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STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D., MONTANA)

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO THE FAR EAST

Mr. President: I hope that what I am about to say will be understood in the same spirit as in which it is intended. The President is scheduled to leave shortly for a visit to Japan and other nations of the Far East. This trip, as the Senate knows, was conceived at another time and in far different circumstances than those which prevail in the world today. It was planned in the light of the apparent easement of tensions at Camp David and as an extension of the President's goodwill tour to Russia.

I need hardly review in detail the shambles to which that original concept has been reduced by recent events. Yet some of the most significant factors in the present situation should be noted. In my opinion, they raise serious doubts as to the wisdom of this particular trip at this particular time. Our relations with Russia are now at a lower ebb than at any time since the Korean conflict. In Korea, one of the scheduled stops on the President's tour, a government has fallen by revolution and a new one is still in the throes of establishing a firm constitutional foundation. In Japan, consideration of the ratification of the new Japanese-American Security Treaty—particularly after the U-2 incident—has stimulated a governmental crisis, with the opposition party on the verge of resigning en masse from the Diet.

Most serious, over the past weekend General Malinovsky ordered the Soviet military establishment not only to shoot down intruding aircraft but to rocket-attack the airfields from which they fly. In response,
the Department of State has reaffirmed the intention of this nation to fulfill commitments to any allied nation around the periphery of the Soviet Union which may be subject to such attacks.

I wonder if the Senate is fully cognizant of the implications of the situation which has thus been created. I wonder if the President and the Executive Branch fully appreciate it. I wonder whether the American people fully grasp it. I wonder, indeed, whether the people of the Soviet Union and the rest of the world are fully aware of it.

If words mean what I think they mean these two announcements signify that the military confrontation is now direct and absolute. A single plane of any nationality which takes off from any nation allied to us and by accident, design, absent-mindedness, or whatever strays across the border of the Soviet Union--a single plane can set in motion the irrevocable chain reaction leading to catastrophic destruction.

I must ask whether or not these are circumstances in which the President should leave the United States. I must express the gravest reservations as to the wisdom of Mr. Eisenhower's departure on a goodwill tour at this time. Rather, I respectfully suggest that he consider going before a special session of the United Nations to call attention to the brink of war situation which now exists on the Soviet borders as a consequence of General Malinovsky's orders to his rocketeers and our inevitable response to those orders. It seems to me that the people of the Soviet Union no less than those of this or any other country have a vital interest
in facing in time this grave impasse and seeking the guidance of the
United Nations in alleviating this most ominous threat to peace.

I would only add these thoughts to what I have said: If the
President feels that, the changed situation notwithstanding, he must go
abroad at this time, that he clearly designate from his Cabinet a single
individual with full authority for the conduct of all aspects—military
no less than civilian—of our foreign relations which he may not be able
to handle while he is en route. And, further, if he goes abroad that he
seriously consider omitting Japan from his schedule. The Japanese-American
Security Treaty, which is now being considered in that country, is well
designed, in my opinion, to serve the interests of both peoples at this
moment in history. But its virtues aside, until the governmental crisis
which the ratification-process has engendered in the Diet subsides, I
believe that a goodwill visit by the President is in the interests of
neither the Japanese nor the people of this nation. It would indeed be
a tragedy if there is at this time a repetition in any fashion of the
experience of the Vice-President in Latin America a couple of years ago.

I need hardly add, Mr. President, that whatever decision the
President may make in these matters, he will speak for all of us. Never-
theless, I would have been remiss in my responsibilities as a United States
Senator if I did not express at this time, before the President’s departure,
my deep concern as to the wisdom and propriety of his tour to the Far East
and particularly to Japan in present international circumstances.
Mr. President:

The President is scheduled to leave shortly for a visit to Japan and other nations of the Far East. This trip, as the Senate knows, was conceived at another time and in far different circumstances than those which prevail in the world today. It was planned in the light of the apparent easement of tensions at Camp David and as an extension of the President's goodwill tour to Russia.

