I was pleased to see the House approve the bill appropriating funds for mutual security in its reduced form. To me it represents adequate provision for our national defense and recognizes the lawmaker's final responsibility to his citizens.

With military outposts around the world facing the constant threat of Communist challenge and our position of Free World leadership, any other course at this time might mean loss of

face, of prestige, and of influence in the cause of world peace.

Unfortunate as our world position has grown to be, there is no alternative but to accept it, however, this does not mean we should continue to involve ourselves promiscuously in new areas, the cost of which endangers our own security and national solvency. As final appropriation measures clear the Congress, there is definite evidence that dangerous overspending and inflation, our greatest enemies, are being recognized and dealt with.

I do not believe the limitations we have placed on foreign aid will adversely affect our standing among our allies. Surely they must by this time realize that the United States Treasury is not bottomless. Commonsense should teach them that unlimited aid must sometime cease.

The action of the Congress in revising downward appropriations for foreign aid will, in my opinion, have a far-reaching beneficial effect. First, it will renew the hopes of American citizens that their heavy tax burden may soon be lightened. Second, it will serve notice to Government agencies and defense leaders, that closer scrutiny of all phases of Federal spending must follow if they would stay within the limits of their appropriations. Third, it will serve to awaken free governments everywhere that the major part of their ability and preparedness to resist aggression rests with their own determination to fully utilize their own resources and national products, and their will to remain independent of outside assistance. Fourth, it will tend to assure the free nations of the world that America is determined to preserve her own economic strength and solvency in order that she may continue to maintain the balance of world power without which the destiny of recently freed nations throughout the world would become totally insecure.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9302) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JUDD. I am opposed to this bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Judd moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 2, line 11, strike out "\$1,250,000,000" and insert "\$1,600,000,000."

On page 2, line 17, strike out "\$585,000,000" and insert "\$750,000,000."

On page 3, line 2, strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert "\$500,000,000."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. JUDD. On that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 129, nays 254, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 197] YEAS—129

- |                 |                |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Addonizio       | Flood          | O'Hara, Ill.    |
| Allen, Calif.   | Fogarty        | O'Neill         |
| Anderson, Mont. | Ford           | Osmer           |
| Arends          | Frelinghuysen  | Ostertag        |
| Ashley          | Fulton         | Patterson       |
| Auchincloss     | Granahan       | Pelly           |
| Avery           | Green, Pa.     | Price           |
| Ayres           | Griffin        | Prouty          |
| Baldwin         | Gubser         | Radwan          |
| Barrett         | Hale           | Ray             |
| Bass, N. H.     | Halleck        | Reuss           |
| Bates           | Harden         | Rhodes, Pa.     |
| Boland          | Haskell        | Riehlman        |
| Bolling         | Hays, Ark.     | Rodino          |
| Bolton          | Heslton        | Rogers, Mass.   |
| Broomfield      | Hill           | Rooney          |
| Byrne, Pa.      | Holmes         | Sadlak          |
| Canfield        | Hosmer         | St. George      |
| Carnahan        | Hyde           | Schwengel       |
| Carrigg         | Jackson        | Scott, Pa.      |
| Chamberlain     | James          | Scudder         |
| Chipherfield    | Judd           | Seely-Brown     |
| Chudoff         | Karsten        | Sheppard        |
| Coffin          | Kean           | Simpson, Pa.    |
| Cole            | Keating        | Sisk            |
| Corbett         | Kelley, Pa.    | Springer        |
| Coudert         | King           | Staggers        |
| Cretella        | LeCompte       | Stauffer        |
| Cunningham,     | McCarthy       | Taber           |
| Iowa            | McConnell      | Teague, Calif.  |
| Curtin          | McIntosh       | Tewes           |
| Curtis, Mass.   | Macdonald      | Thompson, N. J. |
| Dague           | Machrowicz     | Tollefson       |
| Dellay          | Marshall       | Udall           |
| Dennison        | Martin         | Van Zandt       |
| Devereux        | May            | Vorys           |
| Diggs           | Merrow         | Vursell         |
| Dooley          | Metcalf        | Widnall         |
| Dorn, N. Y.     | Miller, Calif. | Wigglesworth    |
| Doyle           | Miller, Md.    | Wilson, Calif.  |
| Dwyer           | Morano         | Wolverton       |
| Farbstein       | Moss           | Yates           |
| Fascell         | Mumma          | Younger         |
|                 | O'Brien, N. Y. |                 |

NAYS—254

- |             |               |                |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abbutt      | Andrews       | Bennett, Mich. |
| Abernethy   | Ashmore       | Berry          |
| Adair       | Aspinall      | Betts          |
| Albert      | Bailey        | Blatnik        |
| Alexander   | Baring        | Blitck         |
| Allen, Ill. | Bass, Tenn.   | Boggs          |
| Andersen,   | Becker        | Bonner         |
| H. Carl     | Beckworth     | Bosch          |
| Andresen,   | Belcher       | Bow            |
| August H.   | Bennett, Fla. | Boykin         |

- |              |               |                 |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Boyle        | Harrison, Va. | Patman          |
| Bray         | Harvey        | Perkins         |
| Breeding     | Healey        | Pfost           |
| Brooks, La.  | Hébert        | Philbin         |
| Brooks, Tex. | Hemphill      | Plicher         |
| Brown, Ga.   | Herlong       | Pillion         |
| Brown, Mo.   | Hoeven        | Poage           |
| Brown, Ohio  | Hoffman       | Poff            |
| Broyhill     | Hollifield    | Polk            |
| Budge        | Holland       | Porter          |
| Burdick      | Holt          | Rabaut          |
| Burleson     | Horan         | Reece, Tenn.    |
| Byrd         | Huddleston    | Reed            |
| Byrne, Ill.  | Hull          | Rees, Kans.     |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Ikard         | Rhodes, Ariz.   |
| Cannon       | Jarman        | Riley           |
| Cederberg    | Jenkins       | Rivers          |
| Celler       | Jennings      | Roberts         |
| Chief        | Jensen        | Robeson, Va.    |
| Chenoweth    | Johansen      | Rogers, Colo.   |
| Christopher  | Johnson       | Rogers, Fla.    |
| Church       | Jonas         | Rogers, Tex.    |
| Clark        | Jones, Ala.   | Roosevelt       |
| Clevenger    | Jones, Mo.    | Rutherford      |
| Coad         | Kearns        | Santangelo      |
| Collier      | Kee           | Saund           |
| Colmer       | Keeney        | Saylor          |
| Cooley       | Keogh         | Schenck         |
| Cooper       | Kilday        | Scott, N. C.    |
| Cramer       | Kilgore       | Scrivner        |
| Cunningham,  | Kirwan        | Selden          |
| Nebr.        | Kitchin       | Sheehan         |
| Davis, Ga.   | Kluczynski    | Shuford         |
| Davis, Tenn. | Knox          | Sleminski       |
| Dawson, Utah | Knutson       | Sikes           |
| Delaney      | Laird         | Simpson, Ill.   |
| Dempsey      | Landrum       | Smith, Calif.   |
| Denton       | Lane          | Smith, Kans.    |
| Derounian    | Lanham        | Smith, Miss.    |
| Dies         | Lankford      | Smith, Va.      |
| Dingell      | Latham        | Smith, Wis.     |
| Dixon        | Lennon        | Spence          |
| Dollinger    | Lesinski      | Steed           |
| Donohue      | Lipscomb      | Sullivan        |
| Dorn, S. C.  | Loser         | Talle           |
| Dowdy        | McDonough     | Teague, Tex.    |
| Durham       | McFall        | Teller          |
| Edmondson    | McGovern      | Thomas          |
| Elliott      | McIntire      | Thompson, La.   |
| Engle        | McMillan      | Thompson, Tex.  |
| Evin         | McVey         | Thomson, Wyo.   |
| Fallon       | Mack, Ill.    | Thornberry      |
| Feighan      | Mack, Wash.   | Trimble         |
| Fino         | Madden        | Tuck            |
| Fisher       | Magnuson      | Ullman          |
| Flynt        | Mahon         | Utt             |
| Forand       | Matthews      | Vanik           |
| Forrester    | Meador        | Van Pelt        |
| Fountain     | Michel        | Vinson          |
| Frazier      | Miller, Nebr. | Walter          |
| Friedel      | Mills         | Watts           |
| Garmatz      | Minshall      | Weaver          |
| Gary         | Montoya       | Westland        |
| Gathings     | Moore         | Wharton         |
| Gavin        | Morris        | Whitten         |
| Grant        | Moulder       | Wier            |
| Gray         | Multer        | Williams, Miss. |
| Green, Oreg. | Murray        | Willis          |
| Gregory      | Natcher       | Wilson, Ind.    |
| Griffiths    | Neal          | Winstead        |
| Gross        | Nicholson     | Withrow         |
| Gwinn        | Nimtz         | Wright          |
| Hagen        | Norrell       | Young           |
| Haley        | O'Brien, Ill. | Zablocki        |
| Hardy        | O'Konski      | Zelenko         |
| Harris       | Passman       |                 |

