

Cos 2,500 years ago has now passed on to this country. Hippocrates, I am sure, would agree, as the citizens of Cos do agree, that it is in strong and able hands."

Thank you, Ambassador Liatas. In the spring we will plant this tree on the beautiful grounds outside this building. May this tree and this library flourish together for a thousand years and more, and may the long future be as great as the splendid past.

You have all received as a memento of this occasion a facsimile copy of the first catalog of the library. Another important catalog was published by the library last week. It is *Early American Medical Imprints, 1668-1820*, by Robert B. Austin. This impressive catalog lists 2,100 books which might be described as the medical incunabula of this country. I commend it to your attention.

I am happy to announce that the 1775 first edition of John Jones' Plain concise practical remarks on the treatment of wounds and fractures has recently been presented to the library through the generosity of Dr. D. Rees Jensen of New York City. This is one of seven copies of this work known still to exist. To all the book collectors in this audience I may add the gentle hint that I hope this gift marks the beginning of a trend.

We have also received a very fine gift from Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, in the form of personal papers and correspondence with many people who have made significant contributions to medical history. Materials of this kind are an important adjunct to the library's collections, and surely this library

provides their most fitting and suitable home.

(Announcements and benediction.)

DEDICATION CEREMONIES, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1961, 3 P.M.—FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1961, 10 A.M.

PROGRAM

Thursday, December 14, 1961, 3 p.m.

Presiding: Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Chairman, Board of Regents.

Invocation: The Reverend William R. Andrew, Chaplain, Clinical Center, National Institutes of Health.

Address: The Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dedication Address: The Honorable LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator, Alabama.

Presentation: His Excellency Alexis S. Liatas, Ambassador of the Royal Greek Government.

Benediction: Maj. Gen. Frank A. Tobey, Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Army.

Music by the U.S. Army Band, commanded by Lt. Col. Hugh Curry.

Friday, December 25, 1961
10 a.m.

Presiding, Dr. Frank B. Rogers, Director, National Library of Medicine.

"The Military Tradition of the National Library of Medicine," Maj. Gen. Joseph H. McNinch, chief surgeon, U.S. Army, Europe.

"Medical Librarianship in the United States," Miss Gertrude L. Annan, president, Medical Library Association.

"The Building Arts in the Service of Librarianship," Dr. Carl W. Condit, professor

of humanities and English, Northwestern University.

"History, Science, and Librarianship," Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, president, American Association for the History of Medicine.

"Physicians and Books," Dr. William B. Bean, professor of medicine, University of Iowa.

"Three Who Made the Library":

J. S. Billings, Dr. Frank B. Rogers.

Robert Fletcher, Dr. Estelle Brodman, librarian, Washington University School of Medicine.

F. H. Garrison, Dr. Dorothy M. Schullian, curator of history of science collections, Cornell University.

BOARD OF REGENTS, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Dr. Norman Q. Brill, Los Angeles, Calif.
Dr. Harve J. Carlson, National Science Foundation.

Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Washington, D.C.
Lt. Gen. L. D. Heaton, U.S. Army.

Dr. Maynard K. Hine, Indianapolis, Ind.
Dr. Hugh H. Hussey, Jr., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Saul W. Jarcho, New York, N.Y.
Rear Adm. E. C. Kenney, U.S. Navy.

Mr. Thomas E. Keys, Rochester, Minn.
Dr. William S. Middleton, Veterans' Administration.

Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Library of Congress.

Maj. Gen. O. C. Niess, U.S. Air Force.
Dr. Robert M. Stecher, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dr. Luther L. Terry, Public Health Service.
Dr. William L. Valk, Kansas City, Kans.

Dr. Theodore R. Van Dellen, Chicago, Ill.
Dr. Warner L. Wells, Chapel Hill, N.C.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of us all, whose mercy is like the wideness of the sea, Thou art never far from any one of us; but, alas, often in our thoughts we are very far from Thee.

Take Thou the dimness of our souls away. May we be of the company of whom it can be said: "They looked unto Him and were radiant and their faces were not ashamed."

It is in Thy light that we become honest with ourselves. Before the bar of our conscience may we esteem faithfulness above the praise of our fellows.

Save us from the shirked responsibility, the easy falsehood, and the unfair retort. Arm us with the power to resist entrenched error, vested selfishness, and the attempt to smear others by unreasoning prejudice.

Across the debris of ancient wrongs may our glad eyes see the coming of the glory, as selfish exploitation in all the earth makes way for brotherhood and for man.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 23, 1962, was dispensed with.

—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 23, 1962,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore on January 24, 1962, signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 315)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 11th Annual Report of the

National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1962.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 10th semi-annual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1962.

REPORT RELATING TO RECENT LABOR DISPUTE IN MARITIME INDUSTRY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, I am

reporting to the Congress about the recent labor dispute in the maritime industry.

A strike took place at 12:01 a.m., June 16, 1961. Although only the ships in port and the employees on such ships were immediately affected, the dispute involved virtually all American shipping companies, some 70,000 employees and about 900 ships, and affected the trade and commerce of every Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf port in the United States.

On June 26, by Executive Order 10949, I established a Board of Inquiry, consisting of the Honorable David Cole, Chairman, Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, and Prof. James J. Healy, to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and report to me on or before June 30, in accordance with the provisions of section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended. I subsequently extended the time for the submission of the initial report of the Board of Inquiry to July 3.

That report concisely presented the facts with respect to the dispute and the positions of the parties as required by law.

On July 3, acting on my instruction, the Attorney General filed a petition in the District Court for the Southern District of New York seeking an injunction against the continuance of the strike. A hearing was held on the Government's motion for a temporary restraining order on July 3, and the court, after finding that the strike affected a substantial portion of the maritime industry, and that it would imperil the national health and safety if permitted to continue, temporarily restrained the strike activities until July 8. A stay of that order sought immediately by the unions was denied by Circuit Judge Clark. (*United States v. National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, et al.*, 292 F. 2d 190, CA 2, July 8, 1961.)

A hearing was held on the Government's motion for a preliminary injunction on July 7, and the temporary restraining order was extended until July 12. Two days before this order was to expire, the court found that it had been "abundantly and overwhelmingly established" that the strike was affecting a substantial portion of the industry, and if permitted to continue would imperil the national health and safety. In addition, it rejected the contention of the National Maritime Engineers' Beneficial Association and the International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots that, because their membership consists of "supervisors," their participation in the strike could not be enjoined. (*United States v. National Maritime Union of America, et al.*, 196 F. Supp. 374, S.D. N.Y., July 10, 1961.)

The unions appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, which, in an opinion issued August 22d, affirmed the lower court's decision. (*United States v. National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, et al.*, 294 F. 2d 385 CA 2.)

Pursuant to section 209(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, I reconvened the Board of Inquiry. The Board held meetings with the parties and obtained the information required for its further re-

port of the current position of the parties and the efforts which had been made for settlement, including a statement by each party of its position and a statement of the employer's last offer of settlement. This final report of the Board of Inquiry was submitted to me September 1.

On September 25, the Attorney General moved the district court to discharge the injunction, which motion the court that day granted effective September 21.

I am happy to report that settlements were reached by all parties to the dispute.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1962.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. CHENOWETH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

METRO HOLOVACHKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to yield at this time to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for the presentation of a matter which I have discussed with the distinguished acting minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration. The resolution would authorize a former member of the staff of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field to testify in a criminal case pending before the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, which grew out of an investigation by the select committee.

As you know, Mr. President, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 255, section 5, 86th Congress, the files of the select committee. The files contain certain evidence relating to Metro Holovachka, former prosecuting attorney of Lake County,

Ind., who has been charged with Federal income tax evasion. Holovachka's trial is scheduled to commence January 29, 1962.

The U.S. Department of Justice has advised that the testimony of Mr. Richard G. Sinclair, formerly a member of the staff of the select committee, will be required at the coming trial. Furthermore, certain evidence contained in the former select committee files will be needed.

The resolution which I am submitting would authorize former select committee staff member Sinclair to testify in the trial and to present certain evidence from the files of the select committee.

Mr. President, I may also state that I have consulted the leadership of both the majority and the minority; and, so far as I know, there is no objection to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 274) was read and, without objection, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 255, section 5, 86th Congress, certain evidence pertaining to an investigation dealing with Metro Holovachka, which investigation was conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field under Senate Resolution 44, 86th Congress; and

Whereas criminal action is pending in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana against said Metro Holovachka, charging income tax evasion; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Justice has advised that a criminal trial in the aforementioned matter is scheduled to commence January 29, 1962, in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Justice has advised that at said criminal trial there will be required the introduction of certain evidence in the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, as well as the testimony of Richard G. Sinclair, formerly an investigator for the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and presently an investigator for the Special Federal-Aid Highway Program Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, to appear and testify in the above proceedings; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate no Member or Senate employee is authorized to produce Senate documents but by order of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations is granted leave to permit the copying and presentation of certain evidence for examination in connection with the aforementioned court case, the evidence thereupon to be returned to the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations; and be it further

Resolved, That Richard G. Sinclair, former staff member of the said select committee, is authorized to appear and testify in the above-mentioned proceedings.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements

in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight training program, for the period January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, on Federal contributions, for the quarter ended September 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 7608 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO AU- THORITY OF INTERNAL REVENUE ENFORCE- MENT OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7608 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to authority of internal revenue enforcement officers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON BALANCES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES ACQUIRED WITHOUT PAYMENT OF DOLLARS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a semi-annual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING SECRETARIES FOR GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam and section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, to provide for appointment of Acting Secretaries for such territories under certain conditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON REFUGEES UNDER DISPLACED PERSONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, reporting, pursuant to law, on refugees under the displaced persons program, for the period July 1, 1961, through December 31, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Government Printing Office, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, for the fiscal

year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to limit contributions to United Nations by the United States in proportion to its pro rata share based upon population, and to prohibit the United States from making any further loans by participating in the issuance or buying of any bonds issued by the United Nations

"Whereas from information deemed reliable, the expenditures of the United Nations from its beginning through the year 1960 totals approximately \$3 billion, of which the United States contributed more than 47 percent; and

"Whereas on this date there are 104 members of the United Nations with a combined population of approximately 2 billion people, of which the United States has 180 million or approximately 9 percent of the total; and

"Whereas each member nation has one vote (except Russia which has three), which gives the United States only ninety-six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the votes in the United Nations, yet it is paying approximately 47 percent of the total expense, which is ridiculous out of all reasonable and equitable proportion on the basis of wealth or population; and

"Whereas for the Congress to permit the United States to be further burdened with such a disproportionate share of such expense is unfair, unreasonable, and inexcusable: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby urged to—

"Limit the contributions of the United States to the United Nations to an amount equal to its pro rata share of the expense based on the ratio which its population bears to the total population of the members of the United Nations; and

"That it prohibit the United States from participating in the issuance or the buying of any bonds to be issued by the United Nations; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Mississippi delegation in Congress, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, January 9, 1962.

"WALTER SILLERS,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate January 15, 1962.

"PAUL B. JOHNSON,

"President of the Senate."

RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the Legislature of American Samoa, be printed in the RECORD.

This statement pertains to the resolution adopted by the United Nations,

relating to the "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."

I believe that the position taken by the representatives of the people of American Samoa is particularly significant, in view of the interest in this subject.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C. January 22, 1962.
Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Enclosed for your information are copies of a resolution setting forth the views of the Legislature of American Samoa with respect to the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1514, a "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."

The legislature's resolution was adopted on December 6, 1961, and we believe you will be interested in the vote by which it was approved. In the senate there were 14 affirmative votes, none negative, and 1 member was absent. In the house of representatives there were 15 affirmative votes, none negative, and 2 members were absent.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10

Joint resolution regarding the declaration of the United Nations General Assembly regarding independence for colonial countries

Be it resolved by the Legislature of American Samoa, That it has carefully considered the declaration dated December 14, 1960, by the United Nations General Assembly regarding the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and

Declares that—

1. The action in 1900 by the chiefs of Tutuila and Aunu'u, and in 1904 by King Tulimanu's and chiefs of Manu'a ceding jurisdiction over American Samoa to the United States of America was freely taken and represented the will of the people. We do not regard ourselves as a people subject to alien domination or exploitation.

2. There is no denial of freedom to the people of American Samoa which constitutes a serious threat to world peace.

3. There are no armed actions or repressive measures in American Samoa.

4. The people of American Samoa value their American nationality and do not desire to take any action that would weaken the relationship of the territory to the United States of America. If there is any doubt about the subject, the legislature would be glad to arrange, upon proper request, for a general plebiscite at which a representative of the United Nations would be welcome as an observer.

RAPI SOTOA,

President of the Senate.

MUAGUTITIA F. TUIA,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 234. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to investigate matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies (Rept. No. 1127);

S. Res. 238. Resolution extending time for filing a report by the Special Committee on Aging (Rept. No. 1128);

S. Res. 242. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction and authorizing certain expenditures therefor (Rept. No. 1129);

S. Res. 243. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make a study of certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1130);

S. Res. 244. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing (Rept. No. 1131);

S. Res. 245. Resolution to print additional copies of hearings entitled "Relationship Between Teamsters Union and Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers" (Rept. No. 1150);

S. Res. 246. Resolution to authorize a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy (Rept. No. 1132);

S. Res. 247. Resolution to provide assistance to Members of the Senate in connection with interparliamentary activities and reception of foreign officials (Rept. No. 1133);

S. Res. 248. Resolution to print additional copies of Senate Document 59 of 87th Congress on "The Communist Party Line" (Rept. No. 1151);

S. Res. 249. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Small Business (Rept. No. 1134);

S. Res. 250. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government (Rept. No. 1135);

S. Res. 252. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ temporarily an additional assistant chief clerk and additional staff and clerical personnel (Rept. No. 1136);

S. Res. 256. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure (Rept. No. 1137);

S. Res. 257. Resolution to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 1138);

S. Res. 258. Resolution to investigate anti-trust and monopoly laws of the United States (Rept. No. 1139);

S. Res. 259. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments (Rept. No. 1140);

S. Res. 260. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 1141);

S. Res. 261. Resolution to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations (Rept. No. 1142);

S. Res. 262. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system (Rept. No. 1143);

S. Res. 263. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 1144);

S. Res. 264. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (Rept. No. 1145);

S. Res. 265. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 1146);

S. Res. 266. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 1147);

S. Res. 267. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office (Rept. No. 1148); and

S. Res. 270. Resolution to authorize a study by Committee on Armed Services on various areas of national defense (Rept. No. 1149).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 233. Resolution to investigate, and make expenditures in connection with, certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1152).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 269. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct a national fuels and energy study (Rept. No. 1153).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 512. A bill to extend the time for completion of the free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada (Rept. No. 1155).

HAZEL T. CLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 277) to pay a gratuity to Hazel T. Clem; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Hazel T. Clem, widow of T. Briley Clem, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eight months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

VONDA P. BERGMAN

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 278) to pay a gratuity to Vonda P. Bergman, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Vonda P. Bergman, widow of Harold Bergman, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to nine and one-half months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELMO W. KEEL

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 279) to pay a gratuity to Elmo W. Keel, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elmo W. Keel, widow of Jessie L. Keel, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to eight and one-half months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EDNA V. McLEOD

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 280) to pay a gratuity to Edna V. McLeod, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Edna V. McLeod, widow of Scott McLeod, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at

the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ALSON J. SMITH

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 281) to pay a gratuity to Alson J. Smith, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Alson J. Smith, widower of Mattie M. Smith, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to nine and one-half months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

THOMAS R. MASSEY

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 282) to pay a gratuity to Thomas R. Massey, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Thomas R. Massey, brother of James T. Massey, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELIZABETH J. HEFNER

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 283) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth J. Hefner, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth J. Hefner, widow of Wilson C. Hefner, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GERTRUDE S. FAUCETTE

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 284) to pay a gratuity to Gertrude S. Faucette, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Gertrude S. Faucette, widow of Andrew McC. Faucette, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ISOM HENDERSON AND PRUDENCE HENDERSON

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported

an original resolution (S. Res. 285) to pay a gratuity to Isom Henderson and Prudence Henderson, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Isom Henderson, father, and Prudence Henderson, mother of William W. Henderson, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO MAKE EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOY TEMPORARY PERSONNEL

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 286) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel (Rept. No. 1154); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
- (2) corrupt practices;
- (3) contested elections;
- (4) credentials and qualifications;
- (5) Federal elections generally; and
- (6) Presidential succession.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. President, from the Senate Committee on Govern-

ment Operations I report an original resolution to continue its authority for the study of "Inter-Agency Coordination, Economy, and Efficiency."

The committee approved the resolution unanimously on January 16. The resolution is identical to Senate Resolution 26, 87th Congress—except, of course, as to the date for the study. It provides the same amount of funds—\$90,000—as was approved under Senate Resolution 26 and Senate Resolution 205 in the first session.

Under the previous study, we have achieved important results for the American taxpayer. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations which has conducted the study, I am today summarizing these achievements in a memorandum to the Committee on Rules.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the Record and that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 276) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:
S. 2740. A bill to provide for the detention of certain mail matter determined to be Communist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2741. A bill to provide for the care and custody of dangerously insane persons acquitted of offenses against the United States solely by reason of insanity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2742. A bill to designate the lake formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia, as Lake Eufaula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2743. A bill for the relief of Molly Kwauk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2744. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 2745. A bill for the relief of Richard Shao-lin Lee and his wife, Grace Fu-hwa Tang Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2746. A bill for the relief of the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 2747. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2748. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain lands by the U.S. Government that have been flooded by the Ableman Dam and Whitewater Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2749. A bill to provide that diplomatic privileges and immunities shall not be granted within the territory of the United States to nationals of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 2750. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE IN TRIAL OF METRO HOLOVACHKA

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 274) relative to the presentation of evidence in the trial of Metro Holovachka in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under a separate heading.)

JOINT HEARINGS ON CIVIL DEFENSE SHELTER PROPOSALS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, and Senators SPARKMAN, PROXMIRE, BENNETT,

DOUGLAS, CLARK, TOWER, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and LONG of Missouri) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 275) providing for joint hearings by the Committees on Banking and Currency and Armed Services on civil defense shelter proposals, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 276) to provide additional funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

HAZEL T. CLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 277) to pay a gratuity to Hazel T. Clem, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

VONDA P. BERGMAN

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 278) to pay a gratuity to Vonda P. Bergman, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ELMO W. KEEL

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 279) to pay a gratuity to Elmo W. Keel, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

EDNA V. McLEOD

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 280) to pay a gratuity to Edna V. McLeod, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ALSON J. SMITH

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 281) to pay a gratuity to Alson J. Smith, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

THOMAS R. MASSEY

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 282) to pay a gratuity to Thomas R. Massey, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ELIZABETH J. HEFNER

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 283) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth J. Hefner, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

GERTRUDE S. FAUCETTE

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 284) to pay a gratuity to Gertrude S. Faucette.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ISOM HENDERSON AND PRUDENCE HENDERSON

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 285) to pay a gratuity to Isom Henderson and Prudence Henderson.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO MAKE EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOY TEMPORARY PERSONNEL

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 286) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel; which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

DETENTION OF CERTAIN MAIL MATTER DETERMINED TO BE COMMUNIST POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to deny unrestricted entry into the United States of mail which the Postmaster General determines to be Communist political propaganda.

This legislation is needed to counteract the unfortunate effects of an Executive order, issued on March 17, 1961, in which the President ordered immediate discontinuation of a program, carried on under both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, to intercept Communist propaganda from abroad.

The White House, undoubtedly acting upon the advice of the Department of State, said the program was being discontinued to help "improve cultural exchanges with Communist countries."

It is difficult to understand how subjecting the American people to a continual barrage of unsolicited and unwanted Communist propaganda can improve our relations with the Communist conspiracy, which has sworn to overthrow our free institutions. If the United States were free to disseminate information concerning our free society behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, I am confident that it would be welcomed by those receiving it. However, the Soviet Union and Red China prevent their people from knowing the truth about America.

Until the Communist dictators agree to a truly reciprocal free exchange of information, it is foolish to allow our mails to be burdened with an unrestricted flood of Communist propaganda.

Would we allow an enemy free access to our mails in any hot war? If not, how can the administration justify the granting of such a privilege to avowed enemies in a cold war situation?

This bill would permit the mail in question to be received by individuals who request delivery, and provides for unrestricted delivery to libraries, colleges, universities, and Government agencies where such material is used for scholarly studies and analysis. I hope the bill will receive the prompt attention of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2740) to provide for the detention of certain mail matter determined to be Communist political propaganda, introduced by Mr. Bush, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2744) to amend the Natural Gas Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to a recent request from your staff, there is enclosed herewith a draft bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. The amendments contained in this bill are intended to carry out a portion of the Commission's legislative recommendations set forth in its 41st Annual Report (1961), pages 2-5.

As indicated on the opening page of that report, the present members of the Commission have only recently taken office. Nonetheless, we have carefully reviewed existing statutory provisions in order to determine what tools we need in order to achieve essential regulatory objectives. We have attempted to identify gaps in our authority which we believe handicap us in doing our work. We recognize that regulation of electricity and gas—two of our primary sources of energy—must take account of many competing considerations and strike a fair balance among them. But we also stress that performance of an effective job calls for clear and comprehensive authority in the relevant areas of responsibility.

In view of our unique position as a completely new group, we believe it advisable to submit new drafts of bills to replace the bills which were introduced during the first session of the 87th Congress. Accordingly, unless otherwise noted below, we request that these drafts be introduced as substitutes for the following bills now pending before the Congress: Senate bills S. 1592 through S. 1604 and S. 1606 through S. 1609; House bills H.R. 6948 through H.R. 6955 and H.R. 6957 through H.R. 6965. No new draft is submitted to replace S. 1605 and H.R. 6956 relating to internal delegation of Commission authority. We favor this proposal and believe that the pending bills are entirely satisfactory.¹

Our reasons for urging enactment of the various amendments submitted to you are set forth below in brief. We discuss suggested statutory changes in the order that we followed in summarizing our legislative proposals in the Commission's annual report, transmitted to the Congress on January 10, 1962. Since many of the proposals are interrelated, the sequence has been adopted for reasons of convenience, rather than to indicate priority.

I

1. Natural Gas Act—sales for resale for industrial use only: Amend section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act so that the Commission will have full authority to suspend all rate schedules subject to its jurisdiction, including those covering sales by interstate pipeline companies of natural gas for resale for industrial use only. Section 4 of the draft would enact this proposal by repealing the proviso in section 4(e) of the act,

¹ It should be noted here that S. 1595, S. 1606, and S. 1607 passed the Senate on August 14, 1961. Each of these bills would enact items of our present program and are discussed below. Although the language of each is included in the drafts now being submitted their passage by the House, as separate bills, would serve the same purpose insofar as the subject matter of those bills is concerned.

which reads: "Provided, That the Commission shall not have authority to suspend the rate, charge, classification or service for the sale of natural gas for resale for industrial use only." The Commission has consistently favored proposals to remove the proviso. The lack of power to suspend new rate schedules for these sales means that we cannot take timely action to protect those affected by rates which may be unreasonable, unduly preferential or discriminatory. The rates not having been suspended, the decision of the Commission, upon completion of a hearing directed to their reasonableness, can have only prospective effect. If the Commission had the power to suspend these rates on industrial gas (as it does in the case of other types of rates), it would be in a position to direct appropriate adjustments covering the period between the filing of the rates and the disposition of the rate proceeding. We note that a proposal to delete the above-quoted proviso clause appeared in S. 1595, 87th Congress, which passed the Senate on August 14, 1961.