I need hardly review in detail the shambles to which that original concept has been reduced by recent events. Yet some of the most significant factors in the present situation should be noted. In my opinion, they raise serious doubts as to the wisdom of this particular trip at this particular time. Our relations with Russia are now at a lower ebb than at any time since the Korean conflict. In Korea, one of the scheduled stops on the President's tour, a government has fallen by revolution and a new one is still in the throes of establishing a firm constitutional foundation. In Japan, consideration of the ratification of the new Japanese-American Security Treaty--particularly after the U-2 incident--has stimulated a governmental crisis, with the opposition party on the verge of resigning in mass from the Diet.
Most serious, over the past weekend General Malinovsky ordered the Soviet military establishment not only to shoot down intruding aircraft but to rocket-attack the airfields from which they fly. In response, the Department of State has reaffirmed the intention of this nation to fulfill commitments to any allied nation around the periphery of the Soviet Union which may be subject to such attacks.

I wonder if the Senate is fully cognizant of the implications of the situation which has thus been created. I wonder if the President and the Executive Branch fully appreciate it. I wonder whether the American people fully grasp it. I wonder, indeed, whether the people of the Soviet Union and the rest of the world are fully aware of it.

If words mean what I think they mean these two announcements signify that the military confrontation is now direct and absolute. A single plane of any nationality which takes off from any nation allied to us and by accident, design, absent-mindedness, or whatever strays across the border of the Soviet Union—a single plane can set in motion the leading irrevocable chain reaction/to catastrophic destruction.

I must ask whether or not these are circumstances in which the President should leave the United States. I must express the gravest reservations as to the wisdom of Mr. Eisenhower's departure on a goodwill tour at this time. Rather, I respectfully suggest that he consider going before a special session of the United Nations to call attention to the brink of war situation which now exists on the Soviet borders as a consequence of General Malinovsky’s orders to his rocketeers and our inevitable
response to those orders. It seems to me that the people of the Soviet Union no less than those of this or any other country have a vital interest in facing in time this grave impasse and seeking the guidance of the United Nations in alleviating this most ominous threat to peace.

I would only add these thoughts to what I have said: If the President feels that, the changed situation notwithstanding, he must go abroad at this time, that he clearly designate from his Cabinet a single individual with full authority for the conduct of all aspects—military no less than civilian—of our foreign relations which he may not be able to handle while he is en route. And, further, if he goes abroad that he seriously consider omitting Japan from his schedule. The Japanese-American Security Treaty, which is now being considered in that country, is well designed, in my opinion, to serve the interests of both peoples at this moment in history. But its virtues aside, until the governmental crisis which the ratification-process has engendered in the Diet subsides, I believe that a goodwill visit by the President is in the interests of neither the Japanese nor the people of this nation. It would indeed be a tragedy if there is at this time a repetition in any fashion of the experience of the Vice-President in Latin America a couple of years ago.

I need hardly add, Mr. President, that whatever decision the President may make in these matters, he will speak for all of us. Nevertheless, I would have been remiss in my responsibilities as a United States Senator if I did not express at this time, before the President's departure, my deep concern as to the wisdom and propriety of his tour to the Far East and particularly to Japan in present international circumstances.
The bill (S. 2584) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had hoped that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Long] would be present, so that he could move to have the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report on the fishing vessels bill, which he had moved to reconsider. The Senator has just entered the Chamber. Does he desire to call up the conference report now?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not urging that the measure be called up for consideration. I am opposed to it. It will have to be called up by those who seek to have the report adopted.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON THE CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1477, S. 2584. The bill relates to construction differential subsidies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2584) to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations on the construction differential subsidy under such title, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1411) to amend the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 898).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4192) to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia of any minister of religion in connection with communications made by or to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the parties to such communications, and asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Abdnor, Mr. Dowdy, and Mr. Springer were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

FORTHCOMING VISIT OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO JAPAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, according to press dispatches today, I note that the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Russell] has voiced concern about the forthcoming trip by President Eisenhower to Japan, in view of the demonstrations there. The Senator from Mississippi said:

"It is his decision, of course, and will be made on the basis of all the facts. But the atmosphere of good will has clouded up and causes concern."