NOT VOTING—49

- |                 |               |                 |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Alger           | Hays, Ohio    | Morgan          |
| Anfuso          | Henderson     | Morrison        |
| Baker           | Hess          | Norblad         |
| Barden          | Hiestand      | O'Hara, Minn.   |
| Baumbart        | Hillings      | Powell          |
| Beamer          | Holtzman      | Preston         |
| Bentley         | Kearney       | Rains           |
| Brownson        | Kelly, N. Y.  | Robson, Ky.     |
| Buckley         | Kilburn       | Scherer         |
| Bush            | Krueger       | Shelley         |
| Curtis, Mo.     | Long          | Siler           |
| Dawson, Ill.    | McCormack     | Taylor          |
| Eberharter      | McCulloch     | Wainwright      |
| Fenton          | McGregor      | Whitener        |
| George          | Maillard      | Williams, N. Y. |
| Gordon          | Mason         |                 |
| Harrison, Nebr. | Miller, N. Y. |                 |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

- Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
- Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Beamer against.  
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. Baumhart for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Long against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Brownson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barden with Mr. Kearney.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Whitener with Mr. Bentley.

Mrs. GRANAHAH and Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CLARK and Mr. CEDERBERG changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GARY. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 252, nays 130, answered "present" 1, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

YEAS—252

Addonizio	Dennison	Jackson
Albert	Denton	James
Allen, Calif.	Derounian	Jenkins
Allen, Ill.	Devereux	Johnson
Anderson,	Diggs	Jonas
Mont.	Dingell	Jones, Ala.
Arends	Dixon	Jones, Mo.
Ashley	Dollinger	Karsten
Aspinall	Donohue	Kean
Auchincloss	Dooley	Kearns
Avery	Dorn, N. Y.	Keating
Ayres	Doyle	Kee
Baldwin	Durham	Kelley, Pa.
Barrett	Dwyer	Keogh
Bass, N. H.	Elliott	Kilday
Bates	Engle	Kling
Becker	Evins	Kirwan
Beckworth	Fallon	Kluczynski
Blatnik	Farbstein	Knutson
Boggs	Fascell	Laird
Boland	Feighan	Lane
Bolling	Fino	Lanham
Bolton	Flood	Lankford
Boykin	Fogarty	Latham
Boyle	Forand	LeCompte
Breeding	Ford	Lesinski
Brooks, Tex.	Fountain	Loser
Broomfield	Frazier	McCarthy
Broyhill	Frelinghuysen	McConnell
Byrd	Friedel	McFall
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton	McGovern
Byrnes, Wis.	Garmatz	McIntosh
Canfield	Gary	Macdonald
Cannon	Gathings	Machrowicz
Carnahan	Granahan	Mack, Ill.
Carrigg	Green, Oreg.	Madden
Celler	Green, Pa.	Magnuson
Chamberlain	Gregory	Mahon
Chelf	Griffin	Marshall
Chenoweth	Griffiths	Martin
Chipperfield	Gubser	Matthews
Christopher	Hagen	May
Chudoff	Hale	Meader
Clark	Halleck	Merrow
Coad	Harden	Metcalfe
Coffin	Hardy	Miller, Calif.
Cole	Harris	Miller, Md.
Cooper	Haskell	Montoya
Corbett	Hays, Ark.	Morano
Coudert	Healey	Moss
Cramer	Hébert	Multer
Cretella	Heselton	Mumma
Cunningham,	Hill	Natcher
Iowa	Holfield	Neal
Curtin	Holland	Nimtz
Curtis, Mass.	Holmes	O'Brien, Ill.
Dague	Horan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.	Hosmer	O'Hara, Ill.
Dawson, Utah	Huddleston	O'Neill
Delaney	Hyde	Osmers
Delay	Ikard	Ostertag

Passman	Santangelo	Thornberry
Patterson	St. George	Tollefson
Pelly	Saund	Trimble
Perkins	Schenck	Udall
Pfost	Schwengel	Ullman
Philbin	Scott, Pa.	Vanik
Pillion	Scudder	Van Zandt
Poff	Seely-Brown	Vinson
Porter	Selden	Vorys
Price	Sheppard	Vursell
Prouty	Sleminski	Walter
Rabaut	Simpson, Pa.	Watts
Radwan	Sisk	Westland
Reuss	Smith, Miss.	Widnall
Rhodes, Ariz.	Spence	Wier
Rhodes, Pa.	Springer	Wigglesworth
Riehlman	Staggers	Wilson, Calif.
Roberts	Stauffer	Wolverton
Rodino	Sullivan	Wright
Rogers, Colo.	Taber	Yates
Rogers, Mass.	Teague, Calif.	Younger
Rooney	Teller	Zablocki
Roosevelt	Tewes	Zelenko
Sadlak	Thompson, N. J.	

