

1958

CC

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 4237 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make, in House bill 13247, all necessary technical and clerical changes, including changes in section and subsection numbers and letters, and cross references thereto.

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

**OLD VINEYARD NAMED SITE**

**FREEMONT.**—The Weibel Champagne Vineyards at Warm Springs near Mission San Jose, site of wine growing pioneer Leland Stanford's famous vineyard, has been named a State historical landmark, it was announced today.

Sanford, who also was United States Senator and Governor of California and founder of Stanford University, founded the famed vineyards in 1869 and later grew grapes there which produced quality wine equal to great European vintages.

Notification of the selection of the site as a landmark was made by the Historical Landmark Advisory Committee, Sacramento, to Weibel, Inc.

**Minshall Again Brings Traveling Office to District**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

**HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL**  
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 years, it has been my privilege and honor to represent the people of the 23d Congressional District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States. As a representative of this outstanding district, I have considered it my duty not only to be well informed of the opinions of the people through personal contact and use of opinion polls, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with Federal agencies and departments. To help accomplish this, I maintain on a year-round basis a congressional office in room 525 of the Federal Building in downtown Cleveland where I can meet with people personally during trips back to the district when my official duties permit. While I am in Washington, a competent staff is in charge of Cleveland office.

A further service to the people of the 23d District is my Washington Report which, in newsletter form, periodically presents a concise accounting of events and opinions on Capitol Hill.

During my service in the Congress, I have considered it of primary importance to be present at the Capitol whenever Congress is in session in order to participate in committee work and to vote on important legislation. This year with Congress in nearly continuous session, I have not been able with intervening committee work to return to Cleveland as much as I would have liked. Therefore, in accordance with the practice I initiated 4 years ago, I am bringing a traveling office to the various communities in the 23d District. This method of meeting with the public has been tremendously popular and it gives me a wonderful opportunity to discuss and learn at firsthand the opinions and individual needs of the people.

With the understanding that Congress will not be in session during the early part of October, I will again this year from October 6 through October 17 follow the same procedure and have a series of conference meetings so that every resi-

dent of this suburban district can conveniently meet with me. These are not group meetings but office conferences for the individual which will enable them to discuss their views and problems personally. No appointments are necessary, and I urge individuals to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient. Every resident of the 23d District is cordially invited to talk over

problems of national concern, to discuss personal problems they might have with the Federal Government, or just to chat and get better acquainted. The knowledge thus obtained will better enable me to represent the residents of the 23d District in the Congress of the United States.

Following is the schedule for these office conferences:

Community	Location	Date	Time (p. m.)
Bay Village.....	Bay Village Townhall, mayor's office, 350 Dover Center Rd.	Monday, Oct. 6...	2-4:30
Westlake.....	Westlake City Hall, 27216 Hilliard Blvd., rooms 10 and 11.	.....do.....	6:30-9
Lakewood.....	Lakewood City Hall, relief office, 14532 Lake Ave.	Tuesday, Oct. 7...	2-4:30
Rocky River.....	Rocky River City Hall, mayor's office, 21012 Hilliard Blvd.	.....do.....	6:30-9
North Olmsted, Olmsted Township, Olmsted Falls.	North Olmsted City Hall, Dover Center Rd.	Wednesday, Oct. 8,	2-4:30
Fairview Park, Parkview, Linndale.....	Fairview Park City Hall, 20785 Lorain Rd.	.....do.....	6:30-9
Berea, Middleburg Heights, Westview, Riveredge Township.	Berea City Hall, 47 East Bridge St.....	Monday, Oct. 13...	2-4:30
Strongsville, North Royalton.....	Strongsville City Hall, mayor's office, 18688 Royalton Rd.	.....do.....	6:30-9
Brecksville, Broadview Heights, Independence.	Brecksville Townhall, 49 Public Square.	Tuesday, Oct. 14...	2-4:30
Parma Heights, Brookpark, Seven Hills, Brooklyn Heights.	Parma Heights Townhall, 6281 Pearl Rd.	.....do.....	6:30-9
Warrensville Heights, Warrensville Township, North Randall, Woodmere, Orange.	Warrensville Heights City Hall, 4700 Warrensville Center Rd., mayor's office.	Wednesday, Oct. 15,	2-4:30
Chagrin Falls, Chagrin Falls Township, Hunting Valley, Moreland Hills, Bentleyville.	Chagrin Falls Library, 100 East Orange	.....do.....	6:30-9
Solon, Glenwillow, Oakwood, Bedford Heights.	Solon Village Hall, council chambers, 6315 SOM Center Rd.	Thursday, Oct. 16.	2-4:30
Maple Heights, Bedford, Walton Hills, Valley View, Cuyahoga Heights.	Maple Heights City Hall, mayor's office, 6553 Lee Rd.	.....do.....	6:30-9
Shaker Heights, Beachwood.....	Shaker Heights City Hall, mayor's office, 3400 Lee Rd.	Friday, Oct. 17....	2-4:30
University Heights, Pepper Pike.....	University Heights City Hall, 2300 Warrensville Center Rd.	.....do.....	6:30-9

I am most appreciative of the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available as an aid in rendering this public service.

Foreign Commerce Committee in the House of Representatives. H. R. 12850 passed the Senate on July 31, 1958.

REMARKS OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICE JOHN E. CONE, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE TO BAN TEEN-AGE WEAPONS, FOR DELIVERY AT HEARING OF UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, JULY 23, 1958

I am John E. Cone, justice of the New York State Supreme Court. I am appearing here today as chairman of the Committee to Ban Teen-Age Weapons.

Our group was formed last year in response to the sharp increase in juvenile delinquency experienced by New York City and State. Many public spirited citizens including 2 Congressmen, 3 district attorneys, 8 State legislators, many judges, members of the clergy, educators, and community minded citizens helped organize our committee.

Our purpose was to put more teeth in existing State, Federal, and city laws with the view of reducing the terrible incidence of youth crime. Our prime objective was to ban the switchblade knife and its successor the deadly gravity knife.

In 1954, through the efforts of a similar committee as I now represent, the switchblade knife was banned in New York State. As you now, these knives open upon the slight touch of a button. Certain knife manufacturers, seeking to circumvent the law, started to manufacture and advertise the gravity knife. This weapon opens and locks automatically at a quick flick of the wrist. Technically, they are not switchblade knives, but they are just as dangerous.

