

... could be met before conditions are
... for private capital. It is these
... standards we are trying to
... in Latin America by this amend-

President, in connection with that,
... a very little that we have thus far
... was pointed out by the very
... Senator from New Mexico.

I have here an article which appeared
... Miami Sunday News on April 28,
... written by an estimable columnist
... the name of Bill Baggs. He points
... some figures which I think would be
... appropriate to mention.

To begin with, the aid in 1956 cost us
\$1,200,000,000.

Here are some figures, the economic aid
totals in 1956 to countries in Asia:

South Korea, \$211 million.
South Vietnam, \$192,800,000.
India \$80,900,000.
Formosa, \$96,500,000.
Pakistan, \$86,300,000.
Iran \$40 million.
Laos, \$36,600,000.
Cambodia, \$26,200,000.
Thailand, \$24,800,000.
Turkey, \$86,900,000.
Spain, \$87,700,000.
Greece, \$45,700,000.
Yugoslavia, \$43,100,000.

And he states:

One could argue, and many have, that
these great amounts are justified in this
nervous world.

However * * * not yet has the writer
heard an argument of any merit that this
is a balanced aid program. For instance,
the members of the family, so to speak, are
the other 20 Republics in this hemisphere.
They have been regarded as not needing aid.
Indeed, they have not asked for it, but the
need is immense. Our own friends and
neighbors in this hemisphere need aid as
much as most of the places in Asia.

Yet, in 1956, typical of the aid which drib-
bled south, was:

Mexico, \$800,000.
Cuba, \$400,000.
Colombia, \$1,100,000.
Argentina, \$100,000.
Uruguay, \$200,000.
Venezuela, \$100,000.
Brazil, \$3 million.

He says:

This Sunday report is neither a plea for
an economic aid program nor a case against
one.

Rather, it is a suggestion that ours is an
unbalanced economic aid program, ignor-
ing our very best friends, the Latin Ameri-
cans, who have pleaded our cause in peace
and have helped to fight our battles in wars.
We have no better friends. But you can
find no suggestion of this friendship in the
economic aid program.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be
printed in the Record in full at this
point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Miami Sunday News of April 28,
1957]

TOO MUCH SCRATCH FOR TEX'S TICH?

(By Bill Baggs)

Lately Mr. Eisenhower has lost his immu-
nity to public criticism, and among his recent
blows none has been as hard as the one
inflicted by his economic aid program. Cer-
tainly you should be interested, if not fas-

inated by his economic aid program. You
are providing the scratch for this itch.

Readers frequently find from any arithme-
tic report. Possibly this is a lingering re-
bellion from school days. For whatever
reason, it is a fact, that there simply is no
other road available down which one may
travel to see the picture of the economic aid
program.

To begin with, the aid in 1956 cost us
\$1,200,000,000.

After prospecting through the national
budget of 1956, one finds that this money
was invested in the management of foreign
armies and air forces as well as foreign
economies.

One of the primary impressions of the
American is that a slab of this is handed
over to our British cousins. This is false.
Most of the foreign aid travels halfway
around the world to Asia.

Here are some figures, the economic aid
totals in 1956 to countries in Asia:

South Korea, \$211,000,000.
S. Vietnam, \$192,800,000.
India, \$80,900,000.
Formosa, \$96,500,000.
Pakistan, \$86,300,000.
Iran, \$40,000,000.
Laos, \$36,600,000.
Cambodia, \$26,200,000.
Thailand, \$24,800,000.
Turkey comes in for \$86,900,000, and in
Europe, the three largest receivers are:
Spain, \$87,700,000.
Greece, \$45,700,000.
Yugoslavia, \$43,100,000.

One could argue, and many have, that these
great amounts are justified in this nervous
world.

However, not yet has the writer heard an
argument of any merit that this is a balanced
aid program. For instance, the members of
the family, so to speak, are the other 20
Republics in this hemisphere. They have
been regarded as not needing aid. Indeed
they have not asked for it, but the need is
immense. Our own friends and neighbors in
this hemisphere need aid as much as most
of the places in Asia.