NAYS—130

Abbutt	Flynt	Pilcher
Abernethy	Forrester	Poage
Adair	Gavin	Polk
Alexander	Grant	Ray
Andersen,	Gray	Reece, Tenn.
H. Carl	Gross	Reed
Andresen,	Gwinn	Rees, Kans.
August H.	Haley	Riley
Andrews	Harrison, Va.	Rivers
Ashmore	Harvey	Robeson, Va.
Bailey	Hemphill	Rogers, Fla.
Baring	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Bass, Tenn.	Hoeven	Rutherford
Belcher	Hoffman	Saylor
Bennett, Fla.	Holt	Scott, N. C.
Bennett, Mich.	Hull	Scrivner
Berry	Jarman	Sheehan
Betts	Jennings	Shuford
Blitch	Jensen	Sikes
Bonner	Johansen	Simpson, Ill.
Bosch	Judd	Smith, Calif.
Bow	Keeney	Smith, Kans.
Bray	Kilgore	Smith, Va.
Brooks, La.	Kitchin	Smith, Wis.
Brown, Ga.	Knox	Steed
Brown, Mo.	Landrum	Talle
Brown, Ohio	Lennon	Teague, Tex.
Budge	Lipscomb	Thomas
Burdick	McDonough	Thompson, La.
Burleson	McIntire	Thompson, Tex.
Byrne, Ill.	McMillan	Thomson, Wyo.
Church	McVey	Tuck
Clevenger	Mack, Wash.	Utt
Collier	Michel	Van Pelt
Colmer	Miller, Nebr.	Weaver
Cooley	Mills	Wharton
Cunningham,	Minshall	Whitten
Nebr.	Moore	Williams, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Morris	Willis
Dempsey	Moulder	Wilson, Ind.
Dies	Murray	Winstead
Dorn, S. C.	Nicholson	Withrow
Dowdy	Norrell	Young
Edmondson	O'Konski	
Fisher	Patman	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cederberg

NOT VOTING—49

Alger	Hays, Ohio	Morgan
Anfuso	Henderson	Morrison
Baker	Hess	Norblad
Barden	Hiestand	O'Hara, Minn.
Baumhart	Hillings	Powell
Beamer	Holtzman	Preston
Bentley	Kearney	Rains
Brownson	Kelly, N. Y.	Robson, Ky.
Buckley	Kilburn	Scherer
Bush	Krueger	Shelley
Curtis, Mo.	Long	Siler
Dawson, Ill.	McCormack	Taylor
Eberharter	McCulloch	Wainwright
Fenton	McGregor	Whitener
George	Mailliard	Williams, N. Y.
Gordon	Mason	
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, N. Y.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Long against.  
Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Preston against.  
Mr. Baumhart for, with Mr. Morrison against.  
Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Alger against.  
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Brownson against.  
Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Beamer against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Bentley against.  
Mr. Robson of Kentucky for, with Mr. Krueger against.

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mrs. Kelly of New York for, with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. Siler against.

Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. McGregor against.

Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Hiestand against.  
Mr. Wainwright for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barden with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Whitener with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] who, if he were present, would have voted "aye." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the mutual security appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1482) entitled "An act to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. MALONE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to secure the program for tomorrow from the acting majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman, the conference report on S. 1747, the poultry inspection bill, will be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN. And that is the only legislation except by unanimous consent?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

#### CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the regular call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next and that it may be in order for the Private Calendar to be called on Thursday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### POSTAL AND CLASSIFIED SALARY INCREASES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the American people can understand the delay and temporizing, which blocks the final enactment and approval of raises that the House has voted to provide needed pay increases for postal and classified and other workers of the Federal Government.

Every type of tactic and argument has been used to obstruct and delay these measures. First, they are mouse-trapped in the preliminary legislative machinery. Then, it is asserted that they are unjustifiable because they will produce inflation, and, finally, they are shuffled in the melee of confusion and voluminous, routine procedure that always attends the preadjournment sessions of Congress.

Beyond this, there are constant threats that these vital measures will be vetoed by the Executive, or merged with other legislation, which will bring about their defeat or let them perish in the maelstrom of last-minute legislative potpourri.

I cannot understand the arguments, let alone the methods, that are being used to sidetrack these worthy measures. Practically every other group of workers in the Nation have currently enjoyed wage and salary increases, and no one has asserted that these increases should not have been granted because they would be inflationary.

Huge appropriations have been passed by Congress for innumerable purposes, which will pour billions of dollars into the economy, and lavish upon foreign nations, and this is not asserted to be inflationary.

Alone, above practically all American workers, the postal and classified groups have not been privileged to enjoy what present economic demands clearly re-

quire—fair and appropriate increases in their pay. Measured by any scale of justice, if increases are justified for all other workers, it is grossly unfair to penalize Government workers by holding up necessary legislation and fabricating specious arguments designed to deprive them of well-deserved pay increases.

It would be a pity and a great injustice if these measures should be buried in the legislative graveyard, or nullified by Executive veto. It would be deplorable to subject these measures to political jockeying and political manipulation to win favor and votes, to be used as a football in a cynical game of political aggrandizement.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these bills, with their proposed fair pay increases, are no more inflationary than any other pay raises that take place in our economy. How can any one logically argue that Government workers should be denied pay increases while all other workers are receiving them? This contention implies gross discrimination against faithful, postal workers, faithful classified and other employees of the Federal Government.

I have vigorously worked for, spoken for and supported these bills. They have real merit. They seek in this period of rising prices to give fair compensation to our valued Government workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every effort by this and the other body to act most vigorously and swiftly to insure the final approval and passage of these measures, and I also respectfully urge our great, beloved President to sign them. Congress must not adjourn until that is done.

#### THE DROUGHT SITUATION IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on July 28 the Republican candidate for Governor of New Jersey sent to each Member of New Jersey's Congressional delegation a copy of a telegram addressed to our distinguished Governor, Robert B. Meyner. The obvious purpose of the Forbes wire was to make some sort of political capital out of the miseries of our State's drought-stricken farmers.

In his usual, unobtrusive way, Mr. Forbes requested that the Governor ask President Eisenhower to declare New Jersey a disaster area. The wire was replete with suggestions that since the Governor had not acted the farmers' plight was worsening by the hour, since the President would obviously declare the State a disaster area. Forbes said "any further delay by you in seeking to assist the State's farmers in this crisis will cause greater hardship and loss." From firsthand observation, Forbes could attest to the need for the disaster declaration.

The ambitious Mr. Forbes thought his gambit would be perfect—if the Governor would act. In his own time, following a study by the head of the State's department of agriculture and on that respon-

sible official's recommendation, Governor Meyner did request the President to take action.

Poor Mr. Forbes. His name can be added to a long list of those who think President Eisenhower will do anything for a Republican candidate. He joined the farmers on the hard floor when the President pulled the rug from under them by refusing to declare New Jersey a disaster area.

Now that Forbes has lost interest in the farmers, even though they are suffering now more than ever, and has turned to more profitable pursuits, the President will have an unobstructed view of New Jersey's devastated farmlands. I am confident that he will review the facts set forth in my letter of yesterday to him and the facts which the Governor has sent him and will soon help our farmers by declaring the State a disaster area.

Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my statement the telegram of July 28 from Malcomb Forbes to Gov. Robert B. Meyner and the text of my letter to the President.

I urge that you promptly ask the President to designate New Jersey agricultural counties disaster areas in view of swiftly mounting loss of most crops from worst drought to hit State in more than 25 years.