It is worthy of note that last year the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency instituted an extensive study and field investigation of the switchblade and gravity knife situation. The results of this survey fully supported and emphasized the need for this legislation.

**Remarks of New York State Supreme Court Justice John E. Cone, Chairman, To Ban Teen-Age Weapons**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

**HON. EDNA F. KELLY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1958

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the New York City Committee To Ban Teen-Age Weapons, of which John E. Cone, Justice of the New York State Supreme Court is the chairman, I am submitting the statement he made at the hearings before the United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Wednesday, July 23, 1958.

The House of Representatives has passed during the session H. R. 12850 which prohibits traffic in switchblade knives. Led by Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY, who first introduced this legislation in 1953, many Members of Congress, particularly from the New York-New Jersey area, sponsored identical bills. Congressman DELANEY and I testified in favor of this legislation during the hearings before the Interstate and

The committee found that over 1 million switchblade and gravity knives are distributed and sold each year in this country. These knives are sold chiefly to juveniles. Some 200,000 are imported.

New York State and 11 other States took action in an attempt to halt the flow of these weapons into the hands of juveniles. This year New York outlawed the manufacture, sale, or possession of the gravity knife. The measure received overwhelming support in the State legislature.

Helping to spark our drive were several of the major metropolitan newspapers and radio station WMGM. We realized, however, that despite our State law, we were relatively helpless in fully meeting the challenge of the gravity and switchblade knives. Thousands of these weapons were being bootlegged into the State from other countries and other States. These weapons had become the symbol, as well as the weapon of the teen-age gang. And they are still easy to purchase.

Advertisements by mail-order houses, in sports magazines, in outdoor magazines, all offer these knives for sale.

The only way the individual State can effectively bar the switchblade and gravity knives and remove the handcuffs now binding law-enforcement officers, is for you to enact appropriate Federal legislation. You must prohibit their introduction into interstate commerce, close the mails to them and ban their importation.

Switchblade and gravity knives have no possible legitimate use. They can do nothing worth while that other types of knives cannot do better. A fish knife is more useful to a fisherman, a hunting knife to a hunter. Switchblades are good for just one thing—sneak attack.

They can be easily concealed and called into action at a moment's notice. Their blade, like the tongue of a deadly snake, darts forth with great speed and force.

- You can see from the weapon that I hold in my hand that this is not the type of a knife we used when we were boys, or that the Boy Scouts used. This weapon is designed to be used exclusively for strong-armed purposes.

In support of our stand, I would like to present you with the signatures of 250,000 persons who have signed our petitions and have written post cards urging this legislation. These people represent all walks of lives. One woman wrote to us saying that her son lost an eye because of the brutal switchblade knife. Teen-agers backed the proposed legislation, too.

It was heartening to us to receive the support of the Camillus Cutlery Co., one of the Nation's foremost knife manufacturers. This group is represented here by Mr. Lewis A. Pinkussohn, Jr. This company has worked diligently to rid the market of the death dealing gravity and switchblade knives.

Other leading citizens, such as City Councilman Jack Kranis, State Senator Frank J. Pino, Albert M. Leavitt, president of the Youth Service League, Assemblyman Stanley Steingut, Representative Edna F. KELLY, Captain Frederick Ludwig, to name a few, are largely responsible for calling the threat of this weapon to the attention of the public and for helping to pass the legislation in New York.

The rest is up to you. You can strike a deadly blow at teen-age gangs. You can wrest the gravity knife and switchblade knife from the hands of the young hoodlums. You must grant approval to the bill now under consideration, and ban the gravity and switchblade weapons. Thank you.

## Failure To Extend Public Law 480 Is Bad News for Farmer

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1958

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have called on the leadership of this Congress for extension of the surplus disposal law, Public Law 480. A prominent newspaper in the First Congressional District has done farmers a service by presenting an excellent editorial on the value of this legislation, and what the loss will mean to everyone—farmers and people who depend on a prosperous agriculture indirectly for their income.

The full impact of the failure to extend this law is admirably described in the following article which appeared in the Waseca Journal, Waseca, Minn., and which was reprinted in the Faribault Daily News.

This important law has been passed by both Houses of Congress. Since there is a difference in the two bills, they must go to conference. At this late date it is shocking to note that conferees have yet not been appointed:

#### Bad News

Every day the Democrat-controlled Congress fails to reenact Public Law 480 spells more bad news for the farmer. And the farmer has had plenty of bad news since June 30 when the law passed by the 83d Republican-controlled Congress expired.

A few days ago the United States Department of Agriculture issued its report on the accomplishments of Public Law 480 during the fiscal year ending June 30. The 6.6 million metric tons exported under this law covers nearly every farm food and fiber commodity.

Acclaimed as one of the greatest pieces of all agricultural legislation in all time, this Republican-sponsored law was largely responsible for the increased export of farm products during the Eisenhower administration.

The increase was sizable, too, nearly double that of 1952—94 percent by volume, to be exact.

The law alone cannot take all of the credit for this outstanding Republican accomplishment. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson deserves much of the credit. His agricultural attachés, 50 of them, serving in over 100 foreign countries, negotiated readjustments of tariff barriers, ironed out conflicts with producers abroad, and otherwise made possible the greatest export of farm products the world has ever known from any nation.

Dairymen in this part of Minnesota should be particularly grateful for this legislation and its accomplishments. During the year ending June 30 dairy exports totaled 84,365,000 pounds.

Soybeans, which have become Waseca County's major crop, were supported on the home market through Public Law 480 exports which totaled a staggering 402,814,000 pounds of soybean oil. Corn in the amount of 24 million bushels was sold abroad and

the wheat surplus would be even worse were it not for the Public Law 480 export of 175,485,000 bushels, to say nothing of the nearly 37 million pounds of wheat flour.

The export of beef was more than 11 million pounds while that of tallow was nearly 5 times greater or 54,429,000 pounds.

First Minnesota District Congressman AL QUIE warned of the danger of letting the valuable farm legislation expire on June 26, 4 days before the June 30 deadline. Now the opposition has no one to blame but themselves for the great loss that is being suffered every day by First District farmers.

That loss will continue even beyond the day the law is reenacted, for it will take considerable time to get the massive export machinery in operation. In the meantime, foreign sales lost during the past several weeks show little chance of being recaptured.