2. Natural Gas Act—direct sales for industrial use: Amend section 1(b) of the act so as to vest jurisdiction in the Commission over direct sales in interstate commerce of natural gas for industrial use. Technical amendments to sections 1(c) and 2(6) of the act are also necessary to effectuate the proposal. The amendments are contained in sections 1(a), 1(b), and 2(a) of the draft bill.

We believe that such an extension of the Commission's authority is desirable for several reasons:

(a) It would enable the Commission to prevent undue discrimination, prejudice, and preference.

(b) It would simplify and expedite rate-making procedures (by doing away with the necessity of allocating costs of service between the jurisdictional and nonjurisdictional sales in question).

(c) It would eliminate the incentive to make unregulated sales—an incentive which frequently results in a diversion of gas to inferior uses. It is no answer that direct sales may be constitutionally subject to regulation by the States. Apart from the fact that the States do not generally exercise such authority, it seems plain that fully effective regulation of the rates and distribution of interstate gas cannot be achieved under a system of divided authority which separates direct and wholesale sales.

3. Natural Gas Act—extension of rate suspension period: Amend section 4(e) of the act to authorize the Commission, in its discretion, to extend the period of suspension of a proposed change in a currently effective rate schedule for a further period, not exceeding 6 months, beyond the period for which it was originally suspended under the existing provision of the section, i.e., not longer than 5 months. Section 4 of the draft bill would enact the proposal.

We believe that this amendment, coupled with an existing regulation which prohibits the filing (except with special permission of the Commission) of a change in any rate schedule during the period in which such schedule is under suspension, will alleviate the administrative and economic problems caused by the pyramiding of successive rate filings. If the maximum suspension were extended to 11 months, the Commission would be in a far better position to make rate determinations in major cases in advance of the effective date of the rate change. This would reduce the large amount of proposed increases being collected subject to refund—a situation which may be injurious to seller and buyer alike when large sums are involved—and, by the same token, relieve the ultimate consumer of the necessity of making payments at a rate which may later be determined to be excessive.

The power to suspend is, of course, discretionary and the Commission does not believe that it should be automatically invoked. Moreover, the Commission may permit a portion of an increase to go into effect by inviting the filing of a substitute schedule which provides for rates at a level acceptable to the Commission, coupled with a second rate schedule providing for the balance of the increase, which would be suspended.

Several bills now pending in Congress² and the hearings held before a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee during 1961 reflect the need for expedition of rate proceedings. The Commission is making major efforts to reduce its backlog and to adopt approaches which will make the burdens of rate regulation manageable. For some cases, however, a 5 months' suspension period is unrealistically short.

4. Natural Gas Act—notice and opportunity for hearing in section 7(c): Amend section 7(c) of the act to eliminate the mandatory hearing requirement, substituting in lieu thereof a requirement for due notice and opportunity for hearing. Subsection 5(b) of the draft bill would enact this recommendation.

The requirement for formal hearing in every certificate case has been found unnecessary and tends to cause delay. A hearing would be held when protests raising a substantial issue are received or when the Commission deems a hearing necessary in the public interest. The provision for notice and opportunity for hearing protects the interest of possible protestants in every case.

5. Natural Gas Act—compulsory and emergency interconnections: Amend section 7 of the act to give the Commission authority (a) to require an interstate natural gas pipeline company to construct and operate reasonable extensions or improvements of its pipeline facilities, to establish physical connection of its facilities with the facilities of one or more other persons engaged in the interstate pipeline transportation or sale of natural gas, and to sell or exchange natural gas with such other persons when, after notice and opportunity for hearing, the Commission finds such action necessary or appropriate in the public interest and that such extension, improvement, establishment of physical connection, sale or exchange of natural gas will not place an undue burden on the interstate natural gas pipeline company, require the enlargement or undue extension of its mainline transportation facilities, or impair its ability to render adequate service to its customers; and (b), in cases of emergency, either upon its own motion or complaint, with or without notice or hearing, to require such temporary connections of facilities, and such sale, delivery, exchange, transportation, or allocation of available supplies of natural gas among natural gas pipeline companies as will best meet the emergency and serve the public interest. The new subsection 7(i) here proposed is set out in section 5(c) of the draft bill.

The Commission now has limited authority under section 7(a) of the act to direct a natural gas company to interconnect with and sell gas to a local distributing company. We believe that the authority should be broadened as proposed. Interconnections of pipeline systems, like those of electric power pools, can greatly assist in the distribution of available supplies to the points where they are most needed. The restrictions on Commission action written into the draft will amply protect the interests of the pipeline companies, while the basic authority to order interconnections in the public interest, similar in substance to section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act (as we propose that

² S. 666, S. 1946, H.R. 2757, H.R. 7575.

it be amended), will enable the Commission to take account of consumer needs throughout the Nation. Paragraph (2) of the proposed new subsection relates to emergency situations. Like section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act, it will enable the Commission to order interconnections, without hearing, to assure a continuous flow of gas during a period of disaster or emergency.

6. Natural Gas Act—notice and opportunity for hearing and abandonment of service: Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act should be amended to eliminate the mandatory requirements for hearing, substituting in lieu thereof a requirement for due notice and opportunity for hearing. We would also amend the section to make clear that it applies to sale and service as well as to abandonment of facilities. Section 5(a) of the draft accomplishes these purposes.

As with applications under section 7(c) of the act, there are many cases in which neither the interest of the parties nor the public welfare requires that a hearing be held.

The reason for the recommended change with respect to the applicability of the section is this: Under the present wording, it is often claimed that Commission approval is not required because no abandonment of jurisdictional facilities is involved. A crucial regulatory consideration, however, is whether there will be a change in sales, transportation, or service within the scope of Federal jurisdiction. The proposed amendment will remove any ambiguity as to the scope of the prohibition against unauthorized abandonment.

7. Natural Gas Act—safety regulations: Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act should be amended by adding a new subsection authorizing the Commission to prescribe safety regulations with respect to the construction and operation of interstate natural gas pipelines. The new subsection (j) contained in section 5(c) of the draft would enact this proposal.

At the present time there are no Federal regulations governing the construction or operation of interstate transmission facilities. Some States have enacted rules and regulations in the nature of police regulations, but scattered and nonuniform regulation of segments of large-scale interstate operations cannot be deemed satisfactory. The industry has an excellent safety record, but the necessity of avoiding dangerous conditions becomes even more important as population pressures increase and the network of pipelines spreads.

8. Natural Gas Act—regulation of security issues: Amend section 12 of the Natural Gas Act to give the Commission jurisdiction with respect to approval of security issues of interstate pipeline companies which are subject to the act. Section 6 of the draft would enact this proposal.

The Commission is of the view that it should have substantially the same authority over security issues of natural gas pipeline companies as it now exercises with respect to interstate electric companies. Similar authority has long been exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission in relation to the securities issued by rail carriers. We also note that many of the States perform a comparable function so far as local utilities are concerned.

The Commission regards control over the security issues of regulated pipelines as important from the standpoint of maintaining the strength and stability of these companies. Surveillance is a protection even though we anticipate that it would not often be necessary to disapprove financing plans. The high rate of growth of pipeline companies gives added urgency to this proposal.

9. Natural Gas Act—comprehensive investigatory authority: Amend section 14(a) of the act so as to give the Commission broad powers to conduct investigations and collect

information with respect to the gas industry similar to those now conferred upon it with respect to the electric industry by section 311 of the Federal Power Act, but without impinging upon the existing authority of other Federal agencies in areas under their jurisdiction. Section 7 of the draft would enact this proposal.

The Commission does not have complete authority to secure information relating to all segments of the natural gas industry. The result is that neither the Federal Government, the natural gas industry, nor the consuming public can turn to any single agency and obtain comprehensive information. In contrast, the Federal Power Commission is in a position to provide complete data concerning the electric power industry. Although the trade associations compile some statistical information on the industry as a whole, it is inadequate to meet the needs of the Commission and does not afford the detailed information desired by Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and the general public.

There are now more than 34 million natural gas consumers. Although a great deal of our work involves rates for natural gas in the field and at the city gate, we have very little information on what the ultimate consumer pays and so far as we know this information is not available anywhere. Of all the information we publish, the annual compilation of typical bills for household electric rates arouses the most interest and has probably been the most effective instrument in spotlighting out-of-line rates and stimulating better performance by the power industry with resulting benefits to consumers. We think that the informational technique is equally applicable in the natural gas field.

10. Natural Gas Act—additional authority as to importation and exportation: Amend sections 1(b) and 2 of the act so as to include foreign commerce within the coverage of the act and define persons engaged in the importation and exportation of natural gas as "natural gas companies" so far as their operations in the United States are concerned. Also, we would revise section 3 to provide that orders issued pursuant thereto be entered upon affirmative findings that the requested authorization "is consistent with the public interest" rather than, as now provided, that such orders "shall issue" unless the Commission finds that the authorization applied for "will not be consistent with the public interest." Sections 2(b) and 3 of the draft bill would make these changes.

Although there is one court decision to the contrary (*Border Pipe Line Co. v. F.P.C.*, 171 F.2d 149), we believe that the language of the act indicates that it was the Congress purpose to give the Commission jurisdiction over companies exporting or importing natural gas to or from a State adjacent to the international border. If such gas is not controlled, there is a significant gap in the regulatory scheme.

The amendment to section 3 would simplify proceedings in which authorization is necessary for a proposed import or export under both sections 3 and 7 of the act.

11. Natural Gas Act—alienation of gas reserves: Amend section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act so as to require Commission approval for the transfer by an interstate natural gas company of natural gas reserves where such reserves have constituted part of the basis for the issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity. The amendment is included in section 5(a) of the bill.

Companies now free to dispose of gas reserves may find other more profitable uses for the gas and impair their ability to render the service certificated by the Commission based upon the existence of those reserves. As a result of the Supreme Court's decision in *F.P.C. v. Panhandle Eastern Pipe*

Line Co. (337 U.S. 498), holding that the Commission, at least in certain circumstances, does not have the authority it here proposes, the abandonment provision in section 7(b) does not offer the protection that had been previously assumed—that a natural gas company could in no way bring about an abandonment or impairment of service without Commission approval.

The amendments which we are proposing to the Federal Power Act are being prepared and will be submitted in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

STABILIZATION OF MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators CARROLL, MOSS, METCALF, BIBLE, CANNON, ALLOTT, CHAVEZ, DWORSHAK, JACKSON, HAYDEN, KEFAUVER, CHURCH, LONG of Missouri, KUCHEL, SYMINGTON, MAGNUSON, and WILEY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes.

This bill provides for import taxes on imported lead and zinc ores, concentrates and metals. It is similar to a bill I introduced during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, except that this bill contains no subsidy provisions. A subsidy bill was enacted into law during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

If enacted, this proposed legislation would provide a balance to the unstable lead and zinc markets and would help restore our domestic lead and zinc industries to a sound and healthy condition.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2747) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Lead and Zinc Act of 1962."

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Declaration of policy

SEC. 101. It is declared to be the policy of Congress—

- (a) to promote a reasonable balance between foreign and domestic supplies of lead and zinc ores, concentrates, and metal, and;
- (b) to restore to a sound and stable condition the domestic lead and zinc mining industry.

Effective date

SEC. 102. Subject to the provisions of section 4622(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by title II of this Act, this Act shall take effect ninety days after date of enactment of this Act, and the quotas provided for by Proclamation Numbered 3257 of September 22, 1958, shall be discontinued on the effective date of this Act.

Severability

SEC. 103. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or the application of this Act which can be effected without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Act are severable.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Amendments to chapter 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

SEC. 201. Chapter 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended as follows:

(a) By redesignating subchapter G as H.
(b) By renumbering sections 4601, 4602, and 4603 as sections 4631, 4632, and 4633, respectively.

(c) By inserting after subchapter F the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER G—LEAD AND ZINC

"Sec. 4601. Imposition of taxes on imported lead.

"Sec. 4611. Imposition of taxes on imported zinc.

"Sec. 4621. Price determinations.

"Sec. 4622. General provisions.

"SEC. 4601. IMPOSITION OF TAXES ON IMPORTED LEAD.

"(a) There are hereby imposed upon the following articles, imported into the United States, taxes at the rates specified:

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 391 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds.

"Rate of tax

"One and four tenths cents per pound on lead content, provided that such taxes shall not be applied to the lead contained in copper, gold, silver, or tin ores, or copper mattes, unless actually recovered.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Lead bullion or base bullion, lead in bars and pigs, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, antimonial scrap lead, and all alloys or combinations of lead not specially provided for.

"Rate of tax

"Two cents per pound on lead content.

"(b) If the average market price of lead determined in accordance with section 4621 is less than 13½ cents per pound, there shall be imposed on the following articles additional taxes at the rates specified beginning on the first day of the calendar quarter next following such determination: *Provided*, That when the said average price of lead so determined is 14½ cents per pound or more, the said additional taxes shall cease to be imposed beginning on the first day of the calendar quarter next following such determination:

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 391 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds.

"Additional tax

"One and four-tenths cents per pound on lead content, provided that such taxes shall not be applied to the lead contained in copper, gold, silver, or tin ores, or copper mattes, unless actually recovered.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Lead-bullion or base bullion, lead in bars and pigs, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, antimonial scrap lead,

and all alloys or combinations of lead not specially provided for.

Additional tax

"Two cents per pound on lead content.

"(c) In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there are hereby imposed upon the articles provided for in paragraphs 46, 72, 320, and 397 and lead in sheets, pipe, shot, glazier's lead, lead wire, babbitt metal, solder, and type metal under paragraph 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, imported into the United States, taxes at the rate of 2 cents per pound on the lead contained therein.

"SEC. 4611. IMPOSITION OF TAXES ON IMPORTED ZINC.

"(a) There are hereby imposed upon the following articles, imported into the United States, taxes at the rates specified:

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 214 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Zinc fume.

"Rate of tax

"One and four-tenths cents per pound on zinc content.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 393 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Zinc-bearing ores of all kinds, except pyrites containing not more than 3 per centum of zinc.

Rate of tax

"One and four-tenths cents per pound on zinc content, provided that such taxes shall not be applied to the zinc contained in lead, tin, or copper ores unless actually recovered.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended:

"Zinc in blocks, pigs, or slabs: 2.0 cents per pound.

"Zinc, old and worn out, fit only to be remanufactured, zinc dross, and zinc skimmings: 1.4 cents per pound.

"(b) If the average market price of zinc determined in accordance with section 4621 is less than 13½ cents per pound, there shall be imposed upon the following articles additional taxes at the rates specified beginning on the first day of the calendar quarter next following such determination: *Provided*, That when the said average price of zinc so determined is 14½ cents per pound or more, the said additional taxes shall cease to be imposed beginning on the first day of the calendar quarter next following such determination.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 214 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Zinc fume.

"Additional tax

"One and four-tenths cents per pound on zinc content.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 393 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: Zinc-bearing ores of all kinds, except pyrites containing not more than 3 per centum of zinc.

"Additional tax

"One and four-tenths cents per pound on zinc content, provided that such taxes shall not be applied to the zinc contained in lead, tin, or copper ores unless actually recovered.

"Article

"Articles provided for in paragraph 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended:

"Zinc in blocks, pigs, or slabs: 2.0 cents per pound.

"Zinc, old and worn out, fit only to be remanufactured, zinc dross, and zinc skimmings: 1.4 cents per pound.

"(c) In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there are hereby imposed

upon the articles provided for in paragraphs 5, 77, 93, 214 other than zinc fume, 341, 380, 381, 1,634, alloys of zinc, zinc strip, and other zinc mill products under paragraph 397, brass wire under paragraph 316(a), leaded zinc oxides containing over 25 per centum of lead under paragraph 72, zinc dust under paragraph 394, and parts whether partly or wholly manufactured from zinc, provided for in paragraphs 372, 369, 353, and 368 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, imported into the United States, taxes at the rate of 2 cents per pound on the zinc contained therein and in addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law there is hereby imposed upon zinc wire under paragraph 316(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, imported into the United States a tax at the rate of 4 cents per pound on the zinc content contained therein and in addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law there is hereby imposed upon zinc sheets under paragraph 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, imported into the United States a tax at the rate of 7 cents per pound on the zinc content contained therein.

"SEC. 4621. PRICE DETERMINATIONS

"(a) For purposes of this subchapter, the terms 'average market price for lead' and 'average market price for zinc' mean, respectively, the average market price for common lead (in standard shapes and sizes delivered at New York City), and the average market price for slab zinc (prime western, free on board, East Saint Louis, Illinois), each determined for a period of three consecutive calendar months as hereinafter provided.

"(b) As soon as practicable after the last day of the second month of each calendar quarter following the effective date of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine the average market price for lead and the average market price for zinc during the three consecutive calendar months immediately ending on the second month of each calendar quarter, shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of each such determination and shall cause each such determination to be published in the Federal Register. The first such determination shall be made and published in the Federal Register as soon as practicable following the effective date of this Act and each such subsequent determination shall be made and published in the Federal Register not later than the last day of each such calendar quarter. The average market prices so determined and published shall be the average market prices governing the imposition and removal of the additional taxes set forth in section 4601(b) and in section 4611(b) of this subchapter as to articles provided for therein entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the calendar quarter following the calendar quarter in which such determination is made.

"SEC. 4622. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

"(a) The taxes specified in subsections (a) and (c) of section 4601 and in subsections (a) and (c) of section 4611 shall be applied on and after the date of the effective date of this Act; the taxes specified in subsection (b) of section 4601 and in subsection (b) of section 4611 shall be applied on the effective date of this Act as if the average market price for lead and the average market price for zinc had been determined, in accordance with section 4621, to be less than 13½ cents per pound, and thereafter shall be applied in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 4601 and of subsection (b) of section 4611.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions contained in subsection (b) of section 4621 and in subsection (a) hereof, the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 4601 and of subsections (a), (b), and (c)

of section 4611 shall not apply insofar as the imposition of taxes is concerned until the effective date of this Act: *Provided, however*, That any such taxes on any of the articles specified in sections 4601(a), 4601(b), 4611(a), or 4611(b), other than those included within paragraphs 392 and 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall not be applicable to any such articles which were entered in bonded warehouse prior to the date of enactment of this subchapter, such products upon being withdrawn from bonded warehouse during the statutory period of the bond to be subject to the rates of duty which were applicable thereto prior to the enactment of this subchapter.

"(c) On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the articles provided for or referred to in subsection (a) of section 4601 and subsection (a) of section 4611 may be duly entered for warehouse by the importer under bond. Any such article may be withdrawn from warehouse and entered for consumption during a period when the tax imposed by section 4601(b) or section 4611(b), as the case may be, is applicable upon payment of such tax, and upon payment of the applicable duty; any such article may be withdrawn from warehouse and entered for consumption during a period when the tax imposed by section 4601(b) or section 4611(b), as the case may be, is not applicable only upon certification that the article has been sold for use. The term 'sold for use' applied to any article means that the article has been sold or otherwise transferred, or is subject to a binding agreement for sale or transfer, to a purchaser or transferee who intends to process, manufacture, fabricate, or combine it to produce a different article.

"(d) For purposes of this subchapter, the term 'United States' includes Puerto Rico."

(d) By amending the table of subchapters for such chapter to read:

"Subchapter G. Lead and zinc.

"Subchapter H. Special provisions applicable to import taxes."

TITLE III—EFFECT OF AMENDMENTS ON TARIFF ACT OF 1930

SEC. 301. (a) The treatment provided for imports of articles described in sections 4601 and 4611 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by title II of this Act, shall, for purposes of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, be considered as having been in effect continuously since the original enactment of said section 350.

(b) The duties imposed under paragraphs 214, 391, 392, 393, and 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall cease to apply to the articles provided for in subsections (a) and (b) of section 4601 and in subsections (a) and (b) of section 4611 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by title II of this Act, as of the date the import taxes imposed by said subsections become applicable.

DENIAL TO U.S. CITIZENS OF DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY WITHIN TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that diplomatic privileges and immunities shall not be granted within the territory of the United States to nationals of the United States. This bill is designed to exclude from diplomatic immunity citizens of the United States who are employed in this country in the service of a foreign government.

I am aware that the principle of diplomatic immunity is firmly established in international law. From far

back in history, diplomatic immunity has been almost universally recognized in the body of rules known as international law. Whether by custom or by treaty, diplomatic immunity can be traced back to the earliest peoples of whom we have any written records. Even primitive tribes realized that for the purposes of communication and trade with one another, their messengers or envoys must be immune from molestation while on a mission. The custom and tradition of diplomatic immunity have therefore become a principle of international law and the nations of the world recognize it as such. Our own country, as far back as April 1790, adopted legislations that embodied the idea of diplomatic immunity.

This immunity, however, does not mean that a diplomatic officer is free from the restraints of American or foreign laws and police regulations, but only that he cannot be arrested, tried or punished in the event of failure to respect them. Sanctions may be applied against him by first, complaining to his government; second, an official request to that government for his recall; and third, if such request is not granted, and if the offense is serious enough, a declaration that he is *persona non grata* and an order that he leave the country forthwith.

This system has worked rather well. Let me state that my bill is not designed to affect the nationals of countries other than those of the United States.

Many foreign governments find it necessary to hire citizens of the United States. Therefore, we find many American citizens who are exempt from arrest and prosecution under the laws of the United States simply because they are employed by foreign governments and can claim diplomatic immunity.

From time to time there have been complaints that Americans so employed and familiar with our national and local laws and customs flagrantly violate these laws and claim diplomatic immunity to avoid liability of debts, and to avoid arrest and prosecution for misdemeanors and criminal offenses. Mr. President, I believe that this is wrong. I believe that every American citizen, no matter where he is employed, should have to respect the laws and ordinances of this country and its communities. The mere fact that he is employed on the staff or as a domestic servant, a chauffeur, or a gardener in an embassy should not exempt him from obeying the laws of the land if he should refuse to do so.

I do not believe that our diplomats or other representatives of our Government, who while abroad employ nationals of other countries, should claim diplomatic immunity for such persons when they violate the laws of their native land. I do not believe it would harm our diplomatic activities in other countries if those countries enacted laws similar to the bill I am introducing today.

It is therefore the purpose of this proposed legislation to bring this problem to the attention of the Congress and open the subject to some investigation.

I believe that there is a need to survey the situation and provide some way to deal with those American nationals who flagrantly, openly and brazenly violate laws of our country and then seek diplomatic immunity to avoid paying the penalty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2749) to provide that diplomatic privileges and immunities shall not be granted within the territory of the United States to nationals of the United States, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

JOINT HEARINGS ON CIVIL DEFENSE SHELTER PROPOSALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which would provide for joint hearings on civil defense shelter proposals. I submit the resolution on my own behalf and on behalf of eight other Senators, all of whom are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The resolution calls for joint hearings by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Armed Services. The other sponsors of the resolution are the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. My cosponsors and I may have differing views as to what ought to be done about civil defense shelters, but we are of one mind as to the fact that when hearings are held, in order to give the country and ourselves the necessary information and to insure full consideration of the merits of the proposals for a large-scale Federal fallout shelter program, they should be joint hearings by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Armed Services, both of which committees have appropriate jurisdiction, the first in the field of Federal housing, urban renewal, community facilities, and all of its other aspects, the second in the field of national defense.