In the past few days I have visited with farmers and New Jersey farm agents in most counties and can assure you from firsthand information and observation throughout the State, that our farmers from Sussex to Cape May, face crippling financial losses. Federal aid will be essential for many to stay afloat.

Am sending copies of this wire to our New Jersey Congressional delegation asking that they back up with the Federal Government your request.

The Governors of other nearby States facing the same situation already have acted on behalf of their people. Any further delay by you in seeking to assist the States farmers in this crisis will cause greater hardship and loss. My consultations with county and a number of State agricultural experts indicate unequivocally they would like you to act.

Sincerely,

Senator MALCOLM S. FORBES.

AUGUST 14, 1957.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because of urgent appeals which I have received from farmers in New Jersey, particularly those in the Fourth Congressional District which I represent in the House, I am writing to you asking that you reconsider your recent decision denying the application submitted to you to declare New Jersey a disaster area because of drought conditions.

In view of the very tragic conditions in my State, it is difficult to understand why New Jersey is not eligible for immediate help to alleviate a situation which is becoming more desperate each day. New Jersey farm losses due to the drought have been estimated as high as \$40 million, which represents approximately 13 percent of the expected \$300 million value of 1957 crops. If the situation is allowed to continue and no help is granted to the State, it is expected that losses will be double that amount. While I realize that emergency loans are now available to farmers through the Farmers Home Administration, this is not the answer to the problem and is only a partial solution, particularly in view of the fact that immediate aid is needed.

I know that you have on hand all of the facts relating to the effects of the drought in New Jersey as a result of the original application submitted to you so that it is not necessary to review them for you. However, I feel it incumbent upon me to emphasize again the growing danger that practically all of New Jersey's agricultural crop will be destroyed and farmers ruined unless some assistance is granted at once. I cannot urge too strongly that you review this whole problem again and take steps immediately to declare New Jersey a disaster area. The conditions in the State are such that partial and delayed assistance is out of the question and a policy of "too little and too late" would only add to a situation which is already approaching the point of ruin and bankruptcy for our farmers.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully yours,  
FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

#### THE PRICE OF EGGS AT THE FARM

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I made a speech on the floor of the House about the shameful price the farm woman of America is getting for eggs.

That speech struck fire. It has appeared—in part or in entirety—in dozens of newspapers. It has swamped my office under a deluge of mail. I take no credit for the effect of that speech. Far from it. I felt that speech profoundly. I felt it as deeply as I do my love for the United States of America. I felt it as deeply as I do my respect for the deliberations of the House of Representatives. Through me, with my voice, the righteous indignation of millions of American women spoke. That is why my recent speech on the shameful price of eggs at the farm level struck fire.

The theme of that speech was: The price of eggs at the farm is an economic weathervane. It points the way to poverty or progress—to prosperity or depression. The price of eggs at the farm can either be raised to a standard whereby farm women can buy or—and this is a big "or"—you can go back to the days of the thirties. The only difference is that, in 1957, you have a choice.

What I intend to bring before you today is the political effect of the price of eggs paid the farm woman.

Let me tell you a story—one which may well prove to some within hearing a political bedtime story.

Once there was a Vice President. His name was Charles Curtis. He was a Republican Vice President. He had a speech. Perhaps, he had others. Perhaps, this was his only speech. It was about the price of eggs. He made that speech whenever he faced a farm audience. He made that speech near Esterville, Iowa. At the end of the speech, Vice President Curtis always called for questions. He did not expect anyone to ask questions; but he called for them

anyway. That is what he did in northwestern Iowa. Only, this time, somebody asked him a question. Did he answer? Did he come up with any kind of an explanation? Not Vice President Curtis. He refused to answer. He said, "I'm not going to answer. You're too dumb to understand."

Yes. That is what he said.

What happened? Farm women voted their anger. Farmers—husbands, sons, sweethearts—voted their anger. The result? The Midwest—including traditionally Republican Iowa—went Democratic.

That political bedtime story, Mr. Speaker, is over a quarter of a century old. Yet, people within the range of my voice this very minute remember it as vividly as if it were on this morning's news program. They have a good reason to remember it. Vice President Curtis and all those who rode his coat-tail went down to defeat. The embattled farmer—this time, including the farm woman—cut the ground from under them as effectively as the embattled farmers at Concord cut the ground from under the invading British.

Do you know what some of the letters said after my speech on the price of eggs at the farm of a few days ago?

One letter said that this farm woman, after a year of indefensible low prices for her eggs, could not afford to buy chicks for this year's production.

Another letter said that it cost more to feed, build, and operate her small flock than it returned in cash.

Still another letter said that this woman was ashamed to send her children to school in their old patched suits and dresses. She would have had good clothing for them if she had been paid even a decent price for eggs.

Still another letter said that the writer needed her egg money to make up for the losses her grain-farming husband was incurring.

These people are not going to forget their elected representatives who sat on their hands when the time came for them to raise these hands to be counted in the battle for a fair price for eggs at the farm.

With radio, TV, and daily and weekly newspapers—the 1957 farmer and his wife are immeasurably better informed than their spiritual and physical fathers and mothers of some 25 years ago.

You can bet your bottom dollar that they are not—and I quote—"Too dumb to understand."

Why am I bringing out these political facts of life to a mixed audience of Republicans and Democrats? Because I believe, with all my heart, that the need for a living price for eggs at the farm is an American issue which surmounts partisan approach. It is far, far better for the American farm woman—and through her, the American farm—to win through to the calm harbor of economic stability than it is for any one of us to survive in office.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, allow me to paraphrase the words of that early patriot-liberal, Patrick Henry, in the Virginia House of Burgesses: "President Harding had his Albert Fall; President Hoover had his Curtis; and President

Eisenhower—may profit by their example."

And, if there be any cries of treason in the wake of what I have just said, I reply—with Patrick Henry—"If this be treason, make the most of it."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and got here at the close of the rollcall. I should like to state for the RECORD that had I been here I would have voted "nay" on this last vote.

#### OUR FOREIGN POLICY IN LATIN AMERICA

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a deliberative body, the greatest in the world. From our exchanges of facts and views, in committee and on the floor, come the policies of our Nation. Yesterday on the floor the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO] made a speech defending the Dominican Republic and attacking my activities in connection with certain changes I propose in our foreign policy for Latin America. He did not see fit to give me notice in advance, so it happened that I was not present to make corrections and comments. I shall do so now. I notified him this morning and this evening at which time he told me. I shall specify the 12 errors of fact and the nine unsupported opinions in his 25-paragraph talk.

First, I want to say this about those who are opposing my stand. They do not fight out in the open. They defend a man who is a murderer a thousand times over, a man whose country is the slaughterhouse of the Caribbean, but they do it unilaterally by avoiding open debate where the accuracy of their facts and the evidence supporting their opinions would be open to immediate challenge.

The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], also a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, did have the courtesy to notify me in advance of his recent speech. This gentleman did yield to me briefly in the course of his remarks for certain corrections. To my disappointment he did not choose to stay in the chamber to hear my remarks and, as he might have thought necessary, enter into any colloquies to attempt to correct me on the facts or opinions offered in my speech.