OTR

## National Defense Education Act of 1958

### SPEECH

OF

### HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, have my full support.

The greatest paradox in history is that here, in the world's richest country, thousands of gifted youngsters are not able to use their abilities to the fullest, due to a lack of funds. Many people feel that the Federal Government should not directly participate in education. While I strongly support local control of primary and secondary school education, we must, as a Nation, develop to the fullest our greatest natural resource—namely our youth.

The Education and Labor Committee deserves a great deal of credit for the comprehensive bill they have prepared. Ever since January 1954, when I introduced the first bill which provided for a system of scholarships for those with unusual scientific abilities, I have felt very strongly that we must aid those who are intellectually gifted but unable to attend a college or university due to the lack of funds. The first Russian sputnik was the catalyst which finally brought the full attention of the American people to our educational needs—particularly at the higher levels.

The purposes of this bill are to assist in the improvement and strengthening of our educational system at all levels and to encourage able students to continue their education beyond high school! It is designed to accomplish these objectives by, first, establishing loan programs for students at institutions of higher education; second, providing grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools; third, establishing language institutes and area centers to expand and improve the teaching of lan-

languages; fourth, assisting in the expansion of graduate education; fifth, assisting in the improvement of guidance, counseling and testing programs; sixth, providing for research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related mediums for educational purposes; and, seventh, improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

America is confronted with a serious and continuing challenge in many fields. The challenge—in science, industry, government, military strength, international relations—stems from the forces of totalitarianism. This challenge, as well as our own goal of enlargement of life for each individual, requires the fullest possible development of the talents of our young people. American education, therefore, bears a grave responsibility in our times.

It is no exaggeration to say that America's progress in many fields of endeavor in the years ahead—in fact, the very survival of our free country—may depend in large part upon the education we provide for our young people now.

A number of provisions in the bill are aimed specifically at reducing the waste of needed talent which results when students with great potential ability drop out of school or college too soon. Several other provisions are designed to encourage an improvement and expansion in the teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. Another provision recognizes the need for more college teachers to prepare future scientists, teachers, and leaders in many fields.

Although our national security is handicapped by shortages of highly trained persons in all fields of endeavor, many thousands of young people with high ability drop out of high school before graduation or fail to attend college subsequent to graduation. This is a loss not only to these young people, but to the Nation as a whole. The bill provides grants to support improved State and local programs of counseling, guidance, and testing to help identify able students and encourage them to remain in school and achieve their optimum of performance based on their intelligence and aptitude. The bill also provides a program of loans to college and university students to help those who need financial assistance to continue and complete their education.

There are not many men such as Thomas Alva Edison who in spite of poverty and humble beginnings have made such tremendous contributions to mankind. What else might this genius have contributed to the world had he been able to take advantage of the loan provisions of this bill at the age of 18 in the year 1865? How many similarly brilliant intellects have been lost to mankind, and are being lost every day, because of the inability to finance further study? This bill is a great step toward a better educated America.

It is unfortunate that an amendment to the original bill struck out the provisions for a limited program of Federal scholarships. One of the chief criticisms of the scholarship provision seemed to be based on the fact that there are already

private foundations as well as States offering scholarships. The main point these critics seemed to ignore is that in spite of this so-called abundance of scholarships, a large percentage of those high-school graduates qualified for college, and capable of contributing greatly to this Nation's welfare, do not attend college—mostly due to financial reasons. The vast majority of scholarships do not come anywhere near covering the cost of the individual's college course. This was well pointed out in the report of the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School:

A recent survey covering 147 representative public and private colleges and universities during the period 1950-54 showed that nearly two-thirds of all scholarships paid less than 20 percent of all the college expenses of the holders. Graduates reported a median total 4-year expenditure of \$5,020, of which only 6.4 percent, or \$320, came from scholarship funds.

Unfortunately, due to the lack of adequate scholarships, many extremely brilliant individuals are indiscriminately deterred from following the avenues in which they could make their greatest contributions—not because of lack of interest but because of the economic difficulties of their parents. It has been said that it is discriminatory to give one individual a scholarship and another a loan. But, is it not even more discriminatory—against our Nation as a whole—to deny an impoverished individual the right to make his contribution to society?

It is my fervent hope that in the near future we will make even greater strides toward a better educated America by giving each individual the opportunity to fully develop his skills, physical or mental, regardless of his financial status. In this way this Nation will always continue to lead the world in all forms of endeavor.

A Dulles Form

EXTENSION OF

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 8, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, probably the most perceptive and illuminating comments on the current Middle East crisis have been made by the noted columnist, Walter Lippmann. One of his recent articles clearly points out America's present position in this critical area, and I consider it well worth the attention of our colleagues. The article follows:

While we do not know much about the meeting at Peking over the weekend between the Russians and the Chinese, we do know that it has added a new complication to a summit meeting. Khrushchev's original proposal had the great practical advantage that it looked to the Middle East without raising the problems of the Far East. On this essential point Gen. de Gaulle's proposal took advantage of what really was an important concession, and offered to meet at the summit without Red China participating.

But our own counter proposal, which insisted upon imbedding a summit meeting in the Security Council, meant not only that Mao was not to be present but that Chiang had the right to be present and in case there was any voting under the Council's procedure, to exercise a veto.

Now Mr. Dulles has raised the bus, and if there is to be a summit meeting at all, we must expect that in one way or another Mao will have a part in it.

In my own view I am unhappy and apprehensive about the way we are being pushed backward with our minds confined into a summit meeting. For judging by Mr. Dulles' press conference last week he has not cast himself in the role of a statesman who knows that to make progress toward stability in the Middle East he must give as well as take. He is playing the part of a litigating lawyer who hopes to win an argument. He is out to prove first, that the intervention in Lebanon and Jordan was legal. Having been done at the invitation of the legitimate governments, it is not, therefore, aggression. This is undoubtedly true. And second, he means to turn the table, and charge the Russians and the United Arabs with indirect aggression. If someone had tried to devise a formula most likely to set off a rhetorical explosion which will poison the air, he could not have found a more surefire matchmaker.

Someone to whom the President will listen should warn him that he will make a great mistake if he thinks that he can dominate the summit conference with charges of indirect aggression. For the truth is that indirect aggression—that is to say, propaganda, infiltration, bribery, subversion—is an old instrument of power politics, and in our time it is the way the cold war is fought. "Both sides use it when they think they can do so to their own advantage. It would impair, not enhance, the President's moral credit if he were to become blindly self-righteous, and were to fall into the trap of a skeptical world that we do not resort to what he calls indirect aggression and that only our adversaries do."