Yet, in 1956, typical of the aid which drib-
bled south, was:

Mexico, \$800,000.
Cuba, \$400,000.
Colombia, \$1,100,000.
Argentina, \$100,000.
Uruguay, \$200,000.
Venezuela, \$100,000.
Brazil, \$3,000,000.

This Sunday report is neither a plea for
an economic aid program nor a case against
one.

Rather, it is a suggestion that ours is an
unbalanced economic aid program, ignoring
our very best friends, the Latin Americans,
who have pleaded our cause in peace and
have helped to fight our battles in wars.
We have no better friends. But you can find
no suggestion of this friendship in the
economic aid program.

Mr. SMATHERS. Before long Foreign
Aid Appropriations will be coming be-
fore us. They need to be put into better
balance. Many of us, and justly so, are
in a mood to carefully examine the pro-
posed expenditures, and cut where not
fully justified. While I propose to op-
pose foreign aid in some instances, I am
convinced that the small amounts pre-
sently being provided for Latin America,
far from being in excess, barely fulfill the
minimum requirements of an effective
program for the Western Hemisphere.
I am equally convinced that the new ap-
proach to foreign aid developed in the
special fund for Latin America, which
we passed last year, is a significant and

worthwhile innovation. Here in the
Western Hemisphere, where interna-
tional cooperative procedures in eco-
nomic and political matters are being
tested, we have a real chance to make
freedom and prosperity a true bulwark
against communism. We can do this by
continuing the type of assistants which
I proposed last year and which the Con-
gress adopted for Latin America. It is
a program in which we can effectively
assist our neighbors to help themselves in
solving their difficulties. It is not a
foreign-aid program in perpetuity. I
am unalterably opposed to any such pro-
gram. It is a specific program, devel-
oped for limited purposes and a limited
time. It is a program designed to pro-
mote minimum standards which will at-
tract the investment of private capital.
It is a program with respect to which we
can see the end in sight. It is a program
that represents an investment by the
United States, the results of which will
be realized when these various Latin
American countries have achieved polit-
ical and economic stability.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will
the Senator yield for a brief observa-
tion?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to compli-
ment the Senator upon his fine address
and to commend him for his interest in
our South American neighbors. With
the existing situation in Europe, Asia,
and the Middle East, I believe that too
often these days we overlook programs
for the nations to the south.

The Senator has been a wonderful
friend of our South American neigh-
bors. He has done much to establish
better ties, and I think he has rendered
fine service in presenting his address to-
day and the program which he has sug-
gested today.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am very grateful
to the able senior Senator from Tennes-
see for his comments. I may add that
he himself has long evidenced a great
interest in the part of the world to the
south of the United States. I know that
the people in that area count him as
one of their good friends. I know that
when the amendment designed to facili-
tate the lending of money in Latin Amer-
ican countries comes before the Senate
the Senator from Tennessee will sup-
port it, as he did last year when that
subject was considered.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to associate
myself with the remarks of the Senator
from Florida and the Senator from Ten-
nessee. The project which the Senator
from Florida is promoting is very worth
while. He has been urging action along
this line for a long time, and I assure him
that I think the program is very impor-
tant. I shall do what I can to assist him
in promoting such a program.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from
Arkansas is a very influential member of
the Committee on Foreign Relations. In
the past he has evidenced a great inter-
est in the southern nations. With his
continued support, I believe we shall be

former. He was born on a farm near Butler, Mo., and except for a short time in his early years, spent all of his life farming in Bates County.

He knew his people well and he served them well.

As a Member of the 81st, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses, his was a respected and authoritative voice in the House of Representatives.

He had truly earned the tributes paid him when he was recognized as one of our truly great farmer-statesmen.

Along with respect for his knowledge and experience, all who knew him shared in admiration of his personal courage.

It was not only the courage to fight for what he believed in, but also the courage to serve his people in the face of a physical handicap that would have put lesser men on the sidelines.

A year ago GEORGE CH. ISCHER undertook an operation for the removal of a leg. Nevertheless, he remained an active Member of Congress, and last summer and fall waged a strenuous campaign for renomination and reelection.

No finer tribute to his courage and dedication could have been given than the overwhelming vote which he received last November—the greatest victory of his career.

Yes, Missouri and the country have lost a dedicated and courageous public servant.