It is my hope that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO] will agree to meet me in open, simultaneous debate on this important subject about which they have unrestrainedly registered their violent

dissent from my position. Such debate, it seems to me, would be in the best traditions of this House as a deliberative body. Insertions of speeches in the Record or unannounced speeches, like the one under discussion, or a failure to allow colloquy seem to me unfortunate and a gage of the faith the gentlemen have in the soundness of their position.

Before I take up in detail the 12 notable factual misstatements and the nine unsupported opinions in the speech of the gentleman from Connecticut, let me set forth again what the shooting is all about. My distinguished colleague from Connecticut, like the other gentleman who takes issue with me, failed to set out and discuss the policies I recommend. Instead, like the others, he sets up various strawmen and collateral matters and attempts to strike them down in order to score points against me.

My recommendations briefly are:

Publicly declare which nations are dictatorships;

Cut off all aid to Latin American dictatorships;

Instruct our Ambassadors in all countries under dictators to be courteous but cool;

Help the democracies and the countries emerging into democracy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to 12 notable misstatements of fact and to nine unsupported opinions offered in the speech of the gentleman from Connecticut, the very gentleman who advised me in his speech of yesterday to concern myself only with those matters about which I had knowledge.

He states that I said on Meet the Press that I favored the resultant chaos following a revolution in the Dominican Republic. I did not. Factual error No. 1.

He calls the Dominican Republic "that island stronghold of resistance against communism." This is nonsense. Unsupported opinion No. 1. Trujillo would be of no help if the Soviet Union attacked us. By consolidating all industry and commerce under himself and by holding back social and political improvements, he has set the stage for communism. Trujillo imported exiled Dominican Communists in 1946 from Mexico to make it appear that he was truly popular and that the only real opponents of his regime were the Communists.

Here is what Prof. Robert J. Alexander, of Rutgers and Columbia Universities, writes in his recently published book, *Communism in Latin America*: "Potentially one of the most powerful and dangerous Communist parties of Latin America is that of the Dominican Republic. Although by the end of 1956 the Dominican Partido Socialista Popular—as the local Communists are called—had only a handful of supporters, and was forced to operate very much underground, Generalissimo Trujillo had prepared the soil for a sudden development of the Communist seed."

Alexander explains that the police state atmosphere "is certainly preparing the way for communism in the Dominican Republic. It is preventing the growth of healthy democratic parties which might challenge the appeal of the

Communists to the masses of the peasants, workers and intellectuals. It is equating all opposition to Trujillo with communism, thus clouding people's minds concerning the real nature of the Communist internal movement, its aims, objectives, and methods of operation."

He accuses me of irresponsibly "destroying friendships it has taken the United States years to cultivate" and "championing those very forces our Federal Government is attempting with such effort and expense to eradicate." I recognize that the gentleman is entitled to his opinions. He offers no evidence to support it. Unsupported opinion No. 2. I take strong exception to these opinions. I challenge him to produce any evidence to support this fantastic charge. The making of such unsupported charges is, I believe, unfair and irresponsible.

The gentleman states, in the copy of his speech released to the press, "It is difficult for the Members of this body and the American public to believe that one who has never been to the Dominican Republic could be an authority on its internal affairs." Unsupported opinion No. 3. I have never said I was such an authority. The State Department's highest Latin American official, who I do not believe has been there either, stated in Congressional hearings that it was a dictatorship. The State Department in official notes has rejected the Dominican explanation of Gerry Murphy's death and has twice and without result asked that a high Dominican official cooperate in the investigation.

The gentleman believes that the Foreign Affairs Committee should handle this matter. He implies that I disagree. Factual error No. 2. I do not disagree. I seek and will welcome such consideration. I have presented a memorandum to members of this committee and have repeatedly made requests to be allowed to appear before the Latin American Subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Connecticut is a member.

The gentleman is again in error, this time involving simple arithmetic, when he says that my amendment to deny mutual security funds to Latin American dictators was "almost unanimously condemned by a vote of the full House."

The House has 435 Members with two current vacancies. I estimate that more than 400 were on the floor when this amendment came up for a vote. The tally on the division was 171 to 4, 175 votes in all, less than half the full House. Factual error No. 3. Many colleagues told me they voted against the amendment or refrained from voting because they thought the issue too important to pass on so summarily, and at that late hour of the day, and that it should first be the subject of committee hearings. I do not agree with the gentleman that the House looks upon this issue with "apathy." Certainly the gentleman from Connecticut does not. Factual error No. 4.

The gentleman alleges that "the principal beneficiaries of the campaign thus far have been Communists and Communist sympathizers" here and in Latin American countries. Again, the grossly irresponsible unsupported assertion. The gentleman's opinion is as good as his

evidence and his evidence is in default. Unsupported opinion No. 4. I thank him for admitting that my campaign has "found acceptance in some reputable sections of the press." Does he then believe that the New York Times and the Washington Post are also dupes of slaves to the Kremlin? Or in my district the Eugene Register-Guard, Coos Bay Times, Medford Mail-Tribune, and others?

The gentleman grants, in his next breath, that my motives are "altruistic," but he says that is "of passing consequence," because "they serve but to carry out a subversive design of the Kremlin to destroy the most anticommunistic nation in the Caribbean." Again, a serious and unsupported charge, and what a charge. Unsupported opinion No. 5. I tell the gentleman from Connecticut that if he has any evidence that my motives are serving to carry out any such subversive design, please make it known and without further delay. If the gentleman speaks from knowledge, he owes it to me and to our Nation to disclose this knowledge.

The gentleman refers, with regard to me, to "what he views as a dictatorship" implying that my characterization of the so-called Dominican Republic is a unique and prejudiced personal opinion. Factual error No. 5. Again, I refer him to Assistant Secretary Rubottom's testimony before the gentleman's own subcommittee. Does the gentleman deny that Dominican Government is a bloody dictatorship held together by bribery and terror? Does the gentleman hold that the President and the legislature govern in the so-called Dominican Republic?

The gentleman believes the present Dominican Government to be friendly to us, which I doubt, but let us assume so. Are there not other more pertinent standards we use in assessing governments? Such as decency and fairness? But passing this, let me say that the gentleman's assumption that the overthrow of the Trujillo regime would inevitably mean replacement by one "steeped in Marxism" is another example of his preference for argument by unsupported assertion. Unsupported opinion No. 6. Trujillo, as mentioned above, has certainly set the stage for the Communists, but it is by no means certain they would prevail. At least, the gentleman fails to back up his opinion.

He says he makes these statements "with the deep conviction gained through years of on-the-scene relationship with our nations to the south." Is it too much to ask that the gentleman provide at least a little evidence for some of these opinions, or does membership on the appropriate committee qualify a member to speak as an authority who need not offer factual support for his assertions, however drastic and fantastic?

The gentleman opines that my campaign against the Dominican Republic has been "prompted and encouraged only by naivete of our foreign policies and not by careful thought." If the gentleman showed any indication that he had read even one of my many speeches on this subject, I would be inclined to take his observation more seriously. Unsupported opinion No. 7. I certainly have

more careful thinking to do and I have a lot more to learn. But no one yet, least of all the gentleman from Connecticut, has undertaken to demonstrate to me in open debate or otherwise, why the policies I advocate are not necessary if we are to regain our moral leadership in Latin America and if we are to fight communism effectively in the Western Hemisphere.