Panama will be sitting on the Security Council, a living reminder of how the United States obtained the Canal Zone in order to build the canal. Guatemala was only recently the scene of a successful coup, publicly applauded by Mr. Eisenhower himself, to oust an anti-American and fellow traveling government. The President will be reminded of what happened in Iran when Mossadegh was pushed out. Over the whole of the President's denunciation of external interference against existing governments will hang the Dulles theory of the liberation of eastern Europe, and the obvious fact that if we knew a way to overturn the existing governments without the enormous risks of war, we should be only too happy to use that way.

The central fact is that in the cold war today, the opportunities open to our adversaries are much greater than those open to us. For we are opposing three big revolutionary movements—the Russian, the Chinese, and the Arab—which has a potent appeal to the intellectual leaders and to the masses of backward countries. Not all countries are vulnerable to these revolutionary movements. But a great many countries are, and it is in them that indirect aggression works. Governments are not easily overthrown from abroad unless there is already within the country a strong disposition to encourage and to receive external aid.

The thesis, propounded by Mr. Dulles and accepted by Mr. Eisenhower, amounts to a demand that in the weapons of the cold war, our adversaries shall disarm, and in effect acquiesce in their own military containment, as for example, by the remaining members of the Baghdad Pact. Mr. Dulles is telling the President to demand the impossible, and

Transfer of land from the Interior Department to the Armory Board on a 30-year lease. At the end of 30 years, the stadium would revert to the Federal Government, along with the site.

Back went Mr. McLeod and Mr. Shea to draft amendments to the 1957 law.

**DIFFICULTIES DISPELLED**

The new bill, just signed by the President, overcame financing and site questions of Congress. Mainly, difficulties faded after the phrase written into the bill by Mr. McLeod that the stadium would be constructed in substantial accordance with the Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury report.

This called for lifting the \$6 million cost limit from the old law. Substituted was a variable price tag from \$7 to \$8 million, depending on how bonds sold and which design was adopted.

The United States Treasury backed the bond issue, under terms of the bill. Congressional fears that the stadium eventually would be a drain on the Treasury were allayed by a proviso that District Commissioners would budget money annually to make up the difference between bond payments and stadium receipts, if need be.

**LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY**

Commissioners were authorized by the bill to borrow from the Treasury if Congress refused the budget items. Loans would have to be repaid, with interest, by District taxpayers. So the bill made the stadium a clear local responsibility.

Representative HARRIS and cosponsor Senator BIBLE, Democrat of Nevada, blue-penciled from the drafted bill a promise that bonds would be tax free. That satisfied the Treasury, which otherwise would have objected to backing the issue even through loans.

To assure the land transfer, Mr. McLeod gained from Interior Secretary Seaton a pledge to lease the site to the Armory Board for a reasonable sum. "What is reasonable?" pressed Mr. McLeod. The Secretary said \$100.

The words "substantial accordance" also settled the site dispute, at least to the satisfaction of Congress. Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury called the grassy oval of land beside the Anacosta the most desirable site.

So the bill as passed does not bind sponsors to the tract. But the intent of Congress to place the stadium there is clear.

With this language, Representative HARRIS was able to block brickbats thrown at the stadium on the House floor by economy-minded Republican Representatives GROSS of Iowa and SCHENCK of Ohio.

Five typographical errors caught in the Senate sent the bill back to the House for final passage. There, House District Committee Chairman McMILLAN, Democrat of South Carolina, spent the afternoon on the floor with the bill in his coat pocket.

Thanks to his evening defense against Representative O'KONSKI, Republican of Wisconsin, stadium legislation went to the White House.

**Farley Is Back**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. WALTER M. MUMMA**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the following clipping appeared in the Lebanon Daily News, a prominent paper in my district. Its insertion was requested by

Congressman KROGH, of New York, in line with congressional courtesy to me. I am sure Mr. Farley is a nationwide character and his whereabouts interesting.

**FARLEY IS BACK**

At the 1940 Democratic convention Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, placed in nomination the name of James A. Farley. He had left a sick bed to do so, because he shared Farley's determination to oppose a third term.

Neither Glass nor Farley had any illusions as to the outcome. Mr. Roosevelt received 946 delegate-votes against Farley's 72. But the seed of protest against a third term bore fruit, eventually resulting in a constitutional amendment to forbid what, until then, had been an unwritten law.

That break with F. D. R. marked the end of Big Jim's open participation in politics. He resigned as Postmaster General and became first chairman of the board of the Coca Cola Export Corporation. He now is its president.

Now, presumably after "the pause that refreshes," the 70-year-old Farley (who has not held elective office since the one term he served in New York Assembly in 1923) has suddenly announced his candidacy for New York's United States senatorial nomination.

It was the biggest bit of totally unexpected political news in some time. It seems to have caught that State's Democratic bigwigs completely off guard.

If, after an 18-year absence from active politics, Jim Farley manages to capture the top spot on the State ticket, the comeback will be one for the books.

OTK

**H. R. 13247, National Defense Education Act of 1958**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by me to the Honorable Wilbur Young, State superintendent of the State of Indiana Department of Public Instruction, under date of July 28, 1958, in regard to H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958:

JULY 28, 1958.

Hon. WILBUR YOUNG,  
State Superintendent, Indiana  
Department of Public Instruction,  
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SUPERINTENDENT YOUNG: This letter is in response to your communication of July 21, in which you summarize the results of a study of mathematics and science education in Indiana schools in support of your opposition to the enactment of H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

As a Member of Congress representing the Eighth District of Indiana, I am deeply interested in the status of education in our State and throughout the Nation. In this time of peril for our Nation, during which it has become increasingly obvious that the quality of American education is a decisive factor in our struggle to preserve our freedom, I also feel that there is an urgent national interest in the kind and amount of education available to our young people. Therefore, I very much appreciate having

the information you forwarded and your views regarding H. R. 13247.

It is extremely gratifying to me that Indiana boys and girls are doing so well in mathematics and science and that Indiana schools provide such opportunities for academic achievement. The teachers of Indiana are obviously doing a good job, and we should all be thankful that we have these men and women who have dedicated themselves to the most important work of a democracy—the education of our youth.