And all of us in the Missouri delegation have lost a personal friend and a distinguished colleague.

His service to his district and to his country will be long remembered.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 6, Public Law 754, 81st Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. GEORGE P. MAYER, of California, as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 75, 84th Congress, as amended, the Speaker had appointed Mr. O'NEILL, of Massachusetts, as a member of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, on the part of the House.

PAN-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on repeated occasions I have taken the Senate floor to bring to the attention of the Congress the implications involved

by our failure to assume our just responsibilities toward our friends and neighbors to the south of us.

Latin America is an area beset with economic problems. Its people, looking to us to the north of them, cry out for leadership and guidance in their hour of turmoil.

They are a proud people. They are a people who seek no charity, and want none.

They are a people living in an area of unlimited natural resources and wealth, seeking nothing other than to be treated as equals in the councils of state.

Today, artificial barriers prevent a maximum degree of unity, cooperation and understanding—all of which must of necessity exist between us.

Herein lies the crux of the problem in our relations with our friends to the south.

Our failure up to the moment to assist effectively in removing these artificial barriers has inadvertently aided in providing a fertile field in which the seeds of the atheistic philosophy of communism can flourish—and the Communists in launching their economic offensive in the area wasted no time in seizing upon this unfortunate and needless situation.

Time is now running out, and the hour is at hand when flowery phrases professing friendship must be replaced by bold, forthright and courageous action.

We have two choices—either we must assist Latin America to solve its economic problems or else we must be prepared to suffer the consequences, and the consequences could be disastrous, not only to the Western Hemisphere but also to the entire free world.

The area has been crying out and still cries out for us, their friends, to furnish leadership. It is a role which rightly falls on our shoulders. It is a responsibility which we must assume and cannot shirk.

Unless we can furnish leadership in our own backyard, it is difficult to comprehend how we can be expected to carry out effectively our role of world leadership.

Last year I proposed a seven-point program designed to assist immeasurably in solving the economic problems of Latin America. This program is as follows:

First. We must adopt a long-range, workable, effective and stable trade policy between the United States and Latin America.

Second. There must be assurance that Latin America will receive a fair proportionate share of the development loan fund for effective economic assistance.

Third. There is a necessity to restore the Latin American special economic development assistance fund to assist in promoting health, education, and sanitation projects in the area.

Fourth. Is the institution of an adequate and effective student-exchange program.

Fifth. Is the creation of, and our participation in, an Inter-American Development Bank, long desired by the area.

I am happy to report the administration has now seen fit to accept at least that particular recommendation.

Sixth. Is the appointment of an Under Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs.

Seventh. Changes in our existing tax structure are needed to encourage a greater flow of private investment in the area.

Today I should like to add an additional point to this program, and that is the encouragement of the United States in bringing about the creation of a Pan American Parliamentary Association, whose membership would be comprised of legislators of the highest legislative bodies of all countries in the Western Hemisphere. Such a body could aid immeasurably in breaking down the artificial barriers founded on quicksand, which today are preventing a maximum degree of unity, cooperation and understanding in this hemisphere. It is a positive act which can be taken promptly, and one which, without doubt, would produce constructive results.

I am introducing today a resolution to express the sense of Congress that a Pan American Parliamentary Association should be established, and to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of such Association.

A similar resolution has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative ANFUSO, and I am hopeful that the Members of Congress will see the merits of this proposal and favorably act without hesitation on it.

The Department of State, I am informed, looks favorably on this proposal as do many of the Latin American countries, as a means by which the strained relations existing today, created solely by unfounded distrust, can be eradicated.

The destinies of the countries of this hemisphere are bound up in each other. That being so, we must move swiftly to effectively penetrate the obstacles which stand in the pathway toward prosperity and peace.

Unless we successfully accomplish these goals in this hemisphere, we cannot hope to successfully meet our responsibilities toward the free world. We must not fail.

Mr. President, I send the joint resolution to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) expressing the sense of Congress that a Pan-American Parliamentary Association should be established, and to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of such Association, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to comment on the remarks of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] with respect to Pan-American affairs. It has been my feeling for a long time—and perhaps I feel peculiarly this way because we have so

to Marjorie Carrion