The gentleman concludes his remarks by listing what he calls my "incongruous positions" and asserts that my legislative record establishes "rather definitely" that my campaign against the Dominican Government "is, to say the least, unfounded in any known concept of foreign relations." Since the gentleman never bothered to set forth my suggested policies or any "concepts of foreign relations," I fail to see how he could relate them. Unsupported opinion No. 8.

Let us consider one by one these alleged "incongruous positions" which he lists:

A. He complains because I advocate aid to Communistic Yugoslavia but not to the friendly Dominican Republic. My position is that the taxpayer's money should only be used for aid when the United States thereby enhances its security. Aid to Yugoslavia, properly qualified, as this House decided, does make us more secure; aid to Trujillo does not. This is an opinion I have supported with much evidence in several speeches here.

B. The gentleman is in error when he says I would cancel our trade with the Dominican Republic. Factual error No. 6. I do favor trade in nonstrategic materials with Red China.

C. The gentleman again is in error when he says I have urged severance of diplomatic ties with the so-called Dominican Republic. Factual error No. 7. I do advocate recognition of Red China on the same basis we recognize Soviet Russia—certainly not as a sign of softness but as an arm's-length relationship designed to keep communications open.

D. The gentleman is in error again when he states I have branded Gerry Murphy as "an international kidnaper." Factual error No. 8. He says I had a duty to speak up for the 450 servicemen missing behind the Bamboo Curtain of China. Unsupported opinion No. 9. He says many of them are my constituents. He is absolutely wrong. None of the men on that list is from the fourth district of Oregon.

The Department of Defense informed my office yesterday that I was the first Congressman to ask for the names and addresses of his constituents among these 450 men. There are good reasons for not publicizing the addresses of these men, but the information is available on demand.

The gentleman from Connecticut says many of my constituents are on the list. The Chief of the Office of Legislative Affairs at the Department of Defense, Capt. Carleton A. Adams, checked in to this at my request. A few hours ago he informed my office that none of the men on the list was from any of the seven counties of southwestern Oregon which comprise my Congressional district.

I can also note here that no one in the State of Oregon has ever written to me on this subject. That the gentleman from Connecticut should have any information about Oregonians among these 450 men is interesting in that apparently he himself has never requested similar information about his own constituents. For his information, I know, having checked, that there are four men on the list who at one time lived in the State of Oregon, but none of them lived in my district.

If the gentleman has contradictory information, I hope he will be kind enough to let me know about it immediately. Of course I want to do what I can to have all these men released, if any are still alive and being held against their will, and I believe trade in nonstrategic materials and recognition would be great strides in that direction. I might add, for the benefit of Mr. Dulles, that I do not believe it is blackmail to do what is in our own best interest.

Moreover, an important difference in the two cases is that the Foreign Affairs Committee, under the forceful and able leadership of my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], has a firm grip on the problem of the 450 missing men.

E. The gentleman says I have misled the general public in several Latin American countries where I have carried my anti-Dominican preachings in that these peoples thought my opinions were the official view of our Government. Factual error No. 9.

F. The gentleman's ready acceptance of unsupported Dominican assertions that Dr. Galindez was a blackmailer, embezzler, anti-Catholic, and servant of Russia is astonishing. I have met many persons who knew Galindez well. They deny such charges indignantly and say he was a good and brave man. Factual error No. 10. I have abundant evidence in favor of Dr. Galindez and will be glad to make it available to the gentleman, preferably in a floor debate.

G. I have never likened Trujillo to Hitler, contrary to the gentleman's assertion. Factual error No. 11. In some respects they are comparable, such as the enormity of their murder records, but I have never linked the two. It is true, and an occasion for gratitude, that many Jewish refugees were saved through visas from Trujillo. It is not true that these "thousands of Jewish refugees" mentioned by the gentleman are still—as the gentleman mistakenly asserts—enjoying "peace, prosperity, and voice in government they had never known before" in the so-called Dominican Republic. There are about 600 Jews now living in Sosua. Factual error No. 12.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, this is a deliberative body. On one point the gentleman from Connecticut and I agree: Members should speak on the basis of knowledge. I submit that the gentleman from Connecticut spoke yesterday about my Latin American views without knowledge of those views, without knowledge of my activities and remarks and without knowledge of the elementary circumstances.

My analysis here has demonstrated that the gentleman, in his 12-minute, 25-paragraph speech, which occupies only a page of space in the RECORD, managed to crowd in 12 factual errors and 9 unsupported opinions. It was a welter of insufficient preparation, misdirected logic, and flat assertions. Here, in summary, are the factual errors, presented unblushingly by the gentleman from Connecticut:

First. He incorrectly stated that I said on Meet the Press that I favored the resultant chaos of a revolution in the Dominican Republic.

Second. He incorrectly implies that I disagree that the Foreign Affairs Committee should assume jurisdiction and take action in the Murphy-Galindez case and with respect to the governmental policies involved.

Third. He incorrectly states that my amendment to deny mutual security funds to Latin American dictators was almost unanimously condemned by a vote of the full House.

Fourth. He incorrectly declares that the House looks upon this issue with apathy and then belies his own assertion by taking to the floor himself to deliver an unwarranted, unfair, ill-prepared attack on the subject.

Fifth. He incorrectly indicates I am the only one who views the so-called Dominican Republic as a dictatorship, failing to note that this is the view of the highest Latin American specialist in the Department of State as stated this year before the appropriate committees of this House and the other body.

Sixth. He incorrectly states that I favor canceling our trade with the Dominican Republic.

Seventh. He incorrectly asserts that I have urged breaking off of diplomatic relations with the Trujillo government.

Eighth. He incorrectly states that I have called Gerry Murphy an international kidnaper.

Ninth. He incorrectly says I have misled the people of the Latin American countries I have visited into believing that I was setting forth an official view of this country, but he cannot and does not show that this is so by any facts or evidence.

Tenth. He incorrectly charges that Dr. Jesus de Galindez was a blackmailer, an embezzler, an anti-Catholic, and a fellow traveler.

Eleventh. He incorrectly says that I have likened Trujillo to Hitler.

Twelfth. He incorrectly cites the number of Jewish refugees from Europe now living in the Dominican Republic.

And here is a summary of the unsupported, and I will add, mostly unsupported, opinions offered by the gentleman from Connecticut during his brief oration in this House yesterday:

First. He calls the Dominican Republic an island stronghold of resistance against communism, but fails to offer any substantiating evidence for such a statement.

Second. He submits that I am destroying friendships for the United States and defending forces the United States is attempting to eradicate, an absolutely indefensible statement on his part; and, of course, he makes no attempt to defend

it. He contents himself with the wild, unsupported accusation.

Third. He accuses me of presuming to be an authority on the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic, a stand I have never taken.

Fourth. He alleges that my views on Latin American policy have mainly benefited Communists and Communist sympathizers, but he offers not one shred of evidence that this is so.