I think that we can all agree, however, that we cannot be satisfied with the quality of education—in Indiana or in the Nation—until it is the very best that we can make it. After the most careful consideration of the facts available to me, including those presented in your study, I cannot agree that they prove that H. R. 13247 should not be enacted. On the contrary, I think that the great mass of reliable information on the needs and deficiencies of American education conclusively proves that this legislation is needed and that its enactment is vital to national security. It was on this basis that President Eisenhower requested enactment of legislation along these lines early this year. Recently the President has reemphasized his support of H. R. 13247, which in large measure would carry out his recommendations. Based upon my own review of the available facts, I agree with the President in this matter. I think you are entitled to know my reasons for taking this position.

First, your letter deals largely with scholarships. A Federal scholarship program is merely one feature of this legislation, and perhaps not the most important one. The bill would authorize Federal assistance to help and encourage the States to improve counseling and guidance services in the schools so that more of our able youngsters will be identified and properly encouraged to study the hard subjects in high school and prepare to continue their education in college.

Your own study demonstrates conclusively that, even in Indiana, youngsters are not making the most of their abilities in subjects of critical importance to themselves and to the Nation. On pages 3 and 4 of your study it is shown that, of the ninth grade students taking science and mathematics tests, 58 percent showed a knowledge of mathematics and 36 percent showed a knowledge of physical science above their grade level, and 61.6 percent and 50.7 percent were above the national norms respectively in mathematics and science. (If Indiana is only average, the least we could expect is that 50 percent of Indiana students be above the national average in these subjects—without even inquiring as to whether our national average attainment is high enough.)

Yet, on page 2, the study shows that among graduating seniors, only 11 percent had actually taken 4 years of mathematics, and that nearly 75 percent had not taken more than 2 years of mathematics. Worse, it shows that only 2 percent had actually taken 4 years of science, and that nearly 85 percent had taken no more than 2 years of science. Surely you will agree, as an educator, that these 3d and 4th year high school mathematics and science courses are essential to the well-rounded academic education of children who have ability to take them—and are absolutely necessary for a student who plans to take college courses in mathematics and science. Unfortunately, the situation nationally is about the same as in Indiana. United States Office of Education studies indicate that only 1 high school student out of 8 takes trigonometry or solid geometry. This might be contrasted with the Soviet Union where science and mathematics are required study for all secondary school students for each of the final 4 years of secondary schooling. I feel that

the assistance provided by the bill to help improve testing, counseling, and guidance services in our schools would help reverse this condition.

The bill would provide assistance to the States to provide the modern laboratory and instructional equipment needed by the schools to properly teach mathematics, science, and foreign languages. Your study did not deal with the needs of Indiana schools for such equipment, but the lack of modern equipment is generally recognized as one of the major problems of giving effective instruction in these vital subjects. For instance, in the field of foreign language instruction, the report of the House Committee on Education and Labor on this legislation (p. 10) reveals that only 60 high schools in this country have electronic laboratory equipment for drill in hearing and speaking the foreign languages offered.

H. R. 13247 would authorize the commissioner of education to contract with colleges and universities for the establishment and operation of foreign language institutes and foreign language and area studies centers in order to provide advanced training for elementary, high school, and college teachers of modern foreign languages and to provide training for individuals in extremely important languages which are not taught in the United States. I think the necessity for improving our understanding and command of languages is perfectly obvious. I agree with the President that this program will make a solid contribution to our national security and will help meet the growing needs for people with a knowledge of languages on the part of the Military Establishment, science, the diplomatic corps, business, and industry, and education. Did you know that over half of our American high schools offer no courses in a foreign language, and that less than 15 percent of our high school students study a foreign language? By contrast, 40 percent of the high school students in the Soviet Union are studying English. It seems to me that this bill will make it possible for a number of Indiana foreign language teachers to further develop their skills and knowledge to their benefit and to the benefit of their students. I would think that you would welcome such an opportunity for them.

The bill provides for Federal participation in the establishment of university loan funds in order that more deserving college students can be assisted in completing their education. These funds, which account for a large item (\$220 million over 4 years) of the cost of the whole bill, would be returned, with interest, to the Federal Government. Your study does not cover the need in Indiana colleges and universities for additional loan funds for deserving Indiana students, but the need for such assistance has been amply demonstrated in the reports of colleges and universities to the United States Office of Education in its study of institutional student financial aid.

Nor does your letter or study deal with the needs in Indiana, or nationally, for assistance in expanding graduate education in order to increase the number of qualified college and university teachers who, in turn, educate the scientists, doctors, teachers, economists, linguists, engineers, and other highly educated people required by a strong America. Yet the bill you ask me to oppose would provide such assistance to graduate students and, through them, to the institutions in which they are doing advanced work in their fields. There are only about 9,000 earned doctor of philosophy degrees awarded annually in the United States. Yet, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School estimated that only about 6,000 of the recipients of these degrees enter, or are engaged in, college teaching—whereas it is estimated that our colleges and universities will need a minimum of 15,000 new

faculty members each year during the next 12 to 15 years. Where are they to come from? One obvious answer is that a good many will not have completed the full education needed for teaching at the highest academic levels—as is often the case right now. In 1953-54, 40 percent of new college teachers had a doctoral degree; the figure today is 23 percent. You must be aware of the serious consequences of this trend for higher education. I feel that our needs in this respect are so serious—and the consequences to education so grave—that Federal assistance is required in the national interest.

The bill would also authorize the Commissioner of Education, through grants or contracts, to initiate the conduct of research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes. The House committee felt that such a program of research would hold a great promise of improved methods in education which could, in turn, be utilized by schools and colleges in Indiana and elsewhere in the Nation to great advantage.

Finally—and it represents only a part of this proposed legislation—I come back to the single relevant question which your letter and the study raises with respect to H. R. 13247, the need for scholarship assistance.

Nationally, a number of reliable studies have demonstrated that a substantial number of our most able boys and girls—those who have the potential ability to become scientists, or engineers, or teachers, or other badly needed professionals—do not go on to college. Some drop out even before completing high school. Part of the reason for this loss—a loss of abilities we cannot as a Nation afford—undoubtedly lies in inadequate procedures for identifying able youngsters and for properly motivating them by expert counseling and guidance. Another reason is the lack of financial ability to pursue a college education. Through whatever combination of reasons, most estimates are that about one-half of our high-school graduates in the top 30 percent of their class academically do not go on to college.