I, too, have been concerned about this matter, and I have been wondering in my own mind for the past 5 or 6 days whether or not I should give voice to that concern. I realize that the situation is both difficult and delicate at the present time, and that I think that in justice to the situation as it exists, and the potential involved, perhaps some comments are in order. I make these comments because I feel certain that other Senators, in their own minds, and in their unspoken thoughts, are likewise having some questions.

The President is scheduled to leave shortly for a visit to Japan and other nations in the Far East. This trip, as the Senate knows, was conceived at another time and in far different circumstances than those which prevail in the world today. It was planned in the light of the apparent easement of tensions at Camp David as an extension of the President's historic visit to Russia. We need hardly review in detail the shambles to which original concept has been reduced in recent events.

Yet some of the most significant facts in the present situation should be noted. Our relations with Russia are now at a low ebb at any time since the Korean War. In Korea, one of the scheduled stops on the President's tour, a government has fallen by revolution, and a government in the throes of establishing a firm constitutional foundation.

In Japan, the consideration of the ratification of the new Japanese-American security treaty, a treaty which, in my opinion, is well designed to serve the interests of both peoples at this moment in history—the consideration of the ratification of this treaty, particularly after the U-2 incident, has provoked demonstrations and strikes, and has stimulated a governmental crisis, with the opposition party on the verge of resigning en masse from the Diet.

Most serious, over a week ago Marshal Malinovsky, the Soviet military establishment not only to shoot down intruding aircraft, but to rocket attack the airfields from which they fly. This order has been reinforced by Mr. Khrushchev's press conference on Friday last, at which he stated that Marshal Malinovsky, the chief of the Soviet rocket forces, had been given authority to use nuclear warheads in striking at allied bases.

This implies that a nuclear war might be started by a minor Soviet official.

Incidentally, Mr. President, only the President of the United States can issue such an order in the country.

In response, the Department of State has reaffirmed the intention of this Nation to fulfill its obligations to all allied nations around the perimeter of the Soviet Union which may be subject to such attacks.

I wonder whether the Senate is fully cognizant of the implications of the situation which has thus been created. I wonder whether the Senate and the executive branch fully appreciate it. I wonder whether the American people fully grasp it. I wonder, indeed, whether the people of the Soviet Union and the people of the rest of the world are fully aware of it.

Devoid of meaning what I think they mean—although I pray that I am wrong—these two announcements signify that the military confrontation is now direct and challenging, and that a simple plane of any nationality which takes off from any nation allied to us, and which by accident, design, absent-mindedness, or for any other reason, strays across the border of the Soviet Union, can, perhaps, set in motion the irrevocable chain reaction leading to catastrophic destruction.

Mr. President, I need hardly add that whatever may be the decision of the President in this matter—and the decision is his—he will speak for all of us.

Nevertheless, I would be remiss in my responsibilities as a U.S. Senator if I did not express at this time, before the departure of the President, my deep concern over the situation as it is developing in the Far East.

So, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the valuable Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis]; and I also desire to express my concern, although certainly I do not wish to pass any judgment or give any advice at this time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Carlson in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In line with the Senator's statement, it would appear that if a completely unarmed plane which was on a peaceful mission strayed from its course, the Soviet officials would be in a position to start a nuclear war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding of the order issued by Marshal Malinovsky and the effect of the order issued by Mr. Khrushchev at his press conference of last Friday to Marshal Malinovsky, the chief of the Soviet rocket forces.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, like the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], I shall not state any decision I have reached in regard to this matter.

However, the Senator mentioned the President's contemplated trip to Japan; and the Senator's statement was brought about by the statement submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis].

I hold in my hand a letter which came to my office only today. The letter was written to me by an old friend of mine in Japan; for many years he has been both before the war and since the war. He has great influence in the business and economic life of Japan, and is well known to almost everyone.