In our opinion we ought to move further in the direction of the efficiency and the lack of duplication of effort which would result from such joint hearings. So the resolution would authorize and direct both committees to conduct joint hearings upon this subject and to report to the Senate their findings during the present session with recommendations for legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution itself may be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution may be printed in the Record, as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 275) was received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency as follows:

Whereas a civil defense shelter program is an important concern of the Federal Government and the Congress; and

Whereas the establishment of such a program involves important domestic as well as defense considerations; and

Whereas community and private shelters, including multiple-purpose structures, are important forms of public and private housing and community facilities; and

Whereas existing Federal programs to aid public and private housing and community facilities would be substantially affected by a civil defense shelter program; and

Whereas the Committee on Banking and Currency, by virtue of its responsibility for public and private housing community facilities and urban renewal, and the Committee on Armed Services, by virtue of its responsibility for the common defense, have both been concerned with civil defense shelter proposals in the past; and

Whereas civil defense shelter proposals merit unified comprehensive and continuing examination in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) the Committees on Banking and Currency and Armed Services are authorized and directed to conduct joint hearings, studies and investigations on Federal civil defense shelter proposals, and to report to the Senate during the present session the results of their joint studies and investigations, together with their recommendations for any legislative or other measures which they may determine to be necessary or desirable.

(b) Joint hearings shall be held during the present session of Congress and from time to time thereafter as the committees jointly may determine to be required for the performance of their duties.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, at the next printing of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 142) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added to the list of cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of C. Allan Stewart, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to Venezuela, John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Afghanistan, Vice Adm. Edward Nelson Parker, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF MICHAEL H. SURA TO BE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT OF THE UNITED STATES AT PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 1, 1962, at 11 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Michael H. Sura, of Pennsylvania, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this nomination are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5304, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, before the close of business on Tuesday, January 30, 1962.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FREDERICK A. DAUGHERTY TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN, EASTERN, AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 6, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Frederick A. Daugherty, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF L. RICHARDSON PREYER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 1, 1962, at 11 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of L. Richardson Preyer, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge, middle district of North Carolina.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman before the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, held recently in Washington, D.C., dealing with the role of milk in the diet of American people.

HISTORIC AND PROPER RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MILITARY AND CIVILIAN AUTHORITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD a memorandum submitted this week by the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, to the Special Preparedness Subcommittee. This memorandum was filed in response to a request by the chairman of the subcommittee, the able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I was so much impressed with Mr. Lovett's masterful exposition of the historic and proper relationships between military and civilian authorities, that I think his splendid statement should be given immediate further circulation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of January 25, 1962, the text of Mr. Lovett's letter of January 16, 1962, to Senator STENNIS and the attached memorandum.

There being no objection, the editorial, the letter, and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1962.

Senator JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman, Special Preparedness Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Armed Services,
Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN STENNIS: In reply to your letters of December 7, 1961, and January 6, 1962, I respectfully submit the attached memorandum in which I have attempted to respond to your request that I express any opinions or state any views I might hold, based on past experience, in certain areas which form a portion of the broader subjects your committee is studying.

With warm personal regards, I am,
Faithfully yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

MEMORANDUM FOR SPECIAL PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(By Robert A. Lovett)

ROLE OF THE MILITARY SERVICES IN GOVERNMENT

Any examination of the appropriate role of the military in our Government must conclude, I believe, that the separation of the military and civilian functions is not only well established by custom and implicit in our Constitution itself but also that the subordination of the military to civilian authority is specifically established by the provision of the Constitution which makes the President the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

From this separation has grown one of our great national military traditions: that the military should be nonpolitical and that career military officers should stick to their demanding profession and take no part in partisan activities or become involved in discussions of our political issues. This well-established tradition, which has grown more important in this century, should, in

my opinion, apply equally to the civilian heads of these departments while in office for many of the same reasons which apply to the military personnel.

But, since World War II, there is a particular and an additional reason for observance of this tradition and it is of great importance. I refer to authorization by the Congress of the continued use of the absentee ballot for military personnel in reliance on the good faith of military and civilian superiors that the votes will not be influenced from Washington or by commanders in the field. I shall later refer to this quasi-trustee relationship in more detail.

One of the great virtues of the removal of our professional military services from partisan politics is that it permits the President and the Senate, representing the country as a whole, to appoint professionally trained officers based solely on judgment as to what the man can do professionally rather than on what he has done politically. As a consequence, in time of war or of great national emergencies, both the Congress and the people have found it possible to trust our military implicitly and to turn to the military services for men who are above party and who, as professional military officers, serve no faction and no special cause and seek no political advantage.

From the days of Cromwell, some of whose officers not only sat in Parliament but also dissolved it when Parliament failed to do their bidding, peoples whose form of government is based on Anglo-Saxon traditions and institutions have wisely insisted on separating the military and civilian arms of government. Although the lines between the military and civilian functions today are increasingly blurred and overlap because of new weapons of appalling destructiveness, the emergence of a new, competitive world power, and disappearance of splendid isolation, it seems important to retain the separation and to recall Professor Santayana's great warning, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

FUNCTIONS OF THE MILITARY SERVICES IN NATIONAL POLICYMAKING

The primary function of career military officers in national policymaking, apart from their obvious administrative, staff, and command responsibilities, is that of advising on military policies and of preparing detailed, strategic plans as part of the complex of specialized advice from which an overall national policy can be evolved. Their activities in their own professional field take place under the direction and control of the civilian head responsible for the Military Establishment and in accordance with instructions from the President. Therefore, when the governmental policy has been decided on, the President is entitled to expect from them more than the mere virtue of minding their own business. He is entitled to receive instant obedience and the loyalty which makes it their duty to avoid any activities which would tend to undermine the policies established by the Government of which the President is the head.

There are appropriate places for debating the merits of a course of action before a decision is reached. Differences in point of view can be vigorously pressed at several levels—sometimes even to the point of causing exasperation. But these debates customarily take place on a confidential basis and differences are not to be aired in public while policy is being hammered out.

As is known, the Constitution places a duty on the Congress "to raise and support" military forces and "to provide for the common defense," thereby imposing an obligation on the Military Establishments to respond to requests from the appropriate committees of Congress for such information as is necessary to enable the Congress to discharge its constitutional responsibility.

The decisionmaking process was complicated beyond belief in World War II. It was frequently necessary for General Marshall to disagree strongly with courses of action advanced by foreign and domestic military and civilian officials with powerful political backing. These differences in points of view were aggravated by the fact that the war was global in character and that our allies were numerous and vocal.

In these trying circumstances, General Marshall had a simple rule which earned him the admiration of his colleagues at home and abroad and the gratitude of his Commander in Chief as well. He felt that it was of cardinal importance that the Chief of Staff state his plans strongly, make his arguments as forcefully and persuasively as possible (but never in the form of "posterity papers") and that, if he was overruled and then felt that he could not loyally and in good conscience carry out the policy, he should resign.

He said "I think what we suffer from at times is the unwillingness of the individual to take issue on a confidential basis with his Commander in Chief. That is pretty hard to get people to do. There is where you state your case and put your own commission, or command, or position in peril." But, when the policymaking discussions had been completed and the decision had been reached, General Marshall, having had his say, gave and required the most complete loyalty in carrying out the policy which had been established. He said "when the Chief of Staff of the Army sets an example to the whole Army by disloyalty to his Chief and superior, who is the Secretary of the Army, he has just about ruined the Army in my opinion." He pointed out "you (as a general) preach loyalty all the time. You are dealing with an organization where a man receives an order, from even a captain, which leads to his death or his wound and he has to obey that order. He doesn't debate it. He obeys it and that has to be instinctive. Now, if the example at the top is contrary to that, then you have got a very serious situation."

When entering the armed services, military officers voluntarily forego certain privileges retained by civilians who are not members of a disciplined arm of government, and I cannot see how there can be any reasonable justification for the career officer attempting to influence elections or taking part in political activities, either domestic or foreign. These seem properly to be the sole responsibility of governmental officials of the legislative, executive or judicial branches, who are specifically chosen by the people and put into office as their representatives.

In this connection, it is worth remembering that the military officer holds his commission by selection and not by election.

NEW RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE MILITARY SERVICES

I have mentioned above in earlier paragraphs the conviction that military professionals should be contributors to and not deciders of final national policies and have tried to emphasize that they are trained to carry out such political policy but not expected to originate it.

It is appropriate now to consider certain enlarged responsibilities placed on the military by force of circumstances, including technological advances, vastly improved communications and annihilation of distance, and the emergence of a formidable, aggressive-minded world power to threaten us with premature burial, over which it hopes to preside. All of these matters have a direct and potent effect on the major responsibility of the military in connection with raising, training, and putting into the field combat-worthy fightingmen.

A new and increasing emphasis is placed on the necessity for proper education and indoctrination of military personnel, both active and reserve, bearing most directly on

the performance of troops in the field and on occupational duty. Thus, a heavy and continuing duty is laid upon military officers to discuss with troops under their command not only the use of increasingly complicated weapon systems but also certain forms of psychological warfare, brainwashing techniques, etc., and the characteristics, tactics, and wholly different philosophy of communism and of our potential enemy. This has become an important part of protection of troops from insidious methods of modern warfare.

Admittedly, the problem is complicated by the fact that there can be questions of judgment as to what is both effective and appropriate in exposing the Communist devices—particularly, their use of deceit and perfidy as part of their normal foreign policy. It is hard to do this job of exposure by use of the easily available incidents and at the same time avoid completely the rocks and shoals of comment on political beliefs which may be held by some groups in this country. But I think it can be done. It will probably require the use of carefully worked-out programs, outlining a series of curriculums suitable for all units of the Military Establishments, and prepared with the approval of the responsible military officers in command of the troops and public officials of the military departments. It does not seem to me to be either necessary or feasible to draw too sharp a line in such cases but, with appropriate forewarning and reasonable guidelines, it would appear possible to set standards which will permit the avoidance of pitfalls.

Troop training and indoctrination is, however, a far simpler subject to deal with than your question of "what is the proper function of the military in public indoctrination in the cold war field." As a general rule, it seems to me that both the military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense should hold their public speeches to a minimum and in them deal largely with facts in the area of their direct responsibility. I cannot escape the feeling that, as a government, we tend to talk too much. To be sure we are an open society but we give the impression of being unbuttoned. Military officers on active duty in particular should, in my opinion, restrict themselves to informing the public on matters for which responsibility is placed on them by the Department of Defense and should, as indicated in earlier paragraphs, exercise care not to express partisan views or take positions contrary to the approved national political policy.

I have mentioned what seems to me to be the necessity for some system of overall review by the responsible top level departmental officials because the military clearly face a considerable problem in walking the thin line between obvious military matters and those having important bearing on the conduct of troops on foreign duty which would appear to involve, to some extent at least, discussion of relations with the foreign country acting as host or under occupation. Correct conduct of our troops, for example, in West Berlin, or West Germany, becomes of the greatest importance if serious incidents arising out of carelessness or ignorance are to be avoided. The troops are, therefore, necessarily forewarned of the customs, habits and sensitivity of the country involved, as well as the provocations, incitements, and similar traps which the enemy may be expected to spring in order to cause dissension and unrest.

At this point we enter the sensitive areas of "review," "clearance," "evaluation," etc., which have always been a red rag to a bull. It has usually seemed to me that the rag looked redder to the bulls outside the services than to those in them. If we are not to have four military services going their

divergent ways and adding to public confusion concerning our foreign policy or some pending domestic matter, it seems entirely reasonable to me to require some form of higher level clearance applicable to military officers and civilian officials alike. The crux of handling the problem, in my opinion, lies in the quality, proven judgment and attitude of the individual who must do the reviewing. I believe the checking should be done at the highest and most experienced level available. If the clearance or evaluation is done routinely, or at some relatively low level, or by someone or a group who gives the impression of being unsympathetic, arbitrary or power-proud, cries of "censorship" will be deafening.

I do not propose to add to the scar tissue I have acquired in former jousts in this field by now venturing to discuss the limits of free speech by those in national service. I certainly cannot state them or precisely define them. But most people will admit that some limit must exist. I merely point out now that I believe that, in the military services, duty and loyalty impose one such limit even if self-restraint and good taste did not.

PRACTICAL REASONS FOR RESTRAINT ON CERTAIN SUBJECTS

There are at least two reasons, as mentioned earlier in this memorandum, why partisan views or political issues have, in the past, been considered improper subjects for "education" of troops. The first of these is one mentioned earlier, the fact that the Congress and the Defense Department have continued the use of the absentee ballot by soldiers on active service abroad, relying on and trusting in the traditional attitude of the professional military and particularly of the commanding officers that the services will take no part in partisan politics and will do nothing to influence the vote one way or the other.

Secretary Stimson during World War II, drawing on his knowledge of the Army gained from his tenure of the Secretary of War position under President Taft and his knowledge of foreign policy gained as President Hoover's Secretary of State, said in September 1943 in speaking of the War Department's reaction against political activities of Army officers:

"That policy is founded upon the fundamental concept that it would undermine the sound theories of democracy to permit military personnel to take advantage of their service by appealing for election to civil office, and that it would be plainly incompatible with the effective fighting of the war to allow members of the Armed Forces to divide their energies between military duty and any outside interest, whether political, business, or professional.

"The existence of the prohibition against political activities by military personnel is not new to the Military Establishment. The policy of the War Department for a century and a half has been constantly adverse to the participation by members of the Armed Forces on active duty in political affairs. The present Army regulation is nothing more than a mere collation of the various directives pertaining to this matter.

"The War Department considers the existing policy to be wholly consonant with democratic principles and procedures. Nothing could more directly expose a political system to improper intrusions by the military than to allow military personnel to exercise their civil and military offices contemporaneously. The War Department firmly believes that the present policy is essential to the maintenance of the tradition of the American people that the military and civilian branches of Government remain separated."

The American soldier is allowed freely to read the news columns and editorials in a free press. He is subject to the normal chan-

nels of information from his parents, his friends, his neighbors, and the civilian candidates for office soliciting his vote. In these circumstances, there would appear to be little excuse for the military officer to inject himself into partisan discussion on political matters. One of the most dangerous things which can happen to a government is to permit the establishment of a political party line by officers on duty.

The great tradition of the proper role of the career officer is exemplified in the conduct and record of Pershing, Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley and, indeed, most of the great leaders of World Wars I and II, who took the view that the military should speak publicly only on military matters and that they should leave the public statement of foreign policy and national policy to the elected head of the state. Any other course, they believed, brought divided counsels and weakened the authority both of the Chief Executive and the military commanders.

A second practical and fundamental reason for avoiding any form of electioneering or partisan political discussion by the military on active duty is the invitation such acts would extend to politicians to enter the control of, say, the Army. If certain generals are identified with one party or one faction, each new administration will have to seek men who will execute its particular policy. It is difficult to imagine a more dangerous situation for the military or the country. If you have doubts on this, look at unhappy France.

CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

Your request that I comment on any general impressions that I may have as to civil-military relations is a very difficult one since I have been remote from specific problems in this field for some time. I will, therefore, with your permission, limit my reply to comments on an evolutionary development apparent from newspaper accounts and possible problems arising from it.

One predictable result of the extraordinary scientific breakthroughs translated into military uses by new technologies and the simultaneous emergence of a new and aggressive world power, one of whose goals is our destruction, is the increasing intermingling of military and civilian personnel and the blurring of lines between civil and military activities. A group of many skills is now needed in most of our national security activities and the differences in organization, wages, discipline, et cetera, inevitably cause some irritation. It has existed in the past where the military felt that civilian agencies were poaching on their preserves. We have seen this in the missile field a little while ago. But I think that such disputes over who does what are a common occupational disease in government and become more virulent at budget time. They are certainly not, in my opinion, evidence of anything sinister. This civil-military intermingling could, in fact, be very helpful to each if they can succeed in exchanging something other than their bad habits.

Official and personal relations between the military and civilians—looked at from the outside—seem good, judging by the moderate number of times one reads that tired old story about restoring civilian control. Alarmist cries about the lack of civilian control over the military, in our Nation, deal with a strawman issue. They are concerned with a problem that does not really exist, and they are divisive and damaging by falsely implying that the military does not accept our historic tradition of civilian supremacy. Nothing could be more wrong. I have been with the military in three wars and have worked with them in other governmental capacities and I have never heard any military commander raise the slightest question at any time as to their subordination to civilian control. The only real occasion when civilian control is in doubt is

when the civilian officials themselves fail to exercise it, or neglect to use the powers legally vested in them. In my opinion there will be no such problem under the competent direction and control by the unusually able present Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense.

As a final observation, I must say that after many years of direct experience with the military services in a variety of capacities, I have the greatest admiration for our dedicated and skilled career officers and I know of no country more fortunate than we in having military services with the traditions and loyalties that ours possess. I have seen our career officers in competition with those of other countries in the ultimate arenas of war, as administrators of conquered or occupied countries, and as participants in the councils of peace—and I have been proud to have them compared with the men of any other country in the world.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 25, 1962]

MARSHALL'S RULE

The issue of muzzling of the military is complicated, but it is less complicated to large minds than to small. The largest-minded military man of our time was George Marshall. Here is what Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, says about Marshall in a statement prepared for the Senate subcommittee hearings on charges of civilian censorship of the military:

"The decisionmaking process was complicated beyond belief in World War II. It was frequently necessary for General Marshall to disagree strongly with courses of action advanced by foreign and domestic military and civilian officials with powerful political backing. These differences in points of view were aggravated by the fact that the war was global in character and that our allies were numerous and vocal.

"In these trying circumstances General Marshall had a simple rule which earned him the admiration of his colleagues at home and abroad and the gratitude of his Commander in Chief as well. He felt that it was of cardinal importance that the Chief of Staff state his plans strongly, make his arguments as forcefully and persuasively as possible (but never in the form of "posterity papers"), and that, if he was overruled and then felt that he could not loyally and in good conscience carry out the policy, he should resign."

It is an impeccable, broad rule for all levels of command. More specifically as to the present issue, Mr. Lovett, himself a man of large mind, has this to say on his own:

"The great tradition of the proper role of the career officer is exemplified in the conduct and record of Pershing, Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley and, indeed, most of the great leaders of World Wars I and II, who took the view that the military should speak publicly only on military matters and that they should leave the public statement of foreign policy and national policy to the elected head of the state. Any other course, they believed, brought divided counsels and weakened the authority both of the Chief Executive and the military commanders.

"A second practical and fundamental reason for avoiding any form of electioneering or partisan political discussion by the military on active duty is the invitation such acts would extend to politicians to enter the control of, say, the Army, if certain generals are identified with one party or faction, each new administration will have to seek men who will execute its particular policy. It is difficult to imagine a more dangerous situation for the military, or the country. If you have doubts on this, look at unhappy France."

Most by far of today's American military men understand what Marshall meant, and

what Lovett means. They do not need to be reminded, for these are their rules, too. Each can judge for himself the limits imposed on free speech for men in uniform—limits, as Mr. Lovett says, set not only by self-restraint and good taste, but first by duty and loyalty.

The few officers who lack such judgment need to have the rules spelled out for them from time to time. Indoctrination, it might be called.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the hearings of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services designated to study and appraise the use of military personnel and facilities to arouse the public to the menace of the cold war opened on January 23.

The first statement presented was a letter from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, invited by and read by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who, in company with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], had visited Mr. Eisenhower a few days earlier.

This statement, coming from one who had once been the head of the Military Establishment, and later was President during 8 years of the cold war, has special value and meaning for every American today.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

GETTYSBURG, PA.,
January 15, 1962.

HON. JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman of the Special Subcommittee,
Senate Armed Services Committee, U.S.
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am complimented by your invitation to comment on various matters of current interest to your subcommittee.

Because I have had no occasion to examine these issues in detail since leaving the Presidency, I shall direct my remarks to basic considerations rather than to the specifics of pending issues.

This statement therefore will deal in general terms with the public need for information on the Communist threat; extremism; the military role in providing information on communism; slurs on the military; and censorship.

WE SHOULD INFORM THE PUBLIC

I am sure that all of us would deplore any move which would restrict public access to reliable information on the deadliness, implacability, totality and cunning of the Communist assault on freedom. We should not trouble ourselves over the possibility of overinforming the public. Rather we should be watchful of any tendency to withhold releasable information.

Those of us who over the years have had to deal directly with the Communist leaders and system believe—unanimously, I think—that the more our people can be brought to comprehend the all-encompassing nature of the threat, the stronger will be our own determination to preserve freedom at home, and the greater will be our national willingness to sacrifice to advance freedom throughout the world.

Telling the stark truth about communism is the best way to make our own citizenry and other peoples appreciate the blessings of liberty.

We should encourage all individuals who are well informed on Communist tactics and strategy to expound freely and often on this subject. We should concentrate on assuring ourselves that the public has ready access to the best available information, rather than expending too much energy on deciding which persons or groups should fill this need.

One phase of this matter concerns me deeply—as it has for many years.

I refer to the tendency to impugn motives when matters of this kind enter the public arena. Because the public is, rightly, troubled by the Communist menace, the subject tends to excite fear and suspicion and is susceptible always of being exploited for political or other purposes. Thus extremism finds a fertile soil. And as charge begets countercharge, unless the Nation's leaders move with wisdom and restraint the fanatics of both the right and left so belabor each other as almost to monopolize the issue, leading the Nation to preoccupied itself with the evils of extremists instead of the evils of communism. Facts are forgotten in the extravagance of mutual accusation.

Extremism always distorts—what we need are hard facts, calmly presented and digested, so that we may act with prudence and some wisdom in defending ourselves.

Incidentally, I have noted that the fanatic thrives on publicity; he withers when ignored.

Next, I take up the matter which, so you indicate to me, engages your particular interest—the appropriate military role in helping to inform the nonmilitary in respect to the tactics, strategy, and concepts of communism.

CIVIL AUTHORITY VERSUS MILITARY

First, I mention in passing that I endorse without qualification the doctrine of military subordination to civil authority.

The armed services are not policymaking bodies. Their function is faithfully to execute the policy decisions of the properly constituted agencies of civil government. It is equally true, however, that, in this modern day, the need of civil government for the counsel and advice of military personnel in devising of policies grows more acute.

I subscribe also to the position expressed to your subcommittee last fall by the Secretary of Defense, that military involvement in the providing of information concerning Communist potential aggression—indeed its involvement in all matters—must be clearly nonpartisan, directed to subjects related to the defense of America, and in harmony with approved national policies.

This is, of course, easily said. But difficulties are inescapable when one attempts to decide what type of statement or gathering is partisan and what isn't—what, conceivably, in these times is unrelated to the Nation's strength and safety—and what, precisely, national policy really is. Such determinations are necessarily, in good measure, subjective.

I suspect that many active duty personnel could conclude from such broad guidelines that virtually any utterance before a nonmilitary group might be construed as a violation of instructions of higher authority; hence the course of prudence would be to say nothing at all.