Fifth. He sets out a completely irresponsible charge that I am serving to carry out a subversive communistic plot to destroy the Dominican Republic, but he does not attempt to substantiate his charge in any way.

Sixth. He predicts that if Trujillo were overthrown, his successor would inevitably be a Communist, but he does not bother to back up his prediction with one good reason why this must be so.

Seventh. He offers as his opinion that my efforts in the Murphy-Galindez case and in the field of Latin American policy are based on ignorance of foreign policies and are characterized by a lack of careful thought, but I am compelled to point out that the speech given yesterday by the distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs failed to provide much of an example in that direction.

Eighth. He lists a number of what he calls my incongruous positions, but fails to relate them to the changes in foreign policy which I have suggested to his committee.

Ninth. He believes I should direct my efforts toward the 450 men who are still unaccounted for by Red China following the Korean war, but he fails to show that any of my constituents are on the list and my investigation also fails to show any.

As for the gentleman's suggestion that I leave these matters to the President and the appropriate committees, I express my hope that the President and the appropriate committees, including particularly the gentleman's own subcommittee, will ultimately take an interest. I pledge myself to cooperate with them in presenting facts in my possession and my views as to the necessity for our regaining moral leadership in Latin America.

So much for the 17 factual errors and the 9 unsupported opinions in the gentleman's speech yesterday. Nothing is left when they are subtracted, nothing but praise for a terroristic dictator who, in 1937, ordered the slaughter of thousands of helpless Haitians and who since then has spread his network of terror to our own country. Friend of ours? Ally against communism? What nonsense. Murderer, thief, tyrant—those are more accurate.

While I wait for the President and the appropriate committees to reverse our present be-kind-to-Latin-American dictators policy, I intend to continue my campaign. I believe that the change is urgent if we are to fight international communism effectively on our very doorstep. The men and women in the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon are strongly supporting my actions in this respect. Included among them are

Mr. and Mrs. Lester G. Murphy, of Eugene, Oreg., the parents of Gerry Murphy, the boy whose death in my firm opinion resulted from our present Latin American policies.

I want our foreign policies to be effective against international communism, not cause distress to our real friends and contempt by our purported friends in Latin America. I want no more American boys to fall victim to the foul schemes of arch criminals like Dictator Trujillo who murder and corrupt in order to preserve their tyrannies.

The United States, as a Nation under God and as a Nation that trusts in God, will, I am confident, soon revise its foreign policies to conform with the deepest moral and religious principles of its citizens. This revision can come on the floor of this House or in the appropriate committees of Congress or in the State Department or in the White House or in some or all of those places. However it comes and whenever it comes, it must spring from deliberations based on facts which are accurate and opinions which are supported by reliable evidence.

I include an editorial by Tom Wallace, editor-emeritus of the Louisville Times and one of the Founding Fathers of the Inter-American Press Association:

[From the Louisville Times of July 31, 1957]  
SOME AFTERTHOUGHTS ON THE ASSASSINATION OF ARMAS—SLAYING OF GUATEMALAN PRESIDENT MAY BE LOOKED AT FROM MORE THAN ONE VIEWPOINT, WALLACE OBSERVES

(By Tom Wallace)

Assassination of Castillo Armas, President of Guatemala by virtue of a revolution of which he was the head, or nominal head, may be looked at from more than one point of view.

It was, on the face of reports, an atrocious murder done by a palace guard, declaredly a Communist. The murderer reportedly settled his account with justice by shooting himself almost immediately after his crime. Perhaps he imagined himself a hero, as a champion of a cause. The cause possibly of Guatemaltecos who had been exiled since Castillo Armas took up the reins of government. Or possibly the killer was a champion of an ideology or a political party. But he was a Communist, now how did he become a palace guard?

He administered justice to himself if he killed himself, and nobody will argue that his self-directed bullet did not do justice to him or that it did more than justice.

Looked at from another angle, the murder may be rated a tragic incident in the course of unwitting promotion of communism in Latin America by the Colossus of the North. The Colossus' government is bent upon nothing more strongly than upon crushing communism in this hemisphere, unless it is preventing its getting to our doors by taking over Europe.

Widely in Latin America, and widely in the world, the United States was credited, or, according to the sentiment of the observer, charged with having upset the Arbenz government in Guatemala and with having seated, in the position of chief of state, an adventurer who could not have managed a revolution with financial means he could have commanded.

Latin Americans did not relish as an achievement of the United States what our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, called "our victory." Latin Americans who thought it was not Castillo Armas' victory believes he could not have it by means of the small forces with which he set out from Hon-

duras in a movement not protested by the Colossus. They knew that the Arbenz regime was tainted with communism, although not only and avowedly Red. But they held that inasmuch as Guatemala was a sovereign Latin American state, managing its domestic affairs was not the business of the United States.

Latin Americans and North Americans must have known that the handful of leaders and unknown Latinos who take an interest in politics in Guatemala, where the population is chiefly made up of primitive Indians who wear tribal costumes, did not and would not and could not menace the Panama Canal. Anti-Communists in the United States who said they did menace it were proceeding under a pretext or under the influence of hysteria.

Latin Americans held, moreover, that if it were a fact that the ideology of a government in Guatemala were a potential danger to the United States, the colossus, a partner-in-business with the most prominent Fascist in Europe, was obliged under international law and custom to refrain from action with arms, even loaned or donated arms, to rectify the condition complained of.

Arming, or even encouraging Fascist adventures in Latin America, the colossus feeds the fires of communism in the southern half of the hemisphere as nothing else could feed them. If there is danger—I don't believe there is—that communism will actually take over and hold even one Latin American country that danger is due partly to the inclination of the United States Government to show partiality toward dictators who follow the Fascist line although they do not use the label, at the same time keeping a watchful eye upon any Latin American government which may reveal a tendency toward communism.

That the United States so aids Latin American Communists is asserted in a recently published book by a thorough student of the Communist problem in Latin America (*Communism in Latin America*, by Robert J. Alexander).

When the not Red, but somewhat pink, constitutionally chosen Government of Guatemala was overthrown by powerful backers of Castillo Armas, I had no means of knowing that Latinos who said the United States produced the revolution told the truth.

That it was indeed our victory was accepted as a fact by newspaper correspondents and by one great newspaper in the United States, where conservatism governs news and editorial utterance.

Herbert L. Matthews, veteran correspondent of the New York Times, is a member of that newspaper's editorial conference. He mentions the Guatemala incident in a recently published book. *The Yoke and the Arrows*, subtitled, *A Report on Spain*.

Mr. Matthews, old in experience in the field in Latin America, prominent in the Inter-American Press Association, anti-Communist of course, laments that the Pentagon felt it necessary for us to make an ally of Franco to get bases in Spain, and that one result is our cordiality to Franco.

I quote Mr. Matthews:

"In aiding Tito our attitude toward communism was clear. \* \* \* The arrangement was purely practical. We have not contaminated each other, so to speak. That is the way naturally with communism.

"But what about fascism? Obviously we take a different attitude. We not only have a number of allies in Latin America who are Fascists or the equivalent, but we would never lift a finger to prevent a Latin American country going Fascist. When weak little Guatemala threatened to go Communist, we moved in and staged a revolution against the government. \* \* \* We have made a bargain with one of the most tenacious and outstanding enemies of democracy in the world (Franco) to defend democracy."