But I shall confine my observations to the results of the study conducted in our State which you believe demonstrates that Federal scholarships are not needed to enable Indiana boys and girls to go to college, or to stimulate more of them to prepare for college by taking the "hard" courses—such as trigonometry—in high school. Let us look at the facts.

Your first false assumption with respect to this study is that only those intending to study mathematics or science in college should get scholarships. The scholarship aid in H. R. 13247 would not be so restricted. Our national security needs include mathematicians and scientists and linguists but are much broader. We needed educated men and women in all fields. We need gifted economists, political analysts (and political leaders), historians, teachers in all fields, philosophers, and administrators. But your inquiry was directed only to the need for scholarships on the part of those students who wished to study mathematics or science.

Secondly, among those who were capable of pursuing college work successfully, only those scoring in an extremely high percentile were considered eligible.

Thirdly, if financial assistance was needed at all, it is difficult for me to understand how aid ranging as low as \$10 could be of much assistance.

The study, however, did not really answer the pertinent question; How many boys and girls in Indiana who graduate from high school with the ability and desire to successfully pursue a course of higher education are unable to do so because of financial inability?

Fortunately, we do have some reliable information on this question. A study of

60,000 high school juniors and seniors (representing a scientifically selected sample group) sponsored by the highly respected National Science Foundation and conducted by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N. J., led to the conclusion that higher education is still losing up to one-half of the top 30 percent or so of the Nation's high school seniors and that each year \* \* \* between 60,000 and 100,000 highly able secondary school graduates with aptitude and interest for college fail to continue their education for financial reasons. In 1957, according to a research brief issued by the research division of your department, 38,165 students graduated from the public high schools of Indiana (and we must keep in mind that the scholarships provided by this bill would also be available for qualified private school graduates). One-third of this group—at least—must have had the ability to do college work. That would mean over 12,700 in the top third of the group which graduated in 1957. If Indiana is typical of the Nation, a good working hypothesis is that one-half of those top-third students—or about 6,350 Indiana boys and girls of exceptional ability—did not go on to college for financial reasons.

Now, granted, a great many of the graduates who were not in the top-third group did go to college. But it is the loss of these most able youngsters which must be of great concern to Indiana and to the Nation.

Let's approach this question of need for Federal scholarship help from another angle—which apparently was not considered. How many able Indiana boys and girls drop out of school before the senior year in high school? How many of these, if they knew (perhaps through improved counseling and guidance which this bill you oppose would help provide) that it would be financially possible for them to go on to college, might finish high school? Your study doesn't attempt to answer such questions. However, your own department of public instruction, in a May 1954 research bulletin entitled "Holding Power of the Schools of Indiana," reveals that for every 100 Indiana boys and girls who started first grade in the years between 1937 and 1941 only 55 finished high school. And among the recommendations your department made to improve this situation was provide better counseling services. Don't you think that another aid might be to provide a greater assurance that an able child who worked hard in school would be able to go to college despite his lack of financial ability?

To conclude, I cannot agree that this limited study shows that Federal help is unnecessary. On the contrary, the facts point the other way. I think that the teachers, the students, and the parents of Indiana need all the help they can get to improve the quality of educational opportunity for Indiana young people. I believe that a careful reading of the bill, H. R. 13247, would reveal the genuine help it would give to schools all over the Nation. Therefore, I am enclosing a copy of the bill, a copy of the committee report which explains what the bill would provide and a copy of the President's letter of July 7 to Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT in support of H. R. 13247. I hope that when you have had a chance to study these public documents you may change your mind and ask me to support this progressive legislation which is needed by Indiana and the Nation.

In these days of guided missiles, satellites and other advanced weapons of war, the defense of our country is so dependent upon scientific research, and the training of our brainpower to carry on this work, that we cannot afford the luxury of arguing whether the local, county, State or National Government should perform this training function. The defense of America is primarily the duty

of the Federal Government, but in this instance, I believe all the agencies of Government should work together to see that the education and training of Americas leads that of all the world. Certainly there is no strife in Russia among the various agencies of its government as to which one will carry out this function. America cannot afford to fall behind in this field.

Sincerely yours,

WINFIELD K. DENTON,  
Member of Congress.

Address by the Korean Ambassador,  
Dr. You Chan Yang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Korean Ambassador to the United States, my good friend Dr. You Chan Yang, appeared before the assembled representatives to Girls Nation on the campus of the American University on July 30, 1958.

Girls Nation is an annual mock government sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary, and is the sequel to the Girls State in the various States.

This outstanding group of young women were moved and inspired by the remarks by Dr. Yang, and I want to insert them in the RECORD:

My young American friends, for the second consecutive year, I consider it a real privilege to be invited to address the Girls Nation. This year, as last year, I am grateful for the opportunity to chat with you charming young ladies for two reasons. First, I have long admired the tremendous good work done by both the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary in their Boys State and Girls State programs and their climaxes, the annual nations held here in Washington. I have long been of the belief that the Legion, through these programs, is providing the best practical exercise in American citizenship.

I am delighted to be here, secondly, because I can come to you as a father of a young lady of your own age. I know that my own daughter, Sheila, were she here, would thoroughly enjoy this program.

Beneath the veneer of slang and sophistication attributed to the youth of today, I believe that most American young ladies are gravely concerned about their own future and the future of their Nation, in these awesome, atomic times. The mere fact that you young ladies have gathered here in such a serious venture today illustrates that serious thinking is being done on all levels by the youth of the United States.

No one could have expressed more aptly the tenor of our times than did Charles Dickens, about a hundred years ago, in the opening lines of his great novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*. With the events in the Middle East reaching a crescendo and as we anticipate within the next 2 weeks the summit conference at the United Nations, the words of Dickens are as applicable today as they were a century ago:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us,

we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to heaven, we were all going direct the other way—in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only."

These are the worst of times, because it should be obvious to all that the Middle East crisis is a new variation of the proxy war tactics of the Soviet Union. Surely, there can be no doubt about who instigated the revolts in Lebanon and Iraq. About 2 months ago, I prepared a speech, which was delivered at Rockford, Ill., on June 13, in which I said in part: "I believe that it is far less than coincidental that riotings and bombings erupted in Lebanon just at a time when Nasser of Egypt was paying a courtesy call in Moscow." To a number of us here in Washington, the bloody sequence of events in the Middle East was not only clearly predictable but expected. The tragic frustrating part of it was that we could not seem to be able to awaken the free world so as to forestall the grim consequences. In a larger sense, the Middle East crisis has thus many of the earmarks of the Korean problem. It is, as President Eisenhower pointed out in his message to the people of the United States, the pretension of "civil" war. It is the pattern of the Communists seeking to subjugate by the indirect aggression of terrorism, assassination and bluff.