FBI RESPONSIBILITY WITHIN UNITED STATES

It is, of course, not the function of the military services to ferret out the details of attempted Communist subversion in our Nation. This is the task of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. However, by virtue of its vital mission to defend our country, its long professional experience with Communist tactics and its highly developed educational system, our military is singularly well trained to provide to the public, as well as to the members of

the Armed Forces, the implications of the extreme threat of Communist imperialism.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, if your committee should glance over the curricula of the National War College and, indeed, of all the service war colleges, you will find, I believe, that the aims, objectives, and methods of communism and its aggressive threats to our system are probed more intensively and more pragmatically in these institutions than in virtually any civilian university in the Nation.

This has long been true. The Armed Forces Industrial College, for instance, began conducting very fruitful national security seminars on matters of this kind as long ago as 1948. I believe these seminars are still in progress.

The result is that senior officers in the Armed Forces are qualified to develop among their units the necessary understanding concerning potential aggressors, and their purposes and tactics.

RESULTS FROM 1959 SEMINAR

As an example of this kind of education: In the summer of 1959, the Joint Chiefs of Staff authorized a 2-day strategy seminar of 210 selected reservists. The War College seminar presented 55 top experts as lecturers. This faculty was strictly bipartisan—including former Secretary of State Dean Acheson and other prominent Democrats, as well as Republicans.

Some of the speakers were openly critical of various policies and programs of my administration. But I thought it unwise to suppress or inhibit such discussions since I believe that the American people have a right and a need to know the alternate ways of meeting the Communist challenge.

As an indication of the caliber of students, three alumni of the first seminar are now U.S. Senators. Others were college presidents, deans, editors, publishers, Congressmen, Governors, lawyers, college and high school teachers, and businessmen. I believe that all concerned found the discussions highly provocative and useful, and that there is value in such efforts for the Nation as a whole.

The need for anti-Communist education in the Armed Forces is self-evident. Your committee recalls, I am sure, our sad experiences in Korea a decade ago, in respect to the conduct of some of our captured Americans. This gave rise to improved troop information programs designed to strengthen troop appreciation of the fundamentals of our own and the Soviet system.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

I need not remind your committee, especially that in these times military considerations and economic, political, and ideological considerations are interrelated to such a degree as to make an arbitrary dividing line between the military and the nonmilitary increasingly unrealistic—a truth, indeed, which gave rise 15 years ago to the establishment by law of the National Security Council.

Here, in the Nation's topmost planning group, the military, through the Secretary of Defense—and, by invitation, the Chairman and/or members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—directly advise in the development of America's master policies. These advisers, and their supporting staffs, are an asset of incalculable value to this Nation, and policies governing their usefulness and employment should leave a great deal of latitude to the judgment and responsibility of these men.

As to informing the public at large, I have heard statements to the effect that the use of the military in this effort stems from a National Security Council directive of 1958. This, I believe, is in error.

It is true that during my Presidency great pains were taken to coordinate the efforts of the military services in its preparations

for countering hostile moves against the external threat, on the one hand, and those of the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerned in combating internal Communist subversion on the other. But to the best of my recollection there is no National Security document specifically directing military involvement in the internal problem, and unless material has been taken out of context, or general language interpreted very loosely, I think there is no basis for these assertions involving the National Security Council.

Nevertheless, both procedures—the troop education programs and the general educational program—seem to me as desirable for our country now as they did just a few years back. Each supplements and supports the other—Defense personnel takes the lead in the first, civilian agencies do so in the second.

THERE IS A RULE OF REASON

Naturally, when civilians or soldiers undertake programs of this kind, within or outside the Government, the process cannot be expected to work perfectly at all times and at all places. Faulty techniques, errors of judgment, impulsive statements, occasional excesses—these are bound to occur. As always in cases of inescapable overlappings of responsibility, the heads of affected agencies must apply judgment—a rule of reason. Such responsible heads can expect to receive the full cooperation of the military leadership in seeing to it that policies are obeyed and flaws are corrected.

Accordingly, should departmental instructions be so phrased as unduly to prohibit desirable military participation in these educational efforts respecting the Communist menace, I suggest that your committee recommend their restudy with a view to appropriate revision. The Reds are well aware of the integrity, patriotic motives, and high qualifications of our military. I suspect they would be delighted if we should prevent such people from spreading the truth about Communist imperialism.

Pertaining at least indirectly to this subject, I have heard of accusations alleging that military education is so narrow as to make service personnel incapable of grasping the whole complex of dangers confronting our country. It is hinted that the entire officer corps has become politically infected, and prone to be disloyal to the Commander in Chief. I, for one, want to be on the record as expressing my indestructible faith and pride in our armed services—even though their loyalty, patriotism, and breadth of understanding need no defense from me or anyone else.

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL PRESSURES

The entire Nation, including the armed services, insists that in our free system, military influence must be kept within proper constitutional, legal, and administrative bounds.

Moreover, as mentioned in my final address as President, we must watchfully mind the military-industrial complex, for it tends to generate powerful economic and political pressures beyond the anticipations even of the participants themselves. But these are matters of proportion and sensible national leadership, requiring the same kind of continuing oversight and perspective that other major power groupings in our society, including business, labor, and Government itself, require in the interest of keeping our system flexible, balanced, and free.

In a half century of national service, I have yet to meet the American military officer who viewed himself as a budding Napoleon, or even a Rasputin, and I suggest it is worthy of note that in recent world history the three major dictators, Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, came from civil life. This fact does not warrant a general indictment of civilian motivation, any more than one or two military extremists might warrant the absurdity that all the military harbors

political designs dangerous to our constitutional form of government.

LET OUR INFORMED MILITARY SPEAK

I believe, therefore, that your committee will render valuable service by rejecting the recent spate of attacks upon the competence and loyalty of the military and by disapproving any effort to thrust them, so to speak, behind an American Iron Curtain, ordered to stand mutely by as hostile forces tirelessly strive to undermine every aspect of American life.

I say, let our informed military speak, always under properly established policies and the general—not petty—supervision of their civilian superiors. Should they, here or there, speak or act partisanly, imprudently, or in contravention of national policies, then hold them directly accountable, for it is a function of command to keep military personnel properly respectful of the obligations of the uniform.

At all events, I am certain of this: give military leaders a lucid explanation of the Nation's policies, and they will, with rare and easily controllable exceptions, loyally perform.

Generally in the same connection, I question the desirability of requiring the top-most Government officials, whether military or civilian, to submit their proposed public statements for what amounts to censorship of content—as distinguished from security matters—prior to their utterance.

I am aware, in saying this, that procedures in my own and in the administration of my predecessor may have functioned in this way. But, in thoughtful reassessment of this procedure, I incline to the view that when responsible and respected officials feel compelled to submit to censorship, we are smothering the concept of personal responsibility under a practice of heavy-handed and unjustified staff supervision.

COORDINATION NOT CENSORSHIP

Responsible officials, when in doubt, will voluntarily coordinate proposed public statements within their own and sister departments so as to protect the Nation, their services and themselves, but such voluntary coordination is some distance from censorship.

I would hope that all who study this problem objectively will see the virtues of such a cooperative system as opposed to censorship, except, of course, where security is involved. I have always believed—as I now do—that good faith and close understanding among the important officials of great human organizations are far more important to success than are any number of arbitrary regulations and pedantic instructions. This is really the meaning of this letter.

So viewing the problems before your subcommittee, I wish you and your colleagues well in your endeavor to maintain balance and good sense in respect to the matters receiving your current consideration.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my able colleague yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in my opinion the Senator performs a service to the Senate and to the country in asking that General Eisenhower's excellent comments be printed in the RECORD. It is one more valiant and valuable public service by one of the greatest Americans in all our country's history. He has dedicated his entire lifetime to the cause of a free and strong America, and to the cause of a just peace in the world. The

observations he makes with respect to the dangers of extremism in this country, those he utters with respect to his—and our—unerring faith in the American Military Establishment, and his views with respect to the application of the rule of reason in censorship are all in the high tradition with which General Eisenhower has served this country in war and peace.

I repeat, the Senator performs a service in giving the people who read the RECORD an opportunity to see the text of General Eisenhower's comments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope it may be distributed widely.

MANAGEMENT-LABOR CLIMATE IN WEST VIRGINIA CONDUCIVE TO INDUSTRIAL GROWTH—SECRETARY OF LABOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG SPEAKS IN STATE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, industries anticipating locating or relocating their plants and facilities in the State of West Virginia can be assured that a harmonious relationship will exist between management and employees, according to facts disclosed by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg in a recent address in Fairmont, W. Va.

Secretary Goldberg indicated that some industries might hesitate in locating in sections of West Virginia because some areas have been labeled as being strike happy. However, with the use of statistics, the Secretary explained why these conditions could hardly prevail in West Virginia.

The Secretary revealed that during an 8-year period, from 1953 to 1960, industry in West Virginia lost an average of 0.37 percent of total working time as a result of labor-management disputes, or about 1 day per year per employee, on the average. This loss ratio was greatly less than most neighboring States and only slightly above the national figure.

Although these statistics were favorable, it was most encouraging to hear the results of more recent data compiled by the Labor Department.

In this respect, Secretary Goldberg said:

Perhaps more significant in dispelling any notion of strike proneness was the record for 1960, the latest year for which data are now available. In 1960, the strike-loss ratio for West Virginia amounted to 0.10 percent, which was below the level of all States previously mentioned, and even significantly below the U.S. total of 0.17 percent.

In accounting for the improved management-employee partnership, not only in West Virginia but throughout our Nation, Secretary Goldberg cited a factor which is highly complimentary of President Kennedy's administration, the policy of using the Federal Government's good offices to promote collective bargaining, not to intervene by dictating the terms of settlement.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to accompany Secretary Goldberg when he brought forth this information in a meaningful speech. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Representatives CLEVELAND BAILEY

and HARLEY STAGGERS were also with the Cabinet member on his visit to Elkins, Clarksburg, Fairmont, and Morgantown.

The Secretary of Labor is the seventh member of President Kennedy's Cabinet to come into West Virginia during the past year. In addition to Secretary Goldberg, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; the Honorable J. Edward Day, Postmaster General; the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, have also made visits to my home State.

I am extremely proud of this fact because I feel it illustrates the sincerity of the citizens of West Virginia to cooperate and work with the Federal Government as well as displaying a genuine interest by the present administration in the individual welfare of each of the 50 States.

I ask unanimous consent that my introduction of Secretary Goldberg and an official release from his office be included in the RECORD.

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

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF SENATOR RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, WEST VIRGINIA, IN PRESENTING SECRETARY GOLDBERG AT THE DEMOCRATIC BANQUET IN RECOGNITION OF LABOR, SPONSORED BY THE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS AND THE WOMEN'S DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MONONGALIA COUNTY, JANUARY 18, 1962

Our honored guest speaker is the Secretary of Labor of the United States. You know him as a national leader of great physical and intellectual energy. He is also a public official of dedication and high moral purpose. But most important, he is a man who understands people. He understands their needs and their problems, and he acts to help them.

Last February, in the early days of the Kennedy administration, when the Nation was still in the depths of recession, Secretary Goldberg visited some of the areas that were suffering heavily from unemployment and economic decline. Many individuals questions his reasons for making the trip: Could he not obtain all the information he wanted in his own Department of Labor? Could not one of his bureaus supply him with statistics on unemployment, automation, productivity, and the rest? Why did he even need to budge from behind his desk in Washington.

But Arthur Goldberg went out and talked with people. He learned firsthand their problems. He saw their suffering. He met men with families who had been out of work for many months, and even for years, and were on relief. When he returned to Washington he answered his critics.

I heard his answer when he testified before the Senate Employment and Manpower Subcommittee, of which I am a member. It was in the form of an added dimension to the unemployment story. Not only could he relate the bare statistics, but he could speak knowingly of the problem in its human terms.

"Behind these statistics," he said, "are the human beings themselves. Anyone who carefully looks at the statistical scoreboard and comes face to face with the people themselves, cannot escape the overriding importance of programs which we have submitted to the Congress which aim at ameliorating the current situation."

And this country, under the leadership of the Kennedy administration, with the help of a Democratic Congress (in which serve my esteemed colleague, Senator BOB BYRD, and our diligent House Members, Mr. STAGGERS and Mr. BAILEY), and with a vigorous assist from Secretary Goldberg, has moved toward revitalizing the economy. In the last session we extended unemployment benefits, improved and extended the minimum wage law, increased social security benefits, and enacted the Area Redevelopment Act and the Housing Act for urban renewal—all of them measures which have stimulated our enterprise system and helped place us again on the road to recovery and better living.

But there is much to do. The unemployment problem has not been solved. Congress will have its work cut out for it in the current session. I am sure the Secretary will be telling us of legislation the administration proposes to help the unemployed men and women of West Virginia become more secure.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am exceedingly happy to present the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg.

NEWS RELEASE

FAIRMONT, W. VA.—Prospects for industrial peace in 1962 are bright, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg said today.

He coupled that optimistic forecast with the statement that labor-management relations had improved greatly in 1961.

Secretary Goldberg spoke at a luncheon meeting at Fairmont, W. Va.

Expressing optimism over the outcome of current contract negotiations in the steel industry, Mr. Goldberg said:

"President Kennedy is hopeful, in fact quite hopeful, that there will be an amicable settlement between labor and management in the steel industry—and on terms advantageous to all interests concerned—labor, management and the public.

"The President is keeping in close touch with the situation and making every possible effort to create a climate favorable to a peaceful accord in the basic industry."

Secretary Goldberg said that in this instance, as in others involving labor-management relations, the administration has been adhering to a basic policy of "using the Federal Government's good offices to promote collective bargaining, not to intervene by dictating the terms of settlement."

"We are making greater efforts to give positive expression to that philosophy," Secretary Goldberg said, "and these efforts have contributed importantly to development of a growing partnership of labor, management and the public.

"Under the direction of the President, the agencies of Government concerned in this area have taken a series of steps to promote industrial peace.

"Partly as a result of this action, during 1961 the United States enjoyed its greatest period of industrial peace since the end of World War II. Only one-seventh of 1 percent of all estimated working time of all nonagricultural workers was lost because of strikes. The number of strikes and the number of man-days lost to them were both at postwar lows."

Secretary Goldberg praised both labor and management for the cooperative spirit they have shown in the work of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, which was established by Executive order last February. Its first report to the President—on automation—was submitted last week.

Secretary Goldberg cited the work of the President's Missile Sites Labor Commission, created last year, as another example of a more constructive approach to labor-management problems.

"The overall record of labor since the activation of the Commission reflects a grati-

fying measure of accomplishment," Mr. Goldberg said. "A no-strike, no-lockout pledge was obtained for missile and space programs. The cumulative lost time from June through November (approximately 4,260 man-days) as related to the man-days worked (approximately 1,126,000) is 0.06 percent. This represents 4.4 percent of the average time lost at missile sites during the 57-month period prior to March 31, 1961, and only 11 percent of the average time lost in the construction industry in the United States during the same period."

Commenting on labor-management relations in West Virginia, Secretary Goldberg said:

"West Virginia has had its share of industrial conflict, as have all our industrialized States. Unfortunately, conflict long past and almost forgotten often leaves an unwelcome legacy—a ghost that haunts the timid. This ghost may be described in fanciful terms: A community, so the story is told, is 'strike happy.' A pseudoscientific term now popular in some quarters is 'strike proneness.' I have been told that such distorted images have been evoked by employers to whom West Virginia might otherwise be a suitable place in which to locate.

"The best weapons for eradicating ghosts are facts. Let me recite a few. During the 8-year period 1953-60, West Virginia industry lost an average of 0.37 percent of total working time as a result of labor-management disputes, or about 1 day per year per employee, on the average. This loss ratio was substantially less than that experienced in Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana during this period, to mention only nearby States. It was only slightly higher than that for Kentucky and Maryland. The 8-year average ratio for the country as a whole was 0.26 percent.

"Perhaps more significant in dispelling any notion of 'strike proneness' was the record for 1960, the latest year for which data are now available. In 1960, the strike-loss ratio for West Virginia amounted to 0.10 percent, which was below the level of all States previously mentioned, and even significantly below the U.S. total of 0.17 percent."

The Secretary of Labor said that unity in the American labor movement is a major factor working for industrial peace and all other good causes. Praising the labor statesmanship shown in the achievement of a more united and stronger labor movement at the recent AFL-CIO convention, Mr. Goldberg said:

"Our country today more than ever needs a united people, and to have that, we need a united labor movement.

"Labor unity is essential to preservation and growth of the already very great role which American working people have in the stand against communism, and in the whole forward striving of our Nation. American labor amassed its strength behind each new program undertaken in 1961 to improve our social and economic system. It stands in the vanguard working for continued progress in 1962. Greater labor unity means a stronger America."

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXTREMISTS

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I received in the mail a postal card addressed "GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C." I observe that the name "U.S. Senate" in the address is printed in red; the red is meant, according to the indication, to suggest that the Senate of the United States has "sold out" to the Russians.

The face of the postal card reads as follows:

UNITED STATES OF THE U.S.S.R.

When you fill out your income tax forms, Federal and State, also your farm questionnaire, Federal census questionnaire, assessment questionnaire, and about 100 other forms of regimentation and controls, you begin to ask yourself, Is this the United States or the U.S.S.R.?

If you want it to get worse just keep on voting for the same politicians you have been voting for.

ZANE'S RADIO & TV.

Meade and Ashland.

(Hear Ronald Reagan speech to Phoenix Chamber of Commerce.)
Hear Reagan.

At the bottom, in red again, it says, "Hear Reagan."

I suppose it is a reference to Reagan, a film star of some sort or another, who is teaching this sort of thing around the country. This indicates something of the kind of hate literature and distress being sown in the midst of our country.

It is my intention, whenever and wherever possible, to publicize the sort of thing being indulged in under the guise of protecting the freedoms of democracy.

SURVEY REPORT OF J. T. BANNER & ASSOCIATES ON FALLOUT SHELTERS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Laramie Boomerang, from my hometown in Wyoming, in which there is properly applauded the alertness and the speed with which J. T. Banner & Associates, an engineering firm in Laramie, prepared estimates and drawings for public fallout shelters. The able work on the part of J. T. Banner & Associates properly merits this recognition.

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

FIRST IN THE NATION

The U.S. Corps of Engineers last week accepted the survey report of J. T. Banner & Associates on public buildings which might be used for fallout shelters and will report back soon on the conclusions they draw from the report.

The Albany County report was the first in the Nation turned over to the U.S. Engineers in President Kennedy's program of providing public fallout shelters for the population of the Nation. In addition to the Albany County report, the Laramie firm had completed four other counties of the seven assigned to it.

The speed with which the Laramie architects handled the job is praiseworthy and merits the thanks of all area residents who someday may take advantage of such a shelter.

Under the national program those buildings found to be suitable for fallout shelter purposes will be converted for such use in the future. The speed with which the local firm completed its work might well mean that Albany County will also be the first in the Nation to have adequate fallout shelters for its entire population.

Many persons have given up the idea of nuclear war since the easing off of the Berlin crisis. Everything points to the fact that nuclear war would be suicide for the side starting it, and everyone knows that neither the Russians nor the United States feel that

they could carry out such a war without sharing the devastation.

Yet, to rule out the possibility of such a war is indeed a fallacy. As long as the world is in a state of unrest, as long as there are incidents taking place every day in Berlin, as long as the Laos and Vietnam situations remain unsettled there is a possibility of war, triggered perhaps by an incident that started out to be a minor irritation and got out of hand.

Perhaps many of us have scoffed at the idea of fallout shelters but in the event that such shelters are available to the public we doubt that many people will be staying outside those shelters in the event that they do become necessary.

Banner & Associates are to be highly commended for their speedy work in completing their survey and getting it in to the Government for analysis. For if fallout shelters are ever needed, the sooner they are ready the better. Only in that way can we be prepared in the event an incident does touch off war.

DEALING WITH CASTRO

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I call attention to a column in this morning's Washington Post, written by the esteemed observer, Walter Lippmann, in which he analyzes some of the alternatives and urges some conclusions in terms of wise procedures for dealing with Castro.

Because the article is so stable and rational, I think it comes at a propitious moment in our calculations on that question, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ON DEALING WITH CASTRO

(By Walter Lippmann)

The conference of American Foreign Ministers in Uruguay has not concluded its work as this article is written. Moreover, it is being reported meagerly in this country and it may therefore be some time before we can come to an informal conclusion about it.

But it is not too soon to say that there is being created here an artificial and misleading standard by which to judge what is going on. Much too often the issues at Punta del Este are treated in terms of the United States winning or losing—if the condemnation of Castro is very severe and is accompanied by an all-around rupture of diplomatic relations and of trade relations, we win; anything less than this is something of a defeat.

This is, I believe, much too simple a view of a great and extremely difficult, of a quite unprecedented, problem in the history of the American States. The problem is how to contain and isolate Castro's revolutionary interventions, how to turn the Cuban Government from its attempt to become a full satellite of Moscow, how to convert it into a good and reliable member of the hemispheric system.

This will not be done by strong words in a resolution. Strong words never stop any revolution. Almost certainly it cannot be done by breaking off diplomatic relations in this hemisphere. The more Cuba becomes a part of the Soviet and Chinese system, the more it will use their channels to other states. It cannot be done by a general trade embargo. For 80 percent of Cuba's trade is now with the Communist bloc and the rest is with Mexico, Canada, and Western Europe. Cuba's trade with the other American States is negligible. Castro, we must remember, is not nearly so dependent on the Western Hemisphere as was Trujillo.

There is no good reason for crying out that we have been defeated because the biggest countries in South America will not vote for sanctions that would make big headlines in the United States but could have no substantial and decisive effect on Castro's regime. What, then, can be done that is worth doing?

The first thing to do is, as Brazil has been arguing, to lay a sound juridical basis for the containment of Castro. Existing hemispheric law was drafted by men who were thinking of the Second World War. They were thinking of the threat which had been posed of a Nazi or Fascist conquest of South America. If that were the present danger, if there were real danger of a Soviet military establishment in Cuba, those old treaties would still be quite useful. But the existing law is not directed accurately against the methods of the cold war, and it takes a lot of stretching to make the existing law fit Cuba's economic relations with the Soviet Union, or Cuba's agents and infiltrators in South America.

There is very reason to think that we can work out with the active assistance of the big countries of South America a statement of hemispheric law which fits the problem of Castro.

With a law amplified and clarified, we can move with general consent to organize inter-American machinery, in which we would take an active part, to expose and counter Castro's agents in this hemisphere. Moreover, while we cannot blockade Cuba, we can establish surveillance by sea and air and, without violating Cuban airspace, we can keep close watch on the military situation for signs of active Soviet intervention. For this it will probably be better that some diplomatic relations are maintained.

This is a general policy of containment, patiently, persistently and actively administered. There is one alternative to it. That would be for the United States to occupy Cuba, overthrow Castro, and set up a Cuban Government that we like. There are many among us who favor doing this. If it were done, there would at first be very considerable rejoicing and enthusiasm among those who do not look beyond the excitement of the moment.

Once when the church bells were ringing in London to celebrate the beginning of a war, a statesman who had opposed the war said: "Today they are ringing the bells. Tomorrow they will be wringing their hands."

A United States occupation of Cuba would have enormous and far-reaching consequences. Although there are people who affect to think that there is no such thing as the opinion of mankind, or that a decent respect for it is unmanly, the uproar around the world would be tremendous. The inter-American system would be smashed. Whatever happened to Castro himself in Cuba, Castroism, fused with anti-Yankeeism, would rage throughout the hemisphere.