If our victory in Guatemala—the overthrow of Arbenz—reflected our planning—I don't pretend to know the facts—our Castillo Armas' net effect on communism in Latin America was strengthening. If he was murdered by a Communist, and if the murderer killed himself, both victims of gunfire rode for the fall they suffered.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) August 19, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. FENTON until August 21, 1957, on account of death in immediate family.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. ABERNETHY.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAY in two instances, in each to include related matter.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana and to include related matter.

Mrs. BOLTON in two instances, in each to include related matter.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. LANE.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. LONG (at the request of Mr. PASSMAN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARY to revise and extend his remarks made in committee and to include a table.

Mr. LAIRD in three instances.

Mr. HASKELL.

Mr. SAYLOR.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 232. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the readjustment of tax in the case of certain amounts received for breach of contract, and to restrict the issuance of certificates for rapid amortization of emergency facilities;

H. R. 5168. An act for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham; and

H. R. 5707. An act for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 52. An act to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances;

H. R. 1058. An act to preserve the Key deer and other wildlife resources in the Florida Keys by the establishment of a National Key Deer Refuge in the State of Florida;

H. R. 1460. An act for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and others;

H. R. 1562. An act for the relief of Maj. John P. Ruppert;

H. R. 1672. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Edward J. Moskot;

H. R. 1864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lidle Kammauf;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Robert D. Miller, of Juneau, Alaska;

H. R. 2049. An act for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Houser;

H. R. 2460. An act to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

H. R. 2950. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Emery A. Cook;

H. R. 3281. An act for the relief of Howard S. Gay;

H. R. 3440. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan Schlossberg;

H. R. 4023. An act for the relief of Oswald N. Smith;

H. R. 4154. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Thomas Brainard, a minor;

H. R. 5627. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emma Hankel; and

H. R. 8090. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army and certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 16, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1134. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit illustrations and films of United States and foreign obligations and securities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1135. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of Nikitas Kouylos, A-1239918, involving suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)) and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1136. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1137. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize refunds by the Veterans' Administration of amounts collected from former servicemen by the Government pursuant to guaranty of life insurance premiums under the original Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 9302. A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 9240. A bill to revise certain provisions of law relating to the advertisements of mail routes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1740. An act to authorize the payment from the employees' life-insurance fund of expenses incurred by the Civil Service Commission in assuming and maintaining the assets and liabilities of certain beneficial associations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Fifteenth report pertaining to activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to polio vaccine (Rept. No. 1175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 662. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the northwestern part of the State of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 1176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5526. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 883), relating to the rights of vessels of the United States on the high seas and in the territorial waters of foreign countries; with amendment (Rept. No. 1177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6959. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the augmentation of natural food supplies for migratory waterfowl; with amendment (Rept. No. 1178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report on safety of life at sea, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 9302. A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 9303. A bill to require the use of humane methods of trapping animals and birds on lands and waterways under the

jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 9304. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 9305. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 9306. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of mink pelts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 9307. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H. R. 9308. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wild-life, fish, and game, and for other purposes," approved March 10, 1934, as amended, known as the Coordination Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 9309. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to bar absolutely the importation of contraceptive articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 9310. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act to permit corporations to act as trustees under deeds of trust; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 9311. A bill to credit certain teachers in the District of Columbia for services performed by them between September 1944 and July 1, 1955; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 9312. A bill to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to the effective date of certain State agreements or modifications thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9313. A bill to prohibit Government agencies from acquiring or using the National Grange headquarters site without specific Congressional approval, to provide for renovation of the old State Department Building, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, with respect to the days on which the flag of the United States should be displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 400. Resolution recommending the creation of a permanent United Nations

Emergency Force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 9314. A bill for the relief of Antonio Escobedo-Romo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 9315. A bill for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 9316. A bill for the relief of Pierino Renzo Picchione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9317. A bill for the relief of Oshiro Shoko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 9318. A bill for the relief of Elaine Marie Simonton (Yu Keum Ok); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. J. Res. 442. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Colonel William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Achievements in Agriculture—The Meat-Type Hog

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, agricultural research has shown hog producers how to meet consumer demand for lean pork and to cut the fat surplus at the same time. Scientists in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with State experiment stations have shown that meat-type hogs can be produced within any breed by selecting the right breeding stock.

These streamlined, meaty hogs dress out 50 percent or more of the preferred lean cuts, compared with 44 percent in the lard-type hogs that have been grown in this country for many years. This means an extra 13 or 14 pounds of good lean meat with a corresponding decrease in the amount of fat. Furthermore, these hogs produce just as big litters, which grow just as fast and just as economically as the old-fashioned lardy hogs do. Farmers can collect an extra dividend of as much as \$5 a head for the extra pounds of lean cuts.

Between 15 and 20 percent of the hogs going to market these days are meat-type hogs, and the number is increasing as the advantages show up all along the line. Some packers are paying a differential for leaner hogs and others are discounting the price for fat hogs. Market grades have been established to help

buyers identify hogs with the most desirable weight and degree of fatness.

Every man, woman, and child in this country is benefiting from the research that has made it possible for farmers to give us the kind of pork we want and need for best nutrition. It looks now as if our scientists will be able to do the same thing for beef. They are working hard to develop beef animals that will produce steaks and roasts that are tender and juicy without the large amount of fat consumers no longer want or need. They are making progress and deserve our full support.

### Farmers Hold the Key to Future Hog Prices

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, farmers hold the key to future hog prices. If the favorable prices and feeding ratio now enjoyed by producers prompt overexpansion of hog production, heavy supplies could easily bring about lower prices as past experience clearly demonstrates.

Too many hogs leads to inefficient use of resources with accompanying low prices and incomes as producers well remember from their experiences in 1949 and 1955. In 1949, hog producers increased the pig crop by 10 million head and hog prices dropped \$5 to \$6 per hun-

dred. Again in 1954, producers increased total production by 9 million hogs followed by another 9-million-head increase in 1955. Hog market prices dropped sharply.

On the other hand as production is reduced, prices go up. Hog producers made a cut of 7½ million hogs in production in 1956. Hog prices have been running from \$18 to \$21 per hundred at Midwestern markets during recent weeks. A year ago prices, while markets were recovering from heavy 1955-crop marketings, were as much as \$5 per hundred less.

There have been periods when prices have held when hog numbers expanded but usually this was during a period when demand was high due to emergencies such as World War II and the Korean war. In 1941, the United States Department of Agriculture asked for an increase in production and prices held in the war period. With stable production in years following the war, prices stayed high in 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Hog production was increased in 1950 and 1951 but prices held due to the Korean war. Sizable reductions in 1952 and 1953 production increased the price of hogs in 1953 and 1954.

The past shows that when production is balanced with demand, hog producers receive satisfactory prices. If production remains on an even keel during the coming months, price prospects for hogs should be favorable.

The Department of Agriculture has expressed the hope that producers will continue to avoid excessive increases at the time of breeding for the 1958 spring pig crop. It should also be pointed out that the trend toward production of meat-