These are the worst of times also because many of us are apprehensive that the overall world pattern of Communist intent might not be clearly perceived. Also, we are concerned because we are apprehensive that the Communists may succeed in their strategy of talk and trickery until they are ready for an armed showdown. We are concerned that the free world's position might again be weakened as it was as a result of the Geneva Conference of 1954. Most important of all, we are gravely afraid that the United Nations itself might be further weakened in its effectiveness, should the Communists succeed in preventing valid expressions of opinions and important votings in that organization.

On the other hand, it is the best of all worlds because the American people awakened in time to the grave danger which confronted them. Also, the tremulous cries of those fearful of direct Soviet intervention in World War III have proved hollow. To the contrary, as President Syngman Rhee has often argued and as events in the Far East have proved again and again, when the Soviet Union is confronted with a show of strength, it backs down and seeks to appear to be reasonable. Think back a moment. In your wildest imagination, did you believe that even a month ago you expected Khrushchev to come to the United States? No. And while it is true that negotiations are still underway as to who will represent the Arab states, have you stopped to think that for the first time the Soviet Union is not insisting upon complete representation at a meeting by all of its phony satellite powers? Also, the crisis has had the effect of bringing the United States and Great Britain closer together in their views on the Middle East. Furthermore, the Security Council itself, including several nations not directly allied with the free world, voted 10 to 1 against the Soviet Union. The Soviet veto of the proposals to strengthen the United Nations force in the Middle East clearly revealed the bloodied Communist hand, and exposed the falseness of the Communist cry that they desire peace.

You know and I know that the Soviet Union and its puppets can have peace any time they want it. We should have learned the lesson, too, that the best chances for peace lie in the concerted actions of the free world to maintain pressure constantly against the Communist world.

One of the most important things we must

realize is that if the United Nations does not strengthen its authority, it may easily go the way of the old League of Nations. Let us take a specific case—the United Nations observer group in Lebanon. It was the weakness of the UNOGIL which led to the deteriorated situation in Lebanon and encouraged the events in Iraq. Now, I know that you have been given different reports as to the actual events in Lebanon and you have been given criticism of the American action. But from my own files, I want to reveal certain other things to you.

1. The UNOGIL patrols did not go outside the passable roads.
2. The UNOGIL patrols were confined to the daytime; yet the infiltration of men and securing of arms occurred at night.
3. The UNOGIL included only those areas adjacent to opposition-controlled areas, not Rebel-held territory.
4. The headquarters of the UNOGIL operations were located in a hotel in Beirut, from which nothing could be seen; in Zahleh, 40 kilometers from the border; and Salda, which is a coastal city. Needless to say these centers were absolutely useless.
5. The UNOGIL observers could not enter any opposition-controlled areas unless they first secured a pass directly from the Rebel leader himself.

6. When the observers were asked at the press conference about their attitude, if and when they should find many non-Lebanese among the Rebels, they answered: "We shall not try to verify that because we are not investigators."

It should be obvious that any United Nations Observer Group must have access to all danger areas anywhere in Lebanon, in the Middle East and in the world. It should likewise be obvious that if the United Nations cannot beef up those observation teams with an international police force, then the United States and its allies must be given the international authority to maintain world order.

The reason why, as a Korean, I may seem to intrude myself into the Middle East picture is simply because we have seen this very scenario played over and over again. Between 1945 and 1948, repeatedly, United Nations efforts to enter North Korea for the simple purpose of observation were thwarted. Again and again the Communist world has refused permission for the United Nations supervision of elections in North Korea. Originally, this pattern led to the division of my country and ultimately to the Korean war. Since the armistice agreement in 1953 it has prevented a genuine political settlement of the Korean question.

An almost identical pattern occurred in Indochina. The same tragic design exists in Germany. We would be foolish, indeed, if we closed our eyes to the obvious pattern in the Middle East.

I am concerned about these times of crisis; also because I am afraid that our preoccupation with the well-publicized events and our concentration on the summit meeting may prevent us from noting events of equally great significance that are and shall be taking place in the Far East.

For example, in one southeast Asian country a rebellion against Communist infiltration in the central government is being ruthlessly suppressed with the aid of actual military weapons and material provided by the Soviet Union. In the same area, the tiny country of Laos is now in critical danger of being subverted by the Red tide of aggression. In my own country, we have seen a rash of outright acts of piracy in the air. The Communists in North Korea have increased their pressures tenfold during the past year hoping to break the economic and political back of my government. This they have attempted to do by stepping up their slanderous attacks upon my President and our Government and by seeking to isolate us economically through the conclusion of

trade agreement with our nearest neighbor, Japan.

However, they have been unsuccessful. The recent election in the early part of May indicated that democracy is growing at a greater rate than ever before. We now have a flourishing two-party system. The incumbent Liberal Party won a majority of the votes in an election noted for its peaceful atmosphere and good self-regulation. Communist efforts to disrupt that election were completely thwarted.

On August 15, our government will be celebrating its 10th anniversary. This celebration will mark the first decade of the existence of the Republic of Korea. This is a good time for a summing up of our accomplishments and a preview of our hopes for the future.

When President Syngman Rhee was installed as the first President of our country on August 15, 1948, in Seoul, he was faced with the enormous task of trying to create a functioning government in a half of a country which had been liberated just 3 short years before from Japanese occupation and which was politically inexperienced and economically deficient.

What has he accomplished?

As I pointed out before, he worked for and is now achieving a genuine two-party democratic political system. I am amused by the Communist charge that our President is a dictator. If he is, he is the only one in the history of the world who has as his vice president the outspoken leader of the opposition party.

We have accomplished a number of notable political reforms, such as direct voting privileges for both men and women, the establishment of provincial councils, the encouragement of political participation by our women, and a gradual expansion of sound foreign relationship with our friends abroad.