And we, in the meantime, would have entangled ourselves in a guerilla war nourished from outside Cuba. It would be like the British war in Malaya, like the French wars in Indochina and in Algeria. There is no reasonable ground for thinking that intervention in Cuba could be a short, swift, and clean-cut operation. It could not be. It would be a lasting entanglement.

Believing this, believing that intervention would be a calamity, I can see no alternative to a policy of vigorous and alert containment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with the Coast and Geodetic Survey, on page 2.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Adrian S. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Dr. Ansley J. Coale, of New Jersey, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

John O. Bell, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Guatemala;

John H. Burns, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Central African Republic;

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Yemen, to serve concurrently as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the State of Kuwait;

William J. Handley, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Mali;

Ridgway B. Knight, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Syrian Arab Republic;

Henry R. Labouisse, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece;

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Lebanon;

Raymond L. Thurston, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti;

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be the President's special representative and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs, and Ambassador at Large;

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State;

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs;

Frederick G. Dutton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

John M. Cabot, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland;

Executive M, 87th Congress, 1st session. International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, done at Washington on April 24, 1961 (Ex. Rept. No. 1); and

Executive N, 87th Congress, 1st session. Protocol relating to an amendment to the

Convention on International Civil Aviation, dated at Montreal, June 21, 1961 (Ex. Rept. No. 2).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under Coast and Geodetic Survey, on page 2.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislation business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONGRESSIONAL TRADE VETO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In December, and on several occasions since, I have been urging that the President include provision for a two-thirds congressional veto in his trade program. I am therefore extremely disappointed that in asking for sweeping new trade powers, the President does not give the Congress any opportunity to participate.

The Constitution gives the Congress the authority over trade matters. I concede that Congress cannot today do the whole job. Flexibility is necessary to expand our trade contacts. Protectionism is our outmoded concept, but the elected representatives of the people must have some control over arbitrary or excessive action by the Executive. My suggestion for veto power seems to me

the soundest proposal to insure this result, but certainly we must assure it in some manner.

DAIRY FARMERS MUST WATCH FARM MESSAGE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, dairy farmers of New York State and the Nation are anxiously awaiting the special message on agriculture which the President is expected to send to the Congress on or about January 30.

While the specific recommendations for farm program changes are still in the process of formulation, there have been enough leaks and informed source newspaper stories to indicate rather conclusively that radical changes in the present dairy price support program will be urged by the administration. The President's budget message of a few days ago further confirms this view.

It is reported that the administration will propose a new dairy program which would sharply restrict the amount of milk the individual dairy producer will be permitted to market. This is the supply-management concept which has been advocated by administration farm policy planners for various commodities, without success, during the past year and a half. It is essentially a production control operation which would, in effect, tell the farmer how many cows he could milk and how much milk he could sell.

Dairy farmers are rightfully concerned over the fact that milk production has been trending sharply higher during the last year while per capita consumption has been declining.

On Tuesday both the President and the Secretary of Agriculture indicated that Americans should consume more milk to meet their minimum health requirements. More milk consumption is a highly desirable goal. I am, of course, concerned that consumers get good safe milk at fair prices.

However, the possibility of sweeping national production controls on dairy products and other farm commodities is a new departure. I am worried about the impact which such a program would have upon our present reasonable and orderly milk marketing arrangements in the Northeast.

If we are to have production controls at all, they must come from the grassroots. They must be approved by men on the farm, not ordained by remote control from Washington. As one New York farmer put it to me, a small brain closer to the farm is better than a big brain in Washington. Before we start setting up sweeping production controls, we had best have a hard look at what we are doing.

EASTERN COLLEGE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE PLEADS FOR ACTION ON SPORTS ANTIBRIBERY BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, participation in college athletics is supposed to be a way of developing a student's character, sportsmanship, and physical

well-being. In recent years, however, recurrent exposés of basketball fixes have jeopardized all intercollegiate athletics and deeply shocked the public.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association and other affiliated organizations have been making every effort to rid college sports from any taint of corruption. The NCAA recognizes, as we all should, that college athletics is on trial and that the elimination of gambling inroads is essential.

Recently the Eastern College Athletic Conference organized a committee of 40 members, under the chairmanship of DeLaney Kiphuth, of Yale, to pool information on the spread of gambling in intercollegiate athletics and to recommend measures to preclude the recurrence of scandals. A copy of the report of the Committee of Forty has just been furnished to me by Asa S. Bushnell, the commissioner of the ECAC.

This report recommends strong measures to protect our college sports from corrupting influences. It also strongly endorses a bill I have proposed—S. 2182—to make a Federal crime of activity designed to fix sports events or to attempt to do so. In his letter to me, Commissioner Bushnell states:

With Congress once more in session, the ECAC and its member colleges are hopeful that the prospect is good for early adoption of your antibribery bill, S. 2182.

Mr. President, we must not ignore this plea for congressional action.

When our Nation's leading colleges call on us for help in their efforts to drive the gamblers off their campuses and out of their arenas, we should be eager to respond. We will all have to bear some responsibility for the next scandal if we turn a deaf ear to this request for assistance.

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary requested a report from the Department of Justice on my antibribery bill last July, but no recommendations have yet been received from the Department. I am confident that the Attorney General shares my strong desire to pursue every reasonable measure to protect college sports from being destroyed by criminal elements, and that he would consider Commissioner Bushnell's pleas very sympathetically. I have, therefore, asked the Attorney General to review this legislation and have assured him of my willingness to support any effective alternative which he may recommend.

It is my hope that the Attorney General will give his strong endorsement to sports antibribery legislation. Congress certainly will give great weight to his views, and I am confident that with his support action would soon be forthcoming. The future of college sports hangs in the balance, and we must do everything we can to weight the scales in favor of honest character-building competition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Bushnell's letter and the report of the ECAC Committee of Forty be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 18, 1962.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: With Congress once more in session, the ECAC and its member colleges are hopeful that the prospect is good for early adoption of your antibribery bill, S. 2182.

Perhaps in this connection you will find the enclosure interesting. It is the report of our Committee of Forty, which was given responsibility for the development of sound corrective and preventive measures in the situation created by the collegiate basketball fixes. The report was unanimously adopted at the annual meeting of the conference on December 8 last.

Only a few days ago we held a special meeting of our executive council to implement the report's recommendations. Plans were laid for our organization's enactment of all needed legislation with a minimum of delay.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ASA S. BUSHNELL.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF FORTY
INTRODUCTION

The startling revelations of the wave of scandals in intercollegiate basketball during 1961 has prompted educators, athletic administrators and coaches to study intercollegiate athletics with a view to taking steps which will prevent a recurrence of these incidents. This is particularly emphasized by the fact that the 1961 fixes followed by only a decade the wave of scandals in 1951. Feeling that the conference level was a most effective area in which to cope with this problem, the Eastern College Athletic Conference in the early spring of 1961 organized a committee of 40 members to pool information on the spread of gambling in intercollegiate athletics and to recommend to the executive council of the conference measures designed to preclude the recurrence of scandals. This committee has met three times, spent many hours in deliberation, made extensive investigations, and is now prepared to make its report. Though it cannot legislate on its own, the committee strongly urges the executive council to consider remedial enactments which can substantially reduce the possibility of a recurrence of these unfortunate incidents. It is the strong conviction of all members of the committee that should these incidents recur the whole structure of intercollegiate athletics would be jeopardized. College athletics are on trial in the public eye. Success in eliminating gambling inroads is, therefore, vital to the reestablishment of confidence in amateur and intercollegiate sports.

NCAA REPORT

In the fall of 1961 the officers of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the American Football Coaches Association, the National Association of Basketball Coaches, and the National Association of Collegiate Commissioners produced a special report on the problem of bribery in intercollegiate athletics. The ECAC committee wholeheartedly endorses this report. In some of its recommendations the ECAC committee has repeated with special emphasis provisions of the NCAA report. Other parts of the NCAA report are not stressed in this report. This should not be interpreted to mean that any part of the NCAA report is regarded as unimportant and it should be clearly understood that, to repeat, the NCAA report is enthusiastically endorsed.

SPECIFIC PROTECTION AGAINST GAMBLING AND
BRIBERY

Measures must be taken which are designed to resist any reentry of gambling interests into intercollegiate contests and the first concern of the committee has been to recommend such measures.

It is important that all athletic administrators, coaches, and players be reminded constantly of the hazard of gambling and bribery in intercollegiate athletics. Information must be gathered and distributed to all and every effort must be made to keep fresh all available information concerning the nature of the problem. It is feared that after the 1951 scandals the hazards of gambling interests tampering with athletics were soon forgotten. This must not happen again.

To this end it is recommended that the ECAC issue periodic bulletins at regular intervals dealing with the gambling-bribery problem in all of its ramifications. This bulletin should contain case histories of athletics involved with gambling and bribery in 1951 and 1961, the means by which gamblers made inroads, and the disastrous results for the young men who through ignorance of the consequences become involved.

Representatives of the ECAC should meet periodically with district attorneys and with law enforcement agencies in various metropolitan areas to determine the extent of gambling activity and to be aware of interest on the part of gambling groups in intercollegiate sports.

Athletic administrators should conduct annual meetings of members of all teams at which the material issued in the suggested bulletins should be discussed in detail.

Beyond this program of orientation, measures of control must be taken in athletics which will discourage gambling activity. The committee specifically recommends, as follows:

1. Legislation be enacted to bar all outside competition in basketball. This prohibition should last to graduation for all undergraduates who have represented the member institution in the sport of basketball.

2. Wherever feasible intercollegiate competition in basketball should be restricted to basketball courts on institutional premises and not in public arenas.

3. Legislation should be enacted providing for the permanent loss of eligibility of any athlete failing to report a bribe offer or approach by gamblers. It is assumed that member institutions themselves will take steps to dismiss students who fail to report such offers, but, of course, it is not in the capacity of the conference to dismiss such students.

4. The conference should make a concerted and well organized effort to appeal to editors and sports editors of all newspapers in the conference area to discontinue the publication of information regarding odds and point spreads in collegiate basketball and football. This information aids and abets the gambler and thus indirectly involves the institutions themselves in the activities of the gambler.

5. The ECAC should urge the adoption at National and State levels of legislation now pending which would make a crime of activity designed to fix sports events or to attempt to do so.

THE PROPER FOCUS OF ATHLETIC PROGRAMS

All members of the committee have become convinced that this problem is intimately involved in the tendency for athletics to become an end in themselves. Constant efforts must be made to keep athletics in proper perspective. This is not to say that athletics do not have great educational value.

On the contrary, when properly related to the student's total educational experience they can be of most significant educational value. Certain principles must be adhered to to keep athletics in their proper position in the educational scheme.

It is urged that coaches be regarded primarily as teachers with responsibility for giving to athletes the lessons of true sportsmanship, a sense of responsibility to the team and other fundamental values of vigorous athletic activity. When a coach feels that he is being judged not by these standards but by how appealing he can make his team at the gate or by what his raw won-lost record is, he is led to practices which create abuses in athletics. The coach must feel the same kind of interest in the individual student that any good teacher feels.

Principle II of the ECAC Statement of Principles and Policies—Principle of Institutional Control and Responsibility (1961 handbook, p. 39) should be amended to require that each member institution assume responsibility that only those students be admitted who are seeking admission for educational purposes. This amendment should stipulate that member institutions design their athletic programs in such a way as to minimize or eliminate interference with academic pursuits.

It has long been realized that athletics provide a most meaningful and dramatic area for developing high moral standards in the participant. Under Principle VI of the ECAC Statement of Principles and Policies—Implementation of the Principles (1961 handbook, p. 42), it should be provided that each member institution be prepared upon request to furnish to any other member institution, statements concerning principles and policies governing its conduct of athletics. These statements should be submitted annually to the ECAC and should be part of the orientation of each squad at the beginning of its season of play.

Strong consideration should be given to means by which information can be exchanged among member colleges concerning academic standards, financial assistance, and admissions records of individual students. This exchange would be initiated for the purpose of establishing the propriety of competition between two institutions which can be fair only if similar standards in these areas are held by both institutions.

Some institutions have found that a simple pledge signed by the athlete to uphold the highest moral standards in athletics is a helpful procedure in reminding them of their moral responsibilities.

It is recommended that the rules of eligibility be amended to limit athletic eligibility for all undergraduates to the first eight terms of residence in a collegiate institution. This amendment in combination with the present limitation to a 5-year period of eligibility would effectively eliminate the temptation to extend the athletic eligibility of an athlete to the detriment of his academic program. Hopefully many boys now staying on in college with the primary purpose of extending their athletic careers would be discouraged from doing so.

The committee is convinced by its studies that many institutions in this conference have failed to emphasize ECAC principles governing financial assistance. Principle VI—Principle Governing Financial Aid to Athletes (1961 handbook, p. 40), with special emphasis on the following subparagraphs, should be brought to the attention of the presidents of all member institutions each year:

"In all cases where financial aid is given to athletes, all of the following stipulations must be met:

"1. The athlete must be admitted on the same basis as any other student.

"2. The athlete must maintain the same academic standards which are required of other students.

"3. Need or high scholarship or both must be definitely established.

"4. The basis for establishing need for athletes must be the same as that used for establishing need for other students.

"5. The academic standards which are required of a student in order that he qualify for financial aid must be definitely stated by the institution. In the case of high scholarship, it is assumed that the standard will be the same for all students including athletes. In the case where need is the basis upon which a student qualifies for financial aid, the academic standard need not be the same for all students including athletes.

"6. The amount of the grant to an athlete must not exceed the limits which are available to other students. In addition, where financial aid is granted on the basis of need, it shall not exceed the amount necessary to supplement the personal resources and employment earnings of the athlete in meeting the minimum cost of attending school as published in the official bulletin of the institution."

RECRUITING

The committee found that more than any other factor malpractice in recruiting was responsible for the erosion of the educational principles of intercollegiate athletics. At the same time this area is the most difficult in which to present specific recommendations for reform.

It is, therefore, urged that further study be made to discover ways to eliminate those recruiting practices which establish meretricious criteria upon which the student bases his selection of a college. What are these meretricious criteria? Let's identify them and eliminate them. This can be the important charge of the study we recommend.

In addition we also urge that action be taken to improve our current legislation governing recruiting.

Along this line it is recommended that Principle V—Principles Governing Recruiting (1961 handbook, p. 41) be amended by providing that each member institution make a single official responsible for all recruiting by the institution. This official should be intimately acquainted with all parties involved in any way with the institution's recruiting efforts and should make clear to all, the rules of the NCAA, the ECAC, and his own institution with respect to this activity. In this way ignorance, as an excuse for violations of rules and standards, would be eliminated.

Finally it is recommended that penalties for violation of conference or NCAA rules governing recruiting be made more stringent. It is recommended that the council disqualify any institution from competition with other members of the conference if that institution is found to have violated rules governing recruiting. The committee is convinced that the cause of many of the problems in intercollegiate athletics is recruiting malpractice. It is further convinced that these malpractices in recruiting establish a climate of opinion on which scandals can occur.

Rules governing these areas must be detailed and penalties for violations made more severe.

CONCLUSION

There was a general consensus of the committee that all of the foregoing recommended steps might be treatments of symptoms of a disease which could be controlled but not cured by these recommendations. There is a suspicion that the essential problem rests in the failure of some colleges to regard athletics as educational plus a consequent unwillingness on their part to

support expense for athletics as an educational cost. This leads to the demand that the athletic departments support their expenses out of gate receipts. Indeed there are many cases where gate receipts are used to support expenses in areas not related to athletics.

Until such time as educational institutions are willing to assume the expenses in athletics as an educational cost, to relieve the athletic department of the necessity of paying its way, many of the problems discussed in this report will continue to plague us. High pressure recruiting, financial aid to athletes not available to all students, double standards of admission, inordinate pressures for victory in athletics all stem from the necessity to create income out of gate receipts. These practices create an atmosphere in which gambling and bribery can operate.

The foregoing report is respectfully submitted to the Eastern College Athletic Conference assembled in annual meeting.

ECAC COMMITTEE OF FORTY

Chairman: DeLaney Kiphuth, Yale; Lewis P. Andreas, Syracuse; John W. Bach, Fordham; Everett D. Barnes, Colgate; Rev. A. B. Begley, O.P., Providence; Asa S. Bushnell, ECAC; Frank Carver, Pittsburgh; Ernest C. Casale, Temple; J. Orlean Christian, Connecticut; Eugene F. Flynn, Holy Cross; William J. Flynn, Boston College; Jeremiah Ford II, Pennsylvania; Ralph Furey, Columbia; John J. Gallagher, Niagara; Ellwood A. Geiges, ECAC; Hugh S. Greer, Connecticut; James J. Henry, LaSalle; Rev. John J. Horgan, Seton Hall; Alvin F. Julian, Dartmouth; Robert J. Kane, Cornell; Joseph Lapchick, St. John's; J. W. Liebertz, Merchant Marine; Harry Litwack, Temple; Ernest B. McCoy, Penn State; Nicholas M. McKnight, Columbia; Walter T. McLaughlin, St. John's; Paul F. Mackesey, Brown; Robert A. MacKinnon, Canisius; Arthur L. Mahan, Villanova; Donald W. Moore, LaSalle; Kenneth A. Norton, Manhattan; John P. Nucatola, ECAC; Victor F. Obeck, N.Y.U.; Ray Oosting, Trinity; John T. Ramsay, St. Joseph's; George L. Shiebler, ECAC; Edward S. Steitz, Springfield; Herbert E. Sutter, Wagner; Frank R. Thoms, Jr., Williams; Robert M. Whitelaw, ECAC.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a few days ago, in many communities throughout Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the United States, Americans of Ukrainian descent looked back 44 years and commemorated the 2-year period from 1918 to 1920 when Ukraine was independent.

This period was the culmination of a struggle which began in the middle of the 17th century. Although Ukrainian independence lasted only briefly, the people of this nation still think and yearn for the benefits of a free and independent life.

We in Pennsylvania know of their love of freedom, their rich sense of culture, their individual aggressiveness and self-reliance, and their respect for spiritual values. These traits have benefited our State and the Nation.

Ukrainians will not easily forget the centuries of struggle for just 2 years of independence. We all look forward to the day when all nations of the world will have the opportunity of planning their own destinies and the chance to determine for themselves the system of government under which they will live.

The domination of the people of the captive nations should be a constant reminder to all of us of the blessing of liberty. It indicates the necessity for a world in which the rights of all men are respected. It should require us to work even more vigorously for a world in which differences will be settled by rule of law, and not by the terrible weapons of war.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the last 40 years some 42 million brave Ukrainians have suffered under their cruel rulers, the Communist dictators, just as their ancestors suffered as the slaves of the Russian czars for 250 years before that. In the last 300 years the liberty-loving Ukrainian people have known freedom for only the short period of 2 years, between 1918 and 1920. But those sad facts do not tell the complete story of the Ukrainian people's struggle for freedom and independence. That struggle reached its height when the Ukrainian Republic was set up in January of 1918. The date of that great event, January 22, was a turning point in the history of the Ukrainian people, and it has become a national holiday for all descendants and friends of the Ukraine everywhere.

The people of the Ukraine have struggled against tremendous odds to establish a national homeland, but again and again their efforts were blocked by their neighbors. The northern and western parts of the Ukraine are the ancient lands of the earliest medieval Russian state of the 9th through 13th centuries, centering on the capital city of Kiev and the valley of the Dnieper River. These wealthy territories were completely ruined by the Mongols, who invaded the country in the 13th century. Many Ukrainians and Ukrainian-Americans are descendants of these people, the original population of Kiev. These are industrious, courageous, and gifted people. The art, music, and literature of the Ukrainian people have enriched the cultural life of our country.

The people of the eastern and southern Ukraine are for the most part descended from Ruthene immigrants from the north who, to escape the Polish and Lithuanian princes and nobles who were making life hard for them, went to the border territory, an area run by the Lithuanians, where they could live in free communities. But after 1667 the Russians controlled the Ukraine east of the Dnieper River, and then the Ukrainians were divided among Russians, Poles, and Turks. One hundred and twenty-five years later most Ukrainians came under Russian rule, although some still lived in Rumania and the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The feelings which I would like to share with you today were expressed for all time by the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko, who, during an unhappy life, suffered all the hardships of serfdom and exile. Shevchenko reminds us of all the unfulfilled hopes of the Ukrainian people, which he described in poetry about his homeland. Like their great national poet, the Ukrainians still believe in their ideals of freedom and independence. In the sad history of the Ukrainian people, this is a

very encouraging fact. On this 44th anniversary of their historic independence day I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in hoping that peace, happiness, and freedom and independence for the Ukrainian homeland will be achieved and respected.

CONDITIONS IN BRAZIL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on January 15 of this year an editorial appeared in the New York Times entitled "Trouble in Brazil." This editorial is extremely critical of a number of attempts to bring some kind of order out of chaos which, unfortunately, to some extent now affects that great country, which is a prime ally of ours.

On the 19th of January, the very able and distinguished Ambassador of Brazil, Dr. Roberto De Oliveira Campos wrote a letter to the New York Times which I think is worthy of consideration by our colleagues. It replies to the editorial in the New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent that both the editorial and Dr. Campos' letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1962]
CONDITIONS IN BRAZIL—AMBASSADOR COMMENTS ON ECONOMY, STATUS OF LEFTIST MOVEMENT

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your January 15 editorial "Trouble in Brazil" constitutes an exception in the generally balanced and well-informed appraisals of events and situations in Latin America which are characteristic of the New York Times.

As an example of unqualified judgment is, *inter alia*, the statement that the "economy deteriorated." From all indications, the rate of growth of the real gross national product during 1961 has exceeded the 6-percent average achieved during the period 1954-60. This is hardly an evidence of deterioration, particularly if one remembers that few countries in the Western World are attaining this rate of growth, while many others are preparing multiyear plans in order to achieve rates of growth lower than that achieved by the Brazilian economy.

Inflation, of course, still plagues us. But it is not particularly enlightening to talk indiscriminately about it, without differentiating between chronic factors, such as budget deficits (which would account for a much lower rate of inflation) and sporadic factors of a nonrecurrent nature, which explain the recent sharp inflationary upsurge, such as the political crisis of last August, the drought in the food producing area of the center and south and the elimination of the exchange rate subsidies for basic imports.

CONGRESSIONAL SESSION

The failure of Congress to pass the tax reform and land reform bills is held in your editorial as evidence that the new governmental system is not working out and the Congress is "floundering." Since Congress was in session for only 3 months after the establishment of the parliamentary system, and the tax proposal involves a major re-vamping of the fiscal system, it is no wonder that Congress preferred to make a detailed study at its next session in February, recommending in the meantime to the Executive a 40-percent cut in public expenditures.

As to land reform, it is accepted by all sectors of the population that measures must

be taken to improve the access to land. Given the enormous diversity of regional conditions, not one but several methods of land reform must be used: land expropriation and redistribution, progressive land taxes, occupation of idle Government land, and colonization or resettlement schemes.

Numerous proposals have been tabled in Congress and a high-level commission appointed by the Executive to reconcile those proposals and present recommendations for a Government-sponsored bill which would take into account (a) the extreme diversity of regional conditions and demographic density, (b) the obstacle created by the constitutional provision requiring prior cash compensation in case of expropriation, (c) the fact that land taxes and several aspects of land policy fall within the purview of state and municipalities rather than of the Federal Government.