In his letter, after apologizing for the delay in writing—of course he finds that as he grows older letterwriting becomes more difficult—he states:

"It is indeed a great pleasure to learn through your State Department's statement that your President, Mr. Eisenhower is coming to Japan in the near future. The ma-
jorty of our people is in a rapture of delight and gratitude; and it is the sincere desire throughout the country to welcome this distinguished national guest.

This letter has been translated from the Japanese, so some of the sentences are not quite coherent.

 Needless to say, the majority of our people who have good sense is in favor of the new Pact. It has become necessary to have the new Pact passed the House of Representatives, even though members of the New Party cannot bear him now and an anti-Kishi movement has started with a powerful support of our leading presses.

Under such circumstances I am of the opinion that your President’s visit at such time will cause very unpleasant feeling to him and in its turn, I am afraid, an anti-American thought may be prompted by it, and thus his visit may end in smoke. Such being my honest mental attitude at this moment, I earnestly request you to advice your President to postpone his visit until our Prime Minister Kishi will resign and a new Cabinet will be organized.

This sentiment poses the feeling of some solid citizens, and I have read the letter to the Senate for what it is worth.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON THE CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2584.

It is hereby ordered, that Senate bill 2584 now be ordered to the committee of the whole House on the state of the Union to be reported forthwith. The committee of the whole House on the state of the Union is instructed to report Senate bill 2584 in the form in which it was reported from the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 2584 comes from the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill was approved by the committee; only two of the three members of the committee voted against the bill at the time when it was reported by the committee.

Senate bill 2584 amends title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to authorize the Federal Maritime Board to make construction differential payments to American shipyards so that approved U.S. steamship companies can purchase new vessels at the estimated price, as determined by the Board, of building a similar vessel in a foreign shipyard. Under existing law the construction differential may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of the vessel. This bill would amend the existing law so as to raise the subsidy ceiling to 55 percent and applicable to construction contracts signed within 2 years from the date of enactment and applicable to foreign and domestic vessels 5 years from enactment.

This would have the effect, for this limited period of time, of placing both American and American shipyards in a position of their foreign competitors as long as foreign and domestic vessels prices remain at present levels.

Generally speaking, the purpose of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was to allow a construction differential subsidy to be paid to American ship operators. The subsidy was to be the difference between the cost of construction in foreign shipyards and the construction in American yards. Of course, the subsidy applies only to subsidized lines and those flying the American flag.

At the time when the Merchant Act was passed, the average difference between the cost of foreign and American yards ranged between 32 percent and 36 percent. At that time there has been a considerable increase in the difference in the cost of construction as between foreign and American yards. The present time, the difference probably amounts to between 48 percent and 52 percent.

The formula being used at the present time is based on the cost of construction of the vessels in the Netherlands, although the Maritime Board determines the average cost on the basis of the costs of construction in the shipyards of Great Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden, France, and other maritime nations.

The original act imposed a ceiling of 52 percent. In view of that ceiling, although some improvement may occur, with the result that the difference between foreign construction costs and the cost of construction in U.S. yards will decrease, the basis of the difference may increase. Thus it is necessary to provide protection for the subsidized American shipyards, in connection with the amount of construction necessary each year in order to maintain a modern fleet and to keep the American shipyards in operating condition.

It is feared that the difference between the cost of construction in the United States and the cost of construction in foreign yards may increase, although there has been some testimony by officials who believe that that situation will in time change.

But in the meantime we must take steps to enable our subsidized operators to proceed with their building programs. This measure is highly desirable in that connection. In the absence of the enactment of this measure, and if the difference were present ceiling, in some cases the American firms might decide not to build new ships or not to continue to participate in the trade.

In the committee there was some discussion in regard to the matter of maritime subsidies, as they apply to shipbuilding. Members of the committee and certain other Members of the Senate are opposed to any government funding of the maritime subsidies, or anything in toto. But that is a matter of policy.

The enactment of this bill is needed in order to deal properly with the existing situation, and in order to maintain our ship construction program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record excerpts from the committee report which give certain details in regard to this matter.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 1415) were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations on the construction differential subsidy under such title, which has been considered by the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill above, as amended, do pass."