In the economic field, although severed in two by artificial division, the Republic of Korea has achieved stability and is reaching more closely toward the goal of complete economic independence. Thanks to the wonderful aid provided principally by the United States and the United Nations, we have rehabilitated our textile industries, restored our rice production to better than prewar levels, and have laid the foundation for a vast industrial complex that shall fulfill our hydroelectric power and fertilizer needs. We have constructed a new flat glass plant at Incheon, rehabilitated the cotton and woolen textile mills in Seoul, Taegu, and Pusan, and have put our coal and tungsten mines on a well-paying, productive basis.

In the field of social welfare, we have constructed dozens of hospitals and clinics, instituted programs for physicians and nurses, and have made my countrymen the most literate nation in Asia.

Several months ago, when I was home for consultation, I had an opportunity to go about the country and see for myself the remarkable signs of progress. Gradually the scars of Communist aggression are being erased. Smoke is coming from factory chimneys. New housing developments are going up. My countrymen appear to be better clothed and better fed than ever before in my memory. During this past quarter, for the first time in a decade, the wholesale price indexes, instead of rising, actually declined. The money rates have remained stable now for the past 6 months, indicating that the dangerous problem of inflation is well on its way toward solution. If we can count upon continued American aid for the next year or two, and if the people in Washington will grant some of our specific requests for money for important new productive facilities, I feel sure that the time will come soon when Korea will no longer be a burden upon the American taxpayer. I hope that you will help us plead our case.

It has been said that the first year of marriage is always the hardest and the first 10

years of any new country are also the hardest. We have had more than our share of troubles, but I think the way in which we have solved our problems indicates the inherent stability of my country and the dedication of my people.

It was the great British historian, Toynbee, who has argued that the annals of history are largely written by a people being challenged; if they do not respond to the challenge they are obliterated, but if they do respond to the challenge they become a great nation. Our past dedication has been one of challenge and response.

Every day we constantly face new challenges. The greatest challenge right now is the possibility that our corner of the world, and particularly our country, will gradually slip back into the dimmer memories of our American friends. I want you to recognize along with us that there is a "clear and present danger" on the Korean peninsula. First, there is a dangerous military imbalance created by the Chinese Communists by bringing in planes, rebuilding airstrips, and replenishing men and supplies. As far as we are concerned, the Communists have so persistently and consistently violated the terms of the truce agreement that it does not in fact any longer exist.

The real danger in Korea is that the great American people, with all of their humanness and easygoing way of life, may forget the horror that took place in Korea. It is well to remind ourselves from time to time of the bitter flavor of the free world's defensive crusade in Korea.

If you young women of America really want it, this can be the age of wisdom, the epoch of belief, the season of light, and the spring of hope. To paraphrase Dickens, we do, indeed, have everything before us, providing we see the world facts as they really are, remain resolute, and harden ourselves against the Communist barrage of lies.

It would be my hope that when you return to your respective States, you take every opportunity to tell your young associates how critical are these times and how necessary it is for Americans everywhere to be concerned with world affairs. I hope you will tell them something of the Korean cause. I hope you will tell them something of the growing desire of all the free peoples of the world for peace and security, a strengthened United Nations, and a turning back of the Red tide of aggression.

While I am a doctor, I hope your final impression of me is not that of the Witch Doctor. I have tried to be simply a reporter, tell you not A Tale of Two Cities, but a tale of two worlds. Make no mistake about it: Should our world, the free world, be destroyed by the Communist world, there would never again be a Girls Nation; the liberty to enjoy whatever fads and strange music would die and, indeed, life as we enjoy it now would no longer be possible. I have great faith in the youth of America, because of their energy, their enthusiasm, and their wonderful articulateness. I hope that you will accept the challenge to join in the leadership to preserve the free world.

I thank you.

### Conditions in Poland

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 31, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a number of articles which have appeared during the past days in the New York Times.

The events in Poland have caused the greatest concern to all friends of the Polish people and to men of all faiths. The situation in Poland is most precarious, and I insert these articles in the interest of clarifying the picture.

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

[From the New York Times of July 29, 1958]

#### POLES KEEP CURB ON FARMS' SALES—REGIME DEFERS THE ABOLITION OF COMPULSORY DELIVERIES OF GRAIN AND POTATOES

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

WARSAW, July 28.—Poland's peasants were told by the Government today that they would have to continue compulsory deliveries of grain and potatoes to the state.

The decision to make deliveries compulsory for this year's harvest was taken by the Council of Ministers. It is important politically as well as economically.

After the political upheaval of 1956, when Wladyslaw Gomulka returned to power as first secretary of the Communist Party, the Government took several agricultural measures to win the confidence of the peasants. These included free sale of land, lower taxation, the breaking up of most of the collective farms and reduction of compulsory deliveries of grain at fixed prices.

The peasants also won the promise that compulsory deliveries at state prices—which are sometimes less than half of what the product would bring on the free market—would be terminated. Since 1956, compulsory delivery of milk has been abolished, compulsory deliveries of wheat have been cut by one-third and the state price of wheat has been raised.

#### REMINDER BY PEASANTS

But peasant leaders have urged the Government not to forget its promise to abolish compulsory deliveries. They said that the confidence of the farmers depended on keeping that promise.

The fact that the peasants have achieved a measure of economic confidence can be seen almost everywhere in the Polish countryside. The peasants are putting more of their money into farms, as new brick buildings, new barns, and new equipment show.

Today's announcement gave new price concessions to the farmers but made it clear that the Government felt it could not now afford to abolish the compulsory deliveries.

The Government explained its decision by pointing to Poland's poor balance sheet for grain. Last year the country had to import about 1,200,000 tons of grains. This year's floods will probably increase the food import bill and make Poland more dependent in shipments from the Soviet Union.

#### STATE PRICE OF RYE RAISED

The Government decision calls for compulsory delivery of 1,040,000 tons of grain, about the same amount as last year. But the Government has decided to raise the state price of rye by 25 percent, 150 zlotys for 200 pounds, or about \$6 at the official exchange rate. This increase is not likely to be welcomed wildly by the peasants, who can get almost twice as much for the rye they are allowed to sell on the free market.

The Government took other steps to sweeten its decision. Local councils in the mountain regions will be allowed to exempt farmers from compulsory deliveries of grain and potatoes to encourage them to step up stock breeding. Peasants hard hit by the floods also will get special relief. All told, these concessions will amount to 60,000 tons.

The price of potatoes was raised, too, and Trybuna Ludu, the Communist Party paper, made it clear that the promise of abolition

CPYRIGHT