REVOLUTION AS ALTERNATIVE

In view of the foregoing, it is no wonder that the voting of the Federal land reform proposals could not be achieved as speedily as one might wish, unless we were prepared to have agrarian revolution rather than agrarian reform.

In the same issue of the New York Times, Tad Szulc published an article which calls for some comments. There seems to be throughout the article an overestimation of the importance of the leftist movement in Brazil. Since the extreme left is the scavenger of revolution and civil wars, its ideal moment was the political crisis of last August. The fact that the moderate centrist forces prevailed at that critical moment, leading to establishment of a parliamentary regime, gives no basis to presume a different behavior in the more normal conditions that now prevail.

The author seems further to identify our policy of independence with a neutralist policy. There are, however, substantial differences between the two. The typical neutralist country is preoccupied with the creation of a third bloc of powers. We are not. The neutralist countries are systematically nonaligned, while we are committed to the inter-American system. Most of the neutralist countries are not committed to Western democratic institutions or to the free enterprise systems, while we abide by them.

We are not systematically nonaligned, as the neutralists pretend to be, nor systematically aligned as the satellite countries are. While faithful to the inter-American system, we may in specific circumstances follow independent policies, if that serves the cause of peace or the cause of our economic development.

Finally, there should be no oversimplified assimilation of economic nationalism with leftist movements. The bill passed by the lower house to control remittances of profits by foreign investors was more a misguided example of economic chauvinism than a demonstration of leftist power and it is not likely to be upheld by the senate.

ROBERTO DE OLIVEIRA CAMPOS,
Ambassador of Brazil.
WASHINGTON, January 17, 1962.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1962]

TROUBLE IN BRAZIL

Early this spring President Goulart, of Brazil, is going to visit Washington. Within a few weeks the spectacular ex-President Janio Quadros, who suddenly and shockingly resigned last August, is returning to Brazil from his self-imposed exile.

Meanwhile, inflation continues; the economy deteriorates; the new governmental system of a weak executive and cabinet responsibility is not working, and Congress is bitterly divided and floundering, having refused to pass a tax-reform bill last month while the Chamber of Deputies did pass a bill to penalize foreign investments. In October

there will be a congressional election that has Washington deeply concerned, as a dispatch in today's Times says.

There is a disturbing background of social imbalance. In a recent report on "Rural Reform in Brazil" for the American Universities Field Staff, Frank Bonilla pointed out that 8 percent of the proprietors control 75 percent of the area in farm properties; that nearly 10 million out of a total of 12 million farmworkers own no land; that 63 percent of the population depends on agriculture, and that two-thirds of this rural population are illiterate and therefore have no vote.

This tale of woe could be extended. There was a big budget deficit in 1961; the monetary unit, the cruzeiro, has improved lately but remains very weak; there is a flight of capital, and so forth. These things are happening in the largest, most heavily populated and most naturally wealthy of the Latin American countries, the country that Washington hoped would be the linchpin of the Alliance for Progress.

The signposts point toward trouble, but we must take what comfort we can from Brazil's incredible ability to absorb colossal inequities and to survive political crises without revolutions or (with rare exception) dictatorships. In any other Latin American country a dismal but safe prophecy would be revolution. In Brazil anything can happen, including peaceful and democratic survival.

CONFERENCES OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Special Committee on World Peace through Law of the American Bar Association for the last several months has been devoting much time and effort to holding regional conferences of lawyers in order to stimulate interest and activity among lawyers and laymen for the advancement of world peace through the extension and expansion of the rule of law.

The first conference was held in June of 1961 in San José, Costa Rica, and was attended by lawyers from the 23 nations of the Americas.

The second was held in Tokyo, Japan, from September 17-20, 1961.

The third conference of lawyers from African and Middle East countries was held in Lagos, Nigeria, December 3-6, 1961.

The final regional conference of attorneys from European countries is scheduled for Rome in April.

There are tentative plans for holding a world conference of lawyers, possibly in New Delhi, in January of 1963.

The three regional conferences held to date have produced in each instance a written consensus of the participants, which reflect careful thought and a large area of agreement between the members of the legal profession of all of the countries represented. These three documents deserve the close attention of all of us, and I know that they will be of interest to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

I would like to pay special tribute to the ABA committee which has done such effective work in bringing about these conferences. It is an able and distinguished group, chaired by Charles S. Rhyne, Esq., of Washington, D.C., and

its members include: Messrs. Erwin N. Griswold, Arthur Larson, William J. Jameson, Philip H. Lewis, Ross L. Malone, Richard M. Nixon, J. Wesley McWilliams, Mariam Rooney, Ethan A. H. Shepley, Robert G. Storey, William S. Thompson, Lyman M. Tondel, Jr., Robinson Verrill.

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

CONFERENCE OF LAWYERS OF THE AMERICAS ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH THE RULE OF LAW. SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA, JUNE 1961

CONSENSUS OF SAN JOSE¹

[Approved June 14, 1961]

This conference of lawyers from the 23 nations of the Americas convened in San José, Costa Rica, in June 1961, to consider a program to promote world peace through a cooperative and sustained effort of the lawyers of the world to establish the international rule of law, and to formulate plans for a world conference of lawyers, hereby declares this consensus of views:

Modern weapons of destruction must be controlled through the enlightened rule of law and converted to instruments of peace.

Law has been the only means to an orderly society of individuals. It is the only hope for a peaceful society of nations. Judgments of international courts of justice must displace resort to war. This will assure a world order that is just and a realistic "Law of Nations" to replace force as the controlling factor in the world community.

Through the international rule of law the peoples of the world can achieve dignity for the individual, equality of opportunity and legitimate aspiration for economic and cultural progress in a dynamic social order of freemen.

The rule of law puts what is righteous before expediency and wisdom above emotion, so that which is just and fair will rule the affairs of men and governments by reasonable persuasion and a minimum of force, itself controlled by law.

The need for law in the world community is the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization. The broadest objectives of extending the rule of law to the international community are to develop an international legal system which will establish, first, law rules stating minimum standards of conduct for nations and individuals in international relations, second, law rules to facilitate international social and economic contacts, transactions and

¹ This statement is the first effort to state some of the principles and a program to achieve world peace through law. This consensus results from intensive debate and discussion during which the delegates considered the contents of a working paper prepared by international law experts on the history and current status of world law rules and institutions and more than 100 written documents, national studies and reports, proposals, resolutions and statements. The consensus naturally contains many compromises as well as many new ideas which require further study. The record of the San José conference will be published in book form so as to give expression to the many ideas contained in the consensus in summary form as well as to provide a presentation of those ideas advanced by delegates but omitted from the consensus. Similar conferences will be held for the lawyers of Asia, September 17-20, 1961; for the lawyers of Africa in December, and for European lawyers in 1962. A world conference will then be held to assess the recommendations of the continental conferences and to adopt a program to so advance the rule of law in the world community as to achieve and maintain a peaceful world through the rule of law.

development and, finally, creative law to provide for new and adequate international institutions to achieve and maintain that order and stability which will insure rapid progress for the entire world community.

The achievement of the international rule of law requires the observance of basic concepts of morality, justice, equity and reason as tested by the centuries of legal experience of civilized men.

Universal law of mankind

In view of the foregoing, the lawyers of the Americas assembled at the American Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law at San José, Costa Rica, in June, 1961, declare their dedication to the cause of extending the rule of law to the world community through the progressive development of a world legal system based upon a universal law of mankind containing, among others, the following general principles, the acceptance of which is essential to an effective international legal system:

Partial listing of general principles

1. International law is the supreme law of the world community.

2. Individual persons, private organizations, nations, international organizations and juridical persons are subjects of international law in international matters.

3. Founded upon the consent of its constituents, international law embodies fundamental concepts of justice and morality common to civilized societies and represents the universally accepted customs and agreements of nations and individuals throughout the world.

4. The international rule of law is founded on the eternal principle of equality of all persons before the law. This means that every right imposes a duty to respect the rights of others, and that no person, organization or nation is above the rule of law.

5. International law and courts have no authority in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of States; however, tribunals for the settlement of international disputes have the power to determine according to law and applicable agreements the scope and limitations of their jurisdiction.

6. Every subject of international law is bound to fulfill their international obligations and exercise their rights in good faith.

7. All subjects of international law are legally bound to settle all their international disputes by peaceful procedures. International disputes which cannot be settled in due course by negotiations or other peaceful means must be submitted to impartial third party judgment.

8. Judges who sit on international judicial institutions must be impartial, professionally competent and free from political and other improper pressures, so that they can with integrity and judicial independence decide cases impartially according to the facts and the law.

9. All nations must abstain from the unlawful use of armed force, political subversion, economic aggression or defamatory propaganda.

10. The foregoing principle does not preclude states from exercising their right of legitimate self-defense to the extent necessary to repel a threat to their national security.

11. International obligations, including decisions of international tribunals, are enforceable by appropriate international community action.

12. Subjects of international law shall be entitled to the benefit of third party adjudication before an impartial international tribunal, before any community sanctions are imposed because of an alleged violation of international law.

13. All representative government, local, national and international, is founded upon

the consent of their constituents, while under all government based on the rule of law individual persons retain their inalienable human rights.

14. The effective protection of the fundamental human rights of the individual is the indispensable basis for the achievement of a sound legal order based on peace and justice.

Support for world rule of law

Resolves—

A. To support fully the continental conferences of the lawyers of Asia, Africa and Europe and the proposed World Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law; and

B. To carry on the work of this conference in each of the American nations, by pledges of the delegates to this conference to undertake the formation of Committees on World Peace Through Law for their national bar association, in cities of their respective nations, or activate those committees already existing, to contribute to the new international cooperative organization which we propose that the world conference create to stimulate the plans and programs recommended by this conference and the World Conference on World Peace Through Law; and

C. To participate to the fullest in the world-peace-through-law program by working toward worldwide acceptance and application of the rule of law in all international relations; and to that end

D. To encourage individual lawyers and existing public and private international and national organizations and institutions to engage in a coordinated and sustained effort to seek agreement on the implementation of feasible ways of achieving world peace through the rule of law.

Research, education, organization program to achieve a world ruled by law

Recommends:

I. That a world conference of lawyers be convened in 1962 with delegates from all nations participating in the continental conferences invited to attend; and

II. That the topics for discussion at the world conference include:

(1) International judicial machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes.

(2) Arbitration and other means of settlement of international disputes.

(3) The United Nations and regional organizations as factors encouraging the international rule of law.

(4) Facilitation of international commerce and economic development through international law.

(5) The rule of lawyers in development of the international rule of law.

III. That the world conference consider designating a World Rule of Law Year during which a concentrated global effort of the lawyers of the world to advance the international rule of law will be undertaken through a coordinated program of research, education and cooperative action utilizing all existing institutions and international and national organizations, and through establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be necessary to effectuate the objectives and purposes of the world-peace-through-law program; and

IV. That the world conference approve a plan to establish on a permanent basis a World Peace Through the Rule of Law Institute which shall have the following purposes:

(1) To organize and oversee a continuous series of programs and activities to be carried on during World Rule of Law Year.

(2) To coordinate activities of lawyers and legal organizations in a cooperative effort to establish the international rule of law.

(3) To effectuate decisions and recommendations of lawyers convened at the continental conferences and world conference.

(4) To undertake an intensive worldwide educational program designed to reach citizens of all nations to impress upon them the reality of their interdependence and the vital necessity of establishing the international rule of law.

(5) To organize and administer a coordinated global research program designed to accomplish the following:

A. To expand existing knowledge of international law and its sources.

B. Identify areas of common agreement which may be the basis of needed international conventions, treaties or understandings.

C. To identify general principles of international law recognized by the community of nations which can form the basis and foundation for an improved international legal system.

D. To explore areas of possible agreement concerning principles and rules of international law on matters such as outer space, disarmament, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and other areas of international concern.

E. To study and make recommendations in respect to development of international law rules regulating matters of aggression, including use of armed force, subversion, economic warfare, and political propaganda, and, on the other hand, organized community sanctions and the right of self-defense and reprisals.

F. To study existing national and international law with a view to developing recommendations desirable for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development.

(6) To create new and expand existing systems for the continuous reporting and digesting of decisions of international tribunals, international agreements, and materials and research on international law in order to create a complete, accessible worldwide source of information essential to further development of the international rule of law.

(7) To seek proper financing for all the above and other appropriate approved endeavors of the legal profession of the world needed to create and strengthen the legal system and law rules required to achieve and maintain world peace, and, to make from said funds grants in aid of research and other projects undertaken by law schools and other bodies throughout the world.

Some specific goals

V. That there be created a World Court of Human Rights with a carefully drafted jurisdiction which will respect the domestic jurisdiction of nations yet provide a forum to correct existing deficiencies in this important field.

VI. That a Supreme Court of Justice for the Americas be created with jurisdiction over all subjects of international law in international matters.

VII. That to insure uniformity on matters of international law, appeals from the Supreme Court of Justice for the Americas should be allowed to the International Court of Justice.

VIII. That the General Assembly of the United Nations be the sole body empowered to elect judges to the International Court of Justice.

IX. That a judge of the International Court of Justice, whose nationality is the same as that of a party to a dispute before the Court, must, upon the objection of any party, disqualify himself in said case.

X. That more importance should be given to basic principles of natural law as one of the foundations of international law.

XI. That in developing a program of world peace through law we must take into consideration the very serious social and economic problems and the discrepancies which exist in the standards of living among

the different people of the world, all of which contribute to lack of harmony between nations, and such matters as unfair terms of trade for raw materials and the absence of a sufficient guarantee for investments abroad in certain parts of the globe.

XII. That arbitration procedures be unified and modernized, more effective means of enforcing decisions of arbitral tribunals be sought, and that ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards and the Pact of Bogotá be encouraged, and that a system of reporting and disseminating decisions of arbitral tribunals be established.

XIII. That other means for the pacific settlement of disputes such as mediation, conciliation, good offices and investigation should be resorted to when appropriate, and that the competency of the Inter-American Peace Committee should be expanded to allow it to act when requested by any American State.

XIV. That the governments of states should refrain from carrying out acts, be they of a physical, economic or moral character, contrary to the individual personality and the dignity of the human person; and noting with concern that in some states the rule of law does not exist because of the violation of these principles and lack of application and enforcement of existing covenants and treaties, all lawyers are urged to work toward increased respect for an effective application of the rule of law both nationally and internationally.

XV. That all nations should accept, on the basis of reciprocity, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

XVI. That efforts be made to effect changes in the structure of the United Nations to allow it more efficiently to contribute to the maintenance of world peace and security, keeping in mind the demonstrated weaknesses in the Security Council, the fact of the increase in size and change in geographic distribution of the membership of the United Nations, and the need to insure strict adherence to the decisions made by the United Nations; and

XVII. That the International Law Commission be strengthened to better enable it to fulfill its assigned tasks of developing international law by having it become a permanent, adequately staffed organ meeting continually throughout the year.

XVIII. That programs of international educational exchange should include more law students, practicing lawyers, judges and professors of law.

Pledge to build a world law structure

Concludes

That we lawyers of the Americas pledge wholeheartedly and completely to devote ourselves to the foregoing program of sustained effort necessary to the creation of a world of law to the end that the rule of law will govern all men and all nations and any man can then walk any place on the face of the earth, or travel through endless space, in freedom, in dignity and in peace.

AFRICAN AND MIDDLE EAST CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH THE RULE OF LAW, CONSENSUS OF LAGOS, LAGOS, NIGERIA, DECEMBER 3-6, 1961

[Approved December 6, 1961]

We lawyers attending this conference of the nations of Africa and the Middle East, being aware of our professional responsibility to utilize and further develop international law and its institutions as the most effective means of justly resolving world tension and conflict, and recognizing the imperative need for positive and immediate action by the legal profession to fulfill its obligation to

promote world peace through the rule of law, hereby declare the following as our consensus:

SPECIAL CALL FOR ACTION

Be it resolved, That the body of lawyers here assembled exhort the governments of all independent states in Africa and the Middle East to call conferences for the purpose of establishing a Permanent Organization of African States and a Permanent Organization of Middle East States for the promotion of the rule of law and amicable relations between these states, for the eradication of sources of conflict, and for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

This organization for Africa should include an African Court of Justice for settlement of justiciable disputes and provision for arbitration, mediation and conciliation in appropriate cases.

In recognition of the fact that the Arab League has under consideration the establishment of an Arab Regional Court of Justice for member states, we strongly recommend that such a court be formed as soon as possible in the interest of peace and for the promotion of the rule of law.

The organizations should be related to the United Nations and the courts to the International Court of Justice.

DECLARATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In order to establish an effective international legal system under the rule of law we declare that:

I. International law must be the supreme law of the world community and no person of state is above the rule of law.

II. The rule of law in international affairs must be based upon the principle of equality of all states before the law.

III. Founded upon general consent, international law must embody fundamental concepts of justice and human dignity of societies and legal systems, and the generally accepted customs and agreements of nations and individuals throughout the world.

IV. International law in a dynamic world must constantly evolve in the light of new needs and the contributions of new states.

V. A fundamental principle of the international rule of law should be that of the right of self-determination of the peoples of the world.

VI. Individuals, juridical persons, states and international organizations should, in appropriate degree, all be subject to international law, deriving rights and incurring obligations thereunder.

VII. All who are subject to international law should fulfill their international obligations and exercise their rights in good faith.

VIII. All who are subject to international law should resolve their international disputes by adjudication, arbitration, negotiation, or other peaceful procedures. The dispute settling method should be appropriate to the nature of the dispute. Generally, the legal aspects of disputes should be resolved by legal procedures and political aspects by political procedures.

IX. Judges on international tribunals must be professionally competent and free from political, national or other improper pressures.

X. International tribunals, although having no authority in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of states, should have the normal power to determine according to applicable agreements and international law the scope of their jurisdiction.

XI. Decisions of international tribunals should be enforceable by appropriate and expeditious international community action. National legislation should be adopted for the enforcement of the decisions of international tribunals.

XII. Those subject to international law must, prior to the application of any judicially imposed sanctions, be entitled to the benefit of third party adjudication.

XIII. Individuals must be entitled to effective legal protection of fundamental and inalienable human rights without distinction as to race, religion or belief.

XIV. The United Nations organization is the world's best hope for international peace under the rule of law and should be supported and strengthened by all possible means.

In order to effectuate and support the foregoing, this conference now therefore

[Resolutions of conference]

Resolves:

I. To participate to the fullest in the world-peace-through-law program by working toward world wide acceptance and application of the rule of law in international affairs, and to that end

II. To encourage individual lawyers and existing public and private international and national organizations and institutions to engage in a coordinated and sustained effort to seek agreement on the implementation of feasible ways of achieving world peace through the rule of law, and

III. To support the program of world peace through law by encouraging the formation and support of committees on world peace through law within associations of lawyers.

IV. To support the proposed World Conference on World Peace Through Law, and all preliminary action required for that conference.

In order to implement the foregoing resolutions, and recognizing the need for immediate and specific action, this conference now therefore

Program for world peace through law

Recommends:

I. That a planning committee for the World Peace Through Law Institute proposed by the preceding conferences be established and charged with the responsibility for preparation of a draft charter for preliminary organization to be submitted to the proposed world conference of lawyers, said charter including but not limited to the following functions and purposes:

A. To effectuate by every available means the decisions and recommendations of lawyers convened at the world conference.

B. To harmonize activities of lawyers and legal organizations in a cooperative effort to establish the rule of law in international affairs, including arrangements for periodic conferences to promote international understanding and the rule of law.

C. To stimulate, conduct and coordinate a continuous series of programs and activities to be carried on during the proposed World Rule of Law Year.

D. To undertake an intensive worldwide educational program designed to reach lawyers and citizens of all nations to make them aware that international law is already a living and constantly growing system of law which is practical and accepted; and to impress upon them the inescapable logic and vital necessity of fully establishing the rule of law in international affairs.

E. To create new and further develop existing systems for the continuous reporting and digesting of decisions of international tribunals, international agreements, and research or other documents of international law in order to create a readily available source of information for further development of the rule of law in international affairs.

F. To make awards of honor to states, public or private organizations and individuals in recognition of outstanding contributions to the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs.

G. To study and make recommendations with respect to development of the rules, principles and standards of international law defining and controlling use of armed force, subversion, economic warfare, politi-

cal propaganda, and defining the right of self-defense and reprisals, international sanctions, and other lawful means of countering aggression in international affairs.

H. To study existing national and international law with a view to developing recommendations for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development.

I. To further stimulate and help coordinate a global research program utilizing facilities of the Institute and existing national and international organizations to accomplish objectives including but not limited to the following:

1. Expansion of knowledge of international law and its sources;

2. Identification of areas of common agreement which may be the basis of needed international conventions, treaties or understandings;

3. Definition of general principles of law recognized by nations generally which can form the foundation for an improved international legal system and harmonization of different conceptions of international law;

4. Drafting of model codes and recommendations dealing with subjects of international concern, including:

a. International investment, to safeguard adequately the interests of both the capital importing and the capital exporting nations;

b. International trade, especially in commodities and raw materials, to protect the legitimate interests of both consumers and producers, and of both importing and exporting nations;

c. Outer space, to assure its development in accordance with principles of the rule of law and removing it from international politics;

d. Nuclear test suspension coupled with inspection, to adequately provide security against possible violations, while simultaneously assuring inspected countries that their internal security would in no way be violated;

e. International arbitration, public or private including a model clause compromise;

f. International arms control and disarmament;

5. Work on unification and harmonization of law in fields such as commercial documents in which unification or harmonization is practicable and desirable;

6. Engaging in a comprehensive study of existing judicial and nonjudicial international legal disputes, and of proposals for creation of regional and specialized international tribunals, taking into account varying and common legal, economic, cultural, and political interests of nations;

J. To seek proper financing for all the above and other appropriate approved endeavors of the legal profession of the world aimed at creating and strengthening the legal system, and rules of law required to achieve and maintain world peace; seeking to include grants in aid of research and other projects undertaken or to be undertaken by law schools and other bodies throughout the world.

K. To seek consultative status to the Economic and Social Council under article 71 of the United Nations Charter.

II. That special committees be constituted and charged with the task of preparing a draft convention on disarmament, a draft convention to end nuclear testing, and a draft convention on peaceful uses of outer space, said drafts to be available for the delegates at the forthcoming world conference of lawyers.

III. That special committees be constituted for the purpose of drafting agreements and conventions for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development to be available for the delegates at the forthcoming world conference of lawyers.

IV. That the lawyers of the world declare their support for and take action toward establishing a World Law Day.

V. That a world conference of lawyers be convened in 1962 with delegates from all nations in the world invited to attend.

VI. That the topics for discussion at the world conference include the following:

A. Basic principles underlying the rule of law in international affairs;

B. International judicial machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes;

C. Arbitration, conciliation, mediation, good offices, and other means of peaceful settlement of international disputes;

D. The United Nations and regional organizations as factors encouraging the rule of law in international affairs;

E. Facilitation of international commerce and economic development through international law;

F. The role of lawyers in development of the rule of law in international affairs.

VII. That the world conference consider designating a World Rule of Law Year during which a concentrated global effort of the lawyers of the world to advance the rule of law in international affairs will be undertaken through a coordinated program of research, education, and cooperative action utilizing all existing institutions and international and national organizations, and establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be necessary to effectuate the objectives and purposes of the world-peace-through-law program.

VIII. That there be established a global system of regional chambers of the International Court of Justice, from which appeals to the full Court would be permissible.

IX. That there be established a Court of Justice for African nations with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

X. That there be established a Court of Justice for Arab nations with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

XI. That in international matters, individuals, juridical persons, nations, and international organizations be permitted to be parties in appropriate cases before international tribunals.

XII. That the membership of the International Court of Justice more accurately represent the areas and legal systems in the world which are not adequately represented on that body, notably African.

XIII. That efforts be made to establish a series of specialized international courts and tribunals to operate under agreements reached between nations having a common interest in matters specifically assigned to their jurisdiction. These matters could include among other things, trade in certain vital commodities or other items; international investment, public or private; water rights and related problems; and international economic activities, carried on through the United Nations and international organizations.

XIV. That international judicial and arbitration procedures be further developed; that more effective means of enforcing decisions of arbitral tribunals be sought; that ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards be encouraged.

XV. That other means for the pacific settlement of disputes such as mediation, conciliation, good offices and investigation be resorted to when appropriate.

XVI. That all nations accept, on the basis of reciprocity, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

XVII. That the United Nations Charter be revised to take into consideration the fact that the new independent status of many nations of Asia and Africa has nearly doubled United Nations membership, and in particular, that the Security Council and Economic and Social Councils of the United Nations be enlarged to permit adequate representation of these new members.

XVIII. That a concerted effort be made to find ways of making maximum use of existing provisions of the United Nations Charter which can contribute to world peace and security under the rule of law, including the further development of a strong independent Secretariat, the courageous use where necessary by the General Assembly of its powers under the Uniting for Peace Resolution, and the continued development of effective United Nations Peace Forces.

XIX. That efforts be made to achieve uniformity of law, notably in the fields of negotiable instruments, international sales and international transportation; to obtain agreement on uniform rules in the field of conflict of laws for internationally important private law and to secure more effective judicial assistance and to obtain national legislation in harmony with these objectives.

XX. That the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly assume greater responsibility, in particular for assuring consideration of the legal aspects of matters brought before the General Assembly; and that the International Law Commission be strengthened and given more staff assistance, and that its sessions be lengthened.

XXI. That the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) should establish regional branches in different areas of Africa and the Middle East and thereby more effectively and rapidly aid economic development in the "developing" countries.

XXII. That a world community of legal scholars be developed through expanded programs of international exchanges; the community to include law students, practicing lawyers, judges and professors of law, and that universities be encouraged to establish programs devoted to studies concerned with world rule of law.

Conclusion

We delegates attending this Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law, pledge our full support of the programs and principles set forth in this consensus, and the exertion of every effort to realize the ideal of the international rule of law as our contribution to the cause of world peace.

ASIAN AND AUSTRALASIAN CONFERENCE ON
WORLD PEACE THROUGH THE RULE OF LAW,
CONSENSUS OF TOKYO, TOKYO, JAPAN,
SEPTEMBER 17-20, 1961

[Approved September 20, 1961]

We lawyers attending this conference being convinced that the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs will promote world peace hereby declare our consensus as follows:

I. Peace maintained through the rule of law in international affairs will assure a world society dedicated to justice and to fulfillment of the fundamental rights of individuals and nations. Thereby man may pursue in freedom and with equality of opportunity his legitimate aspirations for economic, social and political progress. To achieve these objectives organized law must replace organized war as the controlling factor in the fate of humanity.

II. Being gravely concerned over the threat of weapons of mass destruction and the hazards to mankind arising from existing international tensions and world disorder, we dedicate ourselves to the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs through an organized worldwide effort of the legal profession. We pledge our full and active support of the program and principles set forth in this consensus.

CALL FOR ACTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

As an immediate step to lessen world tensions, we call upon the 16th General Assembly of the United Nations now in session to request immediately of the International

Court of Justice advisory opinions concerning the following:

I. All legal questions involved in the Berlin crisis, including air corridor use, land access routes, and the walling off of East Berlin.

II. Whether any nation has a legal right to conduct nuclear tests and if so, subject to what limitations.

III. All legal questions involved in other crisis areas wherever peace is threatened.

We urge that the General Assembly request the nations involved to refrain from further prejudicial action until such time as these advisory opinions have been rendered and a legal basis for solutions identified.

We further urge that the United Nations immediately begin preparation of drafts on the following:

I. A convention to be signed by all nations dedicating the use and knowledge of outer space to the peaceful uses of all mankind.

II. A convention on disarmament to which universal adherence may be demanded thereby ending the ever accelerating arms race before nuclear holocaust occurs.

III. A convention laying down rules governing investigations and interventions by the United Nations in the interests of preserving peace, thus avoiding the misunderstandings arising from the lack of such rules.

We pledge our assistance in the drafting of these conventions and we urge the lawyers of the world to give their support to this effort as an essential part of the world-peace-through-law program.

TO GOVERNMENTS

We call upon the governments of the world to:

I. Renounce the use of armed force, political subversion, economic sanctions and defamatory propaganda for aggressive purposes.

II. Agree to resolve all disputes with other nations through peaceful means and to submit all legal issues to appropriate international tribunals.

III. Recognize the dignity of the individual and the protection of fundamental human rights as the foundation of the rule of law in the world community.

IV. Accept the supremacy of the rule of law over governments both within nations and in the world community.

V. End the ever accelerating arms race before it explodes by accident or design into atomic holocaust.

VI. End all nuclear tests under an effective inspection agreement which insures compliance.

TO THE PEOPLE

We remind mankind that:

Under the rule of law the individual may live in freedom, in dignity, and in peace. In the absence of the rule of law the individual becomes the subject of arbitrary power over all political, economic and social life. He lives under tyranny and apprehension in fear and bondage.

We therefore call upon the peoples of the world to support this program for world peace through the rule of law as the imperative of our day. In recognition of the power of public opinion in building a world of law, and to reverse the current senseless trend toward war, we further call upon all mankind to take the immediate and practical step of communicating to their government leaders and United Nations representatives, through every possible means, their full support of the above recommendations and the program of world peace through law as herein set forth.

DECLARATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In order to establish an effective international legal system under the rule of law we declare that:

I. International law must be the supreme law of the world community.

II. Founded upon the consent of its constituents, international law must embody

fundamental concepts of justice, human dignity and morality common to civilized societies. It must represent the generally accepted customs and agreements of all nations and individuals throughout the world.

III. International law in a dynamic world must be constantly adjusted to changing needs. It must take account of the special circumstances of newly emerging nations.

IV. Individuals, private organizations, nations, international organizations and juridical persons should all be subject to international law, deriving rights and incurring obligations thereunder.

V. The rule of law in international affairs should be based upon the principle of equality of all its subjects before the law.

VI. All who are subject to international law must fulfill their international obligations and exercise their rights in good faith.

VII. All who are subject to international law must resolve all their international disputes by adjudication, arbitration, negotiation or other peaceful procedures.

VIII. Judges on international tribunals must be impartial, professionally competent and free from political and other improper pressures.

IX. International tribunals, although having no authority in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of states, must have the power to determine according to applicable agreements and international law the scope of their jurisdiction.

X. International obligations, including decisions of international tribunals, must be enforced by appropriate international community action.

XI. Those subject to international law should be entitled to the benefit of third party adjudication before an impartial international tribunal before any judicially imposed community sanctions are applied.

XII. Individuals should be entitled to effective legal protection of their fundamental and inalienable human rights.

In order to effectuate and support the foregoing, this conference now therefore

Resolutions of delegates

Resolves:

I. To participate to the fullest in the world-peace-through-law program by working toward worldwide acceptance and application of the rule of law in international relations, and to that end

II. To encourage individual lawyers and existing public and private international and national organizations and institutions to engage in a coordinated and sustained effort to seek agreement on the implementation of feasible ways of achieving world peace through the rule of law, and

III. To support the program of world-peace-through-law by encouraging the formation and support of Committees on World Peace Through Law within their national or local bar associations, and

IV. To support the proposed World Conference on World Peace Through Law, and all preliminary action required for that conference, and

V. To support the proposed new international organization to be known as the World Peace Through Law Institute.

In order to implement the foregoing resolutions by specific actions this conference

Recommends:

Program for world peace through law

I. That the lawyers of the world declare their support and take action toward establishing a World Law Day, and

II. That a world conference of lawyers be convened in 1962 with delegates from all nations in the world invited to attend, and

III. That the topics for discussion at the world conference include the following:

A. Basic principles of the rule of law in international affairs.

B. International judicial machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes;

C. Arbitration and other means of settlement of international disputes;

D. The United Nations and regional organizations as factors encouraging the rule of law in international affairs;

E. Facilitation of international commerce and economic development through international law;

F. The role of lawyers in development of the rule of law in international affairs.

IV. That the world conference consider designating a World Rule of Law Year during which a concentrated global effort of the lawyers of the world to advance the rule of law in international affairs will be undertaken through a coordinated program of research, education, and cooperative action, utilizing all existing institutions and international and national organizations, and establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be necessary to effectuate the objectives and purposes of the world-peace-through-law program; and

V. That the world conference approve a plan to establish on a permanent basis a World Peace Through Law Institute which shall have the following purposes:

A. To stimulate, conduct and coordinate a continuous series of programs and activities to be carried on during World Rule of Law Year.

B. To harmonize activities of lawyers and legal organizations in a cooperative effort to establish the rule of law in international affairs, including arrangements for periodic conferences of lawyers to promote international understanding and the rule of law.

C. To effectuate decisions and recommendations of lawyers convened at the world conference.

D. To undertake an intensive worldwide educational program designed to reach lawyers and citizens of all nations to impress upon them the vital necessity of establishing the rule of law in international affairs.

E. To study and make recommendations in respect to development of rules, principles and standards of international law defining and regulating matters of aggression, including use of armed force, subversion, economic warfare and political propaganda; and also establishing the necessary community sanctions, together with the right of self-defense, reprisals, and other means of prevention of aggression in international affairs.

F. To study existing national and international law with a view to developing recommendations desirable for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development.

G. To create new and expand existing systems for the continuous reporting digesting of decisions of international tribunals, international agreements, and materials and research on international law in order to create a complete, accessible worldwide source of information essential to further development of the rule of law in international affairs.

H. To seek proper financing for all the above and other appropriate approved endeavors of the legal profession of the world needed to create and strengthen the legal system and law rules required to achieve and maintain world peace, and to make from said funds grants in aid of research and other projects undertaken by law schools and other bodies throughout the world.

I. To stimulate and administer a coordinated global research program utilizing facilities of the Institute and existing national and international organizations to accomplish objectives including but not limited to the following:

1. Expansion of existing knowledge of international law and its sources;

2. Identification of areas of common agreement which may be the basis of needed international conventions, treaties or understandings;

3. Definition of general principles of international law recognized by the community of nations which can form the basis and foundation for an improved international legal system;

4. Drafting of model codes dealing with subjects of international concern, including:

a. International investment, to safeguard adequately the interest of both the capital exporting and the capital importing nations;

b. Commodities and raw materials, to protect the legitimate interests of both producing and consuming nations;

c. Outer space, to assure its development in accordance with principles of the rule of law and removing it from international politics;

d. Nuclear test inspection, to adequately provide security against possible violations, while simultaneously assuring inspected countries that their internal security would in no way be violated;

e. International arbitration, public or private, including a model clause compromissaire;

f. International agreement on arms control and disarmament;

g. Unification and harmonization of law in such fields as are practicable and desirable.

5. Engaging in a comprehensive study of the best and most efficacious system of specialized international courts, taking into account varying legal traditions of different cultural and geographical groupings.

[Future objectives]

VI. That there be established a global system of regional chambers of the International Court of Justice, from which appeals to the full Court would be permissible.

VII. That there be established an Asian Court of Justice with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

VIII. That in international matters, individuals, private organizations, juridical persons, nations, and international organizations be permitted to be parties before the International Court of Justice and its regional chambers, and the proposed Asian Court of Justice.

IX. That the membership of the International Court of Justice be reconstituted to more accurately represent the many areas and legal systems in the world which are not now adequately represented on that body.

X. That arbitration procedures be unified and modernized, more effective means of enforcing decisions of arbitral tribunals be sought, that ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards be encouraged, and that a system of reporting and disseminating decisions of arbitral tribunals be established.

XI. That other means for the pacific settlement of disputes such as mediation, conciliation, good offices and investigation be resorted to when appropriate.

XII. That all nations accept, on the basis of reciprocity, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

XIII. That consideration be given to changes in the structure of the United Nations to allow it more efficiently to contribute to the maintenance of world peace and security under the rule of law.

XIV. That the U.N. Charter be revised to take into consideration the fact that since it was written the world has undergone great change; that the new independent status of many nations of Asia and Africa has nearly doubled United Nations membership; that the tremendous achievements of science and technology have produced new and complex international relationships; and that

the Charter is no longer adequate to meet the new and urgent needs of the peoples of the world of today.

XV. That the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly be given greater authority; and the International Law Commission be strengthened and authorized to meet continuously throughout the year.

XVI. That a world community of legal scholars be developed through expanded programs of international exchanges; the community to include law students, practicing lawyers, judges, and professors of law.

CONCLUSION

We lawyers attending this Conference on World Peace Through Law pledge wholeheartedly and completely to devote ourselves to the foregoing program to the end that the rule of law will govern all men and all nations so they may pursue their legitimate aspirations in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE M. Q. SHARPE, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this week the people of South Dakota were saddened and distressed to learn of the sudden and unexpected death of one of our truly great Governors, M. Q. Sharpe.

M. Q. Sharpe was an attorney general in South Dakota for several terms, and then was elected Governor. He served during the war years, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946. He had made a great record as a lawyer and as a private citizen. In fact, the confidence of the bar of the State in him was such that at one time he was designated to be a one-man commission to revise the South Dakota Code. He did a monumental work with such distinction and such fidelity that no one questioned his recasting of the several statutes and the codification of statutes, over the terms of several legislatures.

Not only was he a great attorney general, but also he was a great servant of the people of the State and of his country, serving as he did during the war years.

I recall particularly the work he did in connection with the authorization for the Missouri River program. Before he was Governor, in 1940, he came to the State capital at Pierre one cold winter day in order to testify at a hearing with respect to a resolution which I had offered in the House of Representatives directing that a study of the Missouri River be made. He presented there his vision for the development of the State of South Dakota which became a guide in the years which followed.

In 1944 he came to the Congress of the United States and here presented to the Committee on Flood Control in the House of Representatives, then under the chairmanship of the Honorable William M. Whittington of Mississippi, and in the Senate of the United States to the committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished then Senator from Louisiana, Mr. John H. Overton, the testimony in behalf of that authorization for a great and comprehensive program in the development of the Missouri River.

Mr. Sharpe was a man of intense concentration on any task to which he assigned himself, so great that seldom, if ever, did he take a real vacation.

It was characteristic of the sympathies and understanding of the man that in the spring, when the youngsters would get out to roll their marbles for the first time, this former Governor, this man who held high office, would always join the youngsters in rolling the first marbles each spring.

He had a great capacity for friendship. In a letter which he wrote to me on the 20th of June 1960, Mr. Sharpe said that he had had the pleasure of addressing the Last Round-Up Club at the stockgrowers convention at Fort Pierre recently, and that there he had read "A Cowboy's Prayer," by Badger Clark, our then poet laureate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in my remarks at this point excerpts from the letter by Mr. Sharpe, since it was written less than 2 years ago and expresses something of his philosophy of life.

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

I had the pleasure of addressing the Last Round-up Club at the stockgrowers convention at Fort Pierre recently. They have 52 actual members ranging in age from 70 to 94 and many of them I had known before. As the meeting had been opened by a prayer by Reverend Weirauch whom you know quite well, I decided it would be appropriate to close it with one which was the finale of my address.

So I advised them that I proposed to read the "Cowboy's Prayer" by Badger Clark and stated among other things that I had always appreciated the fact that Senator FRANCIS CASE sent it to me (which, I might say, we had placed on a Christmas card in the nature of a remembrance the yearend following the poet's death).

A nod of general appreciation went over that rather closely packed audience and I think they are going to make it kind of a continual close for their meetings hereafter. Next year they are going to hold the meeting at Yankton, I think because of its being centennial year and Yankton was the territorial capital. I was much gratified to be invited and, in fact, urged to come to that meeting and give some kind of an address and, if I do, I will probably use Badger Clark's "Cowboy's Prayer" again.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to conclude my remarks, Mr. President, by reading two stanzas from the poem. I ask unanimous consent that the entire poem may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The stanzas of the poem which M. Q. Sharpe read to the Last Round-Up Club at the Stockgrowers Convention at Fort Pierre, which he said was so accepted that they invited him to give it again at the next meeting, which was held at Yankton this past year, in conjunction with our centennial, are—and this was Mr. Sharpe's philosophy, as well as Mr. Clark's:

Let me be easy on the man that's down;

Let me be square and generous with all.

I'm careless sometimes, Lord, when I'm in town,

But never let 'em say I'm mean or small!

Make me as big and open as the plains,
As honest as the hawse between my knees,
Clean as the wind that blows behind the rains,
Free as the hawk that circles down the breeze!

Forgive me, Lord, if sometimes I forget.

You know about the reasons that are hid,
You understand the things that gall and fret;
You know me better than my mother did.

Just keep an eye on all that's done and said
And right me, sometimes, when I turn aside,

And guide me on the long, dim trail ahead
That stretches upward toward the Great Divide.

That is from "A Cowboy's Prayer." It was the prayer and the philosophy of M. Q. Sharpe.

Mr. MUNDT rose.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to join my colleague in the words of tribute to former Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota. Ted Sharpe, as he was known to his many friends, I believe was the hardest working man I ever knew. He spent strenuously long hours working as Governor. He spent equally long hours working as a lawyer for his clients.

As my colleague has pointed out, he also had a great capacity for friendship, an active sense of humor, and a warm personality. I recall that one time years ago, when I was discussing some of my experiences as a former member of the Game and Fish Commission of South Dakota, Governor Sharpe and I were speaking at the same meeting. I had paid a few words of tribute to the mountain trout, whereupon he arose and challenged me to a public debate on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator very much.

He challenged me to a debate on the subject, "Resolved, That the catfish has been of greater benefit to mankind than the mountain trout."

The position of Governor Sharpe was that the catfish provides great fun, thrill, and inspiration for youngsters who fish in rivers with a twig, a bent pin, and a piece of string, or some equally modest type of fisherman's gear. He also referred to the catfish as the exalted friend of the common man. The Governor added that the catfish and its second cousin, the bullhead, also provide necessary food for many people living in the vicinity of lakes and rivers in which these fish might abound.

My position was that the mountain trout provided a greater challenge to the fisherman and that you need to know more than a trout to catch one.

I have always regretted that the debate never came off, but I suppose I was fortunate, because the wager provided, and fitting it was, that whoever lost the

debate was supposed to provide his favorite fish as food for the entire audience.

That incident demonstrates that although he had a serious side, he also had the spirited friendship and sense of humor, to which my colleague has alluded.

South Dakota and the Nation will certainly miss him greatly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my distinguished senior colleague.

Governor Sharpe did have a great capacity for friendship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional one-half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall always cherish the fact that on the 1st of last December, when we had the 25th anniversary victory dinner in Mitchell, Governor Sharpe was among four Governors, present or past, who were in attendance. Many people said to me that one of the great rewards of that particular occasion was seeing M. Q. Sharpe in probably his last public appearance before as many representative citizens from all over the State as there took place. He enjoyed it thoroughly. The pictures which were taken at that time with him and with other former Governors will occupy a place of high regard on the walls of my office, as he does in the affection and hearts of all the men and women of South Dakota.

EXHIBIT 1

A COWBOY'S PRAYER (Written for Mother)

Oh Lord, I've never lived where churches grow.

I love creation better as it stood
That day You finished it so long ago
And looked upon Your work and called it good.

I know the others find You in the light
That's sifted down through tinted window panes,
And yet I seem to feel You near tonight
In this dim, quiet starlight on the plains.

I thank You, Lord, that I am placed so well,
That You have made my freedom so complete;

That I'm no slave of whistle, clock or bell,
Nor weak-eyed prisoner of wall and street.

Just let me live my life as I've begun
And give me work that's open to the sky;
Make me a partner of the wind and sun,
And I won't ask a life that's soft or high.

Let me be easy on the man that's down;
Let me be square and generous with all.
I'm careless sometimes, Lord, when I'm in town,
But never let 'em say I'm mean or small!

Make me as big and open as the plains,
As honest as the hawse between my knees,
Clean as the wind that blows behind the rains,
Free as the hawk that circles down the breeze!

Forgive me, Lord, if sometimes I forget.
You know about the reasons that are hid.
You understand the things that gail and fret;
You know me better than my mother did.

Just keep an eye on all that's done and said
And right me, sometimes, when I turn aside,
And guide me on the long, dim trail ahead
That stretches upward toward the Great Divide.

HELP THE FARMERS THROUGH BEEF PROMOTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Crago, president of the South Dakota Stock Growers' Association, before the 65th Annual Convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association at Tampa, Fla., recently delivered a speech which I believe should be brought to the attention of the many people in the Congress and others in the country who are interested in a long-term solution of the farm problem.

Mr. Crago supports a longtime thesis of mine that we must increase all efforts to expand the consumer market for our farm products if we are to meet the technological challenge confronting the agricultural industry today. It seems to me that new uses, new markets, and the industrial utilization of products of the farm are the ingredients from which we must find the enduring answers to our farm problems.

I commend Mr. Crago for his forward-looking remarks to this most important segment of our agricultural economy. For nearly one-third of a century we in Congress and the people in the Department of Agriculture have endeavored to solve the very real economic problems confronting American farmers almost solely by attacking the supply end of the supply and demand formula. Virtually 90 percent of our effort in legislative matters, and well over 95 percent of our appropriations in terms of agricultural help, have gone to the supply end of the formula during all these years.

As we all know, there are two ends to the formula of supply and demand. Since there are only two ends, I have always been curious as to why we have not spent more time, effort and money to work at least a little on the demand end of the formula, because if we can expand the demand, we can do just as much to get the formula of supply and demand in balance—and thereby increase farm prices—as if we should constantly work on the idea of shrinking the supply. In expanding the demand, we would increase farm income, whereas in unrelentingly shrinking the supply, we reduce the net income of the farmer and we weaken his position in our overall economy.

In 1961, the parity price received by the farmer fell from the disappointing level of 81 percent, which it attained in 1960 under Secretary of Agriculture Benson, to 79 percent, which now prevails under Secretary Freeman. In such an era we surely recognize that something constructive and novel must be done in order to solve the farm problem. We must try something new. Eighty-one percent was inadequate and 79 percent of parity is even worse.

As Senators know, I frequently opposed suggestions presented by Secretary Benson because I felt that they would not increase parity sufficiently. I

was consistently dissatisfied with the 81 percent of parity prevailing in 1960. Now, after a year of a new administration, with new personnel in the Department of Agriculture and with new programs, parity has dropped 2 additional points to 79 percent. The net result is that farmers are 2 percent worse off economically than they were under Secretary Benson. I think no one is satisfied with that situation.

I suggest that Congress and the administration devote some attention, pass some legislation and spend some money in trying to expand the demand for farm products by utilizing them industrially and by publicizing their virtues for food and as clothing. We have failed to try a host of programs which could be used to expand the use and consumption of our farm products. For far too long, indeed, we have neglected the demand end of the all-important supply and demand formula.

I ask unanimous consent that the forward-looking address by President Walter Crago, of South Dakota Stock Growers Association, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF WALTER CRAGO

It is an honor to represent, as president, the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association, and the American National Special Beef Promotion Committee. My name is Walter Crago. I have been asked to discuss the reasons the vast majority of cattlemen in my State and elsewhere favor a program of beef promotion.

The record shows clearly the average cattleman does want, and has wanted for some time, a beef oriented, voluntary, producer controlled, and producer financed method of telling the story of beef.

We have an organization, the National Beef Council, to do this one job. As you know, the American National has a stake in the birth of the National Beef Council.

A review of the obstacles the National Beef Council has had to overcome for survival, in the face of opposition from certain powerful individuals of the American National, in the last 7 years is discouraging and offensive. Details of this struggle are not the purpose of this report. However, let me say now very clearly: our cattle industry needs a dynamic, nationwide team working for survival and our benefit.

We know the American National, the National Livestock and Meat Board, and the National Beef Council on the national level are performing functions cattlemen need. On the State level, we have a few strong affiliates of the American National and Beef Council.

These national groups must become responsive to the desires of their voluntary membership. Our faltering, stumbling, action programs are largely the result of petty jealousy of men whose influence is out of proportion to formally adopted wishes of the people they represent.

We must improve the National Beef Council rather than destroy it. The American National long ago determined that the work of beef promotion is broader than its own ability to handle the job. Dairy interests, feeder interests, producer interests, and others on a wide geographic basis have rallied behind the National Beef Council and will continue to do so.

State beef councils and the National Cowbells have contributed the most work in beef promotion. These people have worked

hard on a project they believe in. Their numerical strength is greater than that claimed by the American National. We are convinced the answer is in teamwork among the three national groups, rather than the bickering of the past.

Weakening, compromising, or any action not of constructive help to the National Beef Council by the American National or any group professing to be the friend of the cattle producer, will be the death of our promotion program. We cannot, should not, and will not expect any underfinanced research and educational organization to be panicked or subverted into doing this specialized promotion job for us. The National Beef Council must depend on the National Livestock and Meat Board for basic research, and meat information and education.

All reports to the contrary, the National Beef Council has always supported the research and education programs of the National Livestock and Meat Board. It is not the intent of the National Beef Council to reorganize to include functions beyond the scope of its original purpose.

Cattle producers have been confronted with a proposal by consultants of the National Livestock and Meat Board. Now that we have for 7 years struggled with the problem of a beef promotion program and have begun to see real programs crystallizing, what are they asking us to do with the assignment of the National Beef Council?

The National Livestock and Meat Board is asking producers to abandon the 7 years of ground work and experience of the National Beef Council. The board asks for sole support of grassroots organizations now allied with the Beef Council which are presently supporting both the Beef Council and Meat Board. The Meat Board speculates a promotion program may be forthcoming with an increase of funds.

Past attacks and present confusion about the National Beef Council have cost the cattlemen of this country untold amounts of dollars. I for one am all through with the vested interests that sabotage and attack the cattlemen's beef promotion organization and program.

I am convinced, if as much money and effort had been turned in favor of the National Beef Council's program as the \$30,000 allocated in a research program resulting in a recommendation favoring a "marriage" of the Meat Board and Beef Council, effective beef promotion through the National Beef Council would be a reality.

The Beef Council, the American National and the Meat Board all need the individual support of many more producers. I hope you can see any compromise of the National Beef Council from its single mission of serving the total beef industry, through paid promotion by the producer, will put beef promotion into the hands of people who have not wanted and opposed beef promotion.

More confusion on this problem may put beef promotion into the hands of Government. This we must avoid. Beef promotion is a job for which we should stand totally responsible. Beef promotion is the work of the National Beef Council.

We hope you will help the Beef Council succeed.

As president of the South Dakota Stock-growers Association, I am proud that our State is the fourth largest in the United States in the production of beef cows. We are proud South Dakota has been near the top in financial support of the National Beef Council. Gentlemen, I am concerned over this fact. The American National has gotten farther away from beef promotion than anything South Dakota people stand for. The American National told each individual South Dakota member of this in individual letters last April. Today the

American National's individual membership in South Dakota has fallen to 169—I repeat 169.

Any organization struggles at times to exist. I feel the American National's proper role is to back both the National Livestock and Meat Board and the National Beef Council.

Should, in the future, the American National, its officers and consultants, push as hard to build the National Beef Council as some of our States have in building State cattlemen's organizations and beef councils, we are convinced 1962 will see a great stride toward our common goal: progress in freedom.

Gentlemen, we can if you will.

CONCERT OF FREE NATIONS TO DEFEAT THE COMMUNIST BLOC

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Senator BUSH, of Connecticut, is quoted with approval in the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate as pressing vigorously for a concert of free nations to work for the defeat of the Communist bloc.

I heartily applaud these views. They urge the same approach to a consolidation of the free nations which I have suggested in proposing an alliance for liberty, similarly constituted.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

SENATOR BUSH OPENS DEBATE

The great debate for the coming decade may well be America's relationship with the Common Market nations of Europe. President Kennedy has initiated the debate by suggesting, rather vaguely, that the way to solve the problem of American competition with Europe is to give him greater powers of reduce tariffs.

Senator BUSH and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, have taken the position that recent hearings by the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy have not shown a clear, convincing case for urgency in granting this power. They further suggest that tariff cutting is not the solution to the problem and that the administration is taking a too limited and narrow view of the entire situation. There are other problems in connection with the Common Market which deserve higher priorities, they say, than tariff cutting.

Senator BUSH asks if it is not time for the administration to broaden its vision to encompass all the problems which must be resolved before the free nations can effectively pool their resources to insure victory in the cold war. Like John J. McCloy and Senator FULBRIGHT, they ask if the time has not come to work vigorously for the formation of a concert of free nations within which all other freedom-loving nations could work for the defeat of the Communist bloc. Senator BUSH spells it out. He says, "Freed of the frustrations which beset the free world in the United Nations, it would accomplish much toward winning the cold war."

Senator BUSH would not abandon the U.N., but he points out that it is evident that the U.N. is an ineffective instrument for achieving the objectives which America shares with Western Europe.

In short, the U.N. has evaded the challenge of world communism to the freedom of man.

It is suggested that steps to this end can be taken under treaties already approved, and without waiting for unneeded congressional action. Both the NATO and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and

Development are available. The whole vast area of quotas, subsidies and controls must be considered, not merely tariffs. The problem of Japan and the developing nations and their exports play a part. Our whole agricultural setup of control and subsidy is contrary to the aims of the Common Market. The different policies of the free nations concerning trade with the enemy must be studied, as must the need for improving our own competitive position in world markets. These are the details and the problems which must be solved and which would not even be touched by the granting of more tariff power to the President.

Senator BUSH has started the great debate on a note of vision. His proposals are forward-looking, and, at the same time, realistic. We believe that the time will come for tariff cutting. When it does, Congress will perform its duty. Until then the Nation must be prepared for the big step. Our allies must be unified, the free world freed of the bumbling of the U.N., our industry modernized, so that, despite high wages, it can compete with Europe. The Nation waits hopefully for administration leadership in this direction.

SENATOR KEATING URGES TRADE VETO

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator KEATING has made a proposal for inclusion in the President's forthcoming trade bill. He has urged that the Congress be given the power, by a two-thirds vote, to veto major trade agreements and modifications negotiated by the executive branch.

Senator KEATING has given considerable thought and attention to this subject, and I was happy to read a recent column by Mr. Donald I. Rogers of the New York Herald Tribune in which he describes and discusses this proposal in some detail. I think Senator KEATING has made a real contribution to our understanding of the trade issue. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rogers' informative article appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that others may study and consider Senator KEATING's trade veto recommendation.

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

SAFEGUARD TRADE

(By Donald I. Rogers)

There is probably no term in the modern lexicon more vague than "free trade." Equally vague is what is intended as its opposite, the term "trade protectionism." In the former, what is usually meant is freer trade rather than free trade, a generally desirable goal.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, said in a recent speech in Congress very probably the most far-reaching single decision which the 2d session of the 87th Congress will be called upon to make is in the field of trade. "We must decide whether we are to go forward or to go backward," he said. "And it is not an easy decision."

What we need, Senator KEATING declared, is a sensible program that will permit an orderly progression toward wider trade contracts. Accordingly, as one of the leading Republicans in the Senate, he is lending partial support to President Kennedy's appeal for power to make across-the-board tariff cut deals with other nations or with international trading combines, such as the European Common Market.

Senator KEATING has introduced a bill, however, which, while granting such power

to the President, would retain veto power over unwise or precipitous decisions in the hands of Congress. It seems a sound proposal, one meriting the serious consideration of the Congress.

Frank in his endorsement of the President's proposal to broaden trade by eliminating or equalizing barriers, Senator KEATING is equally frank in outlining his reasons for wanting specific legislation giving the veto power to Congress. First, he believes it will expedite passage of the President's program and, second, he believes that Congress should retain a supervisory role over the entire scope of international trade.

In his introductory statement, Senator KEATING noted that, although the President has been talking about "across the board" authority, his state of the Union address referred instead to "bargaining by major categories." It makes a significant departure from his previous comments.

What Senator KEATING actually asks is that Congress be granted, by a two-thirds vote, veto authority to disapprove major trade agreements negotiated by the executive branch, assuming that the President does propose new legislation providing broader trade negotiating authority.

Such a policy should give the necessary administrative power to the executive branch and at the same time retain in Congress as much as possible of its constitutional authority in trade matters.

There is, of course, the possibility that the President, in drafting his own proposal, will incorporate the provisions Senator KEATING suggests. This might be termed "assurance type" legislation that Senator KEATING advocates.

Under his bill congressional disapproval would have to be expressed within 60 days. Before expiration of this period, both Houses of Congress, by two-thirds vote, would have to adopt concurrent resolutions disapproving a specific trade agreement, or it would go into effect as negotiated by the executive branch.

This seems to be not only a necessary but a reasonable safeguard. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution does give Congress power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises." Any circumvention of that power that may be deemed necessary because of the developing conditions in world trade should at the same time seek to preserve the constitutional concept that is part of the legislative branch's heritage.

There is every likelihood that the Common Market may expand into a considerable threat to the American economy, and that, as a result, expeditious action on tariffs would be warranted. It is probable, therefore, that the President will be given a great deal more tariff adjusting authority than he has had under the reciprocal trade agreements law.

In truth, however, it is hard to imagine any emergency in the area of world trade which would justify Congress surrendering to the White House dictatorial powers over the duties on imports and exports.

Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, Congress, by a two-thirds vote, may override the President's rejection of a Tariff Commission recommendation for escape-clause action.

Thus, Senator KEATING's bill is nothing more than an extension of this same authority (as outlined in the Constitution) to the newest proposition for dealing with the intricacies of international trade. It appears to be sound and logical corollary to the President's program.

PROPOSED MERGER OF AMERICAN AND EASTERN AIR LINES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a proposed merger between American and Eastern Air Lines—two giants

of airline industry—raises questions as to whether either the public interest or the industry's economic problems are to be helped. The merger might aggravate the competitive imbalances and increase, rather than diminish, the problems of the industry.

The size of the proposed company seems to warrant most careful study and consideration by the appropriate congressional committees and the regulatory agencies of the executive department.

I would certainly urge such consideration.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JUDGE R. JASPER SMITH

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, all Missouri was saddened recently at the death of R. Jasper Smith of the U.S. District Court of the Western District of Missouri.

He was an outstanding legislator and student of the law; and his short term on the bench was a distinguished one.

Mr. President, the Kansas City Star recently carried an editorial that is representative of the feeling of Judge Smith's many friends. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Kansas City Star of January 9, 1962, entitled "Judge R. Jasper Smith," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

JUDGE R. JASPER SMITH

R. Jasper Smith, chief judge of the U.S. district court here, had the reputation as an outstanding jurist although he had been on the bench only since 1956. His death at the age of 53 cuts short what undoubtedly would have been an even more distinguished judicial career.

But R. Jasper Smith long ago achieved a high place as a student, analyst and originator of law. As a Republican State senator for 12 years he was known as the man who could tie the senate into knots—or untie it—virtually at will. He was a master of parliamentary procedure who seldom spoke from the floor but whose knowledge of the law was respected by members of both parties.

In the senate he had been majority and minority floor leader and chairman of the judiciary committee. For years he served with distinction as a member of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. He wrote the legislation that set up the magistrate court plan in Missouri, replacing the old justice of the peace system.

Off the bench or away from the senate floor, Jasper Smith was a humorous conversationalist who loved to discuss interesting legal cases and odd bits of legislation. But his mind never wandered far from the legal processes, whether he was making law as a legislator or interpreting it as a Federal judge.

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on July 13 last year President Kennedy sent to Congress a draft of a water resources planning bill intended to bring about the planning of major river basins of the United States by the year 1970.

The President's bill was in response to the recommendation of our own Senate Select Committee on Water Resources

chaired by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, which recommended:

The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins in the United States.

The select committee also recommended a 10-year program of grants to the States to stimulate their water resources planning and to assist them in participating in the development of plans for the major rivers.

President Kennedy's bill, which I introduced as S. 2246, is a splendidly conceived proposal to achieve much desired objectives. Title I of the bill establishes a Federal Water Resources Council, which will help coordinate the water resources activities of the various Federal agencies. It is to be composed of the Secretaries of the Interior, Army, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare. Title II of the bill provides for the establishment of planning commissions, appointed by the President and including representatives of the States involved, to develop plans for the water and related resources of each major river basin. Title III is the grant program as recommended by the Senate select committee.

The report of the Senate select committee showed that five major basins in the western part of the United States would be short of water by 1980 and three more will be short, including the Great Lakes States from Michigan west, by the year 2000 if our population increases at a medium rate.

We have been struggling since New Deal days to find a governmental mechanism, satisfactory to the Federal Government, the States, and the many subordinate agencies involved in water resources development and management through which we can successfully harness the capacities of everyone involved to achieve planning and subsequent optimum development of our increasingly scarce water supplies. Several patterns, or mechanisms, have been suggested and have either been defeated or proved unworkable. The present proposal, in which the President has closely followed the recommendations of the Senate select committee, is the most hopeful yet made.

In order to expedite action on this pressing problem the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works jointly held hearings last July 26 and August 16 on S. 2246, which was the President's bill. The bill was given a great deal of support from citizens, various organizations and representatives of State governments who were nearly unanimously in favor of the grant program. There was opposition from two or three national organizations consistently opposed to progressive measures.

The Interstate Commission on Water Resources for the Council of State Governments was unable to complete its survey of State views on the measure at the time of the hearing. This work is to be completed in mid-February. The Interior Committee has consequently

set a new hearing on February 16 to permit the Interstate Commission to present its final views and recommendations on the bill. If there are others who now wish to be heard on the measure the committee will attempt to hear them at the same time. They should notify the clerk of the committee of their desire to be heard.

It is the desire of the Interior Committee to have all constructive views, criticisms and suggestions in regard to the bill. At the same time, we hope to handle it expeditiously. The chairman of the House Interior Committee has assured me that it will be handled as rapidly as possible by his group.

We will have few bills of greater importance before the Congress in the present session. The increasing threat and pressure of water shortages makes it imperative that we get our house in order to deal wisely and effectively with water problems.

In announcing this early supplemental hearing on S. 2246 on February 16, I want to assure the Senate that every effort will be made in the Interior Committee to get the matter to the floor promptly and help to make the enactment of a Water Resources Planning Act one of the major accomplishments of the Senate and the Congress in the present session.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK IN NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1760, which I believe is the unfinished business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1760) to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes.

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE IN THE CONGO

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, before Congress adjourned last September, I took the floor several times to express misgivings about the course of events in the Congo and about our policy or lack of policy in this critically important area of the world.

I was troubled over the dangerous degree of leftist influence in the coalition government which was established at the so-called Louvanium Conference in early August of last year.

I was troubled by the evidence that, while we were footing the bill for the lion's share of the U.N. operation in the Congo, we had very little to say about U.N. policy in the Congo; that this policy was in fact controlled by the Afro-Asian bloc and, in particular, by Nehru's unspeakable Minister of Defense, Krishna Menon, a man who has justly come to be regarded as the personification of cryptocommunist.

I was disturbed, above all, by the U.N. military action of last September, and by the grave implications of this action for the future of the U.N. and for the future of the Western alliance.

Toward the end of last November, as my colleagues know, I visited the Congo, where I had extensive conversations with Prime Minister Adoula, President Tshombe, and members of their respective governments. Since there has been a good deal of misinformation about the purpose of my visit and about what transpired during the course of my visit, I think it might be useful, first of all, to set the record straight.

There have been some reports in the press to the effect that I had gone to the Congo against the opposition of the Department of State; that I had encouraged President Tshombe to hold out for complete independence; and that I had told him that American policy in the Congo was misdirected because there were Communists in the Department of State.

The real truth is that a major part of my purpose in going to the Congo was to try to explore the possibilities of a Tshombe-Adoula agreement in informal discussions with the two leaders.

I left for the Congo on November 21. On Monday morning, November 20, President Kennedy asked me to come to his office. We talked about the Congo situation for almost an hour. The President expressed the hope that I could help to arrange a meeting between Tshombe and Adoula.

I told the President that I would make every effort to bring about such a meeting. And the record shows that I did precisely that.

As a final commentary on the misrepresentations that have appeared in the press, I want to read the text of the letter I received on January 10 from Secretary of State Rusk.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: Reference is made to our recent telephone conversation and to your subsequent telegram of January 4, pointing out certain statements made in a newspaper column to the effect that the administration had opposed your recent visit to the Katanga, and that an official of the Department had reported that you had made certain remarks with respect to Communist infiltration in the Department of State to Mr. Tshombe.

I am happy to set the record straight with respect to both of these matters. The administration did not oppose your visit. We feel that your efforts to assist in bringing about the meeting between Mr. Tshombe and Mr. Adoula, which led to the Kitona Agreement, were beneficial. We have found no evidence that a Department official reported that you had discussed with Mr. Tshombe the question of communism in the State Department. Indeed, our Embassy in Léopoldville reports that U.S. representatives who were with you during your conversations state clearly that you did not mention this question.

I hope very much that this letter will clarify the questions that have been raised.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

At a later date, I plan to report to my colleagues in greater detail on what I saw and learned in the Congo. As of this moment, I feel that a frank and detailed presentation may have an adverse

effect on the delicately poised political situation in the Congo and on the critical discussions which are still going on between the central government in Léopoldville and the Government of Katanga.

It is because of this that I have taken the stand that the hearings now proceeding under the separate auspices of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Foreign Relations Committee, should be held in executive sessions.

But I believe there are certain aspects of the situation in the Congo which cry out for immediate consideration and understanding. It is to these aspects that I plan to address myself briefly today.

There has been a tendency to justify the U.N. military action against Katanga on the grounds that this action produced the Kitona agreement, that the Kitona agreement has laid the foundation for Congolese unity, that it has undermined the extremists and fortified the moderates in the central government.

Gizenga and Gizengism, we are told, are now dangers of the past.

It is my profound wish that the prospect were really so cheerful and so uncomplicated.

There are, as I see it, four primary dangers in this Pollyanna approach to the Congo crisis.

The first danger is that we will be lulled into a false sense of security concerning the extremist elements in the Leopoldville Government.

The action against Gizenga is to be welcomed. But even if Gizenga is eliminated, this will not, by a long shot, terminate the danger of communism in the Congo.

Pro-Soviet extremism in the Congo has always been a many-headed monster; and Gizenga is only one of many potentially dangerous elements in the Leopoldville coalition. He is not a member of Lumumba's party but heads his own smaller party, the African Solidarity party. As Vice Premier under Lumumba, he automatically laid claim to Lumumba's mantle when Lumumba died.

There have been other claimants to the mantle of Lumumba. Most notable of these is Christophe Gbenye, Minister of the Interior under Lumumba, later Minister of the Interior under Gizenga in Stanleyville, and again Minister of the Interior in the Léopoldville Government today.

Gbenye, who is even more responsible than Lumumba for the reign of terror in Léopoldville in the summer of 1960, told me proudly that he considers himself the legitimate heir to Lumumba as leader of the National Congolese Movement. Gbenye is a force to be reckoned with since he controls the largest single group of deputies in the Parliament, and the largest single group inside the Congo's gargantuan cabinet of 44 members.

When I was in Léopoldville, I was told that sharp personal differences had developed between Gbenye and Gizenga. Apparently, Gbenye was determined to

assert his undisputed claim to No. 1 position in the radical nationalist movement.

The vote of 67-10 against Gizenga in the Congolese Parliament does not signify a total victory for the forces of moderation. On the contrary, what it signifies is that the Lumumbaist bloc, under Gbenye's leadership, voted solidly to take action against Gizenga.

Gbenye told me in the course of our conversation that he was not a Communist and that he went to church regularly. I am prepared to be openminded about anyone and it is entirely possible that I was misinformed in stating that he had been trained in Prague. I told Gbenye that I accepted his statement that he had not been to Prague.

On the other hand, while I was in Léopoldville, I learned that Gbenye's newspaper, *Uhuru*, still pursued a persistently pro-Soviet and anti-American line; and I also learned that he had set up an unauthorized secret police force responsible to him personally, because the official sureté was under the control of Mobutu's father-in-law, Victor Nendaka, a confirmed anti-Communist.

During the December fighting in Katanga, I was further disturbed to learn that Gbenye had announced the dismissal of Nendaka and that this action had been countermanded thanks only to a threat of military action by General Mobutu.

When I first spoke in the Senate, I pointed out that according to the *Moscow New Times*, 23 out of 44 members of the Cabinet could be considered followers of Lumumba.

The Senator from Minnesota challenged this assertion. He said that only 14 out of 44 members of the Cabinet could be clearly established as Lumumbaists.

In reply, I said I found that this estimate was alarming enough, especially in the light of the fact that the Lumumbaists had secured for themselves the two central positions which Communists and their allies always seek in coalition governments: the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Justice.

When I was in Léopoldville, I was told that the extremists had gained considerably in strength since the coalition government had been established, that the balance was now very precarious, and that Adoula would find it very difficult to survive if he did not, in one way or another, solve the problem of the Katanga secession. Adoula's position may be somewhat more secure today. I hope it is. But, despite the welcome victory over Gizenga, leftwing extremism will remain a real and potent and highly dangerous force in the Congo for a long time to come.

I do not accept the thesis that Gizenga's downfall represents a complete and unmitigated defeat for Soviet policy in the Congo. In fact, on examining the history of the Gizenga affair, I cannot help wondering whether it does not give evidence of deliberate Communist design.

In the first phase, after the downfall and death of Patrice Lumumba, Gizenga, despite his personal weaknesses, was essential to Soviet policy in the Congo. The Kremlin was at that time playing the constitutionality game. Driven out

of Léopoldville by General Mobutu, they had no alternative but to try to establish a regional base elsewhere in the Congo. And so they took the stand that Gizenga, as vice premier, had, on Lumumba's death, automatically become prime minister of the legal government of the Congo. And they assigned their ambassadors to this so-called legal government which Gizenga proceeded to establish at Stanleyville.

In the second phase, after the Louvanium Conference, I believe that it served the interests of the Kremlin to have Gizenga isolate himself in Stanleyville rather than actively assume his duties as vice premier in Léopoldville.

The public outcry in this country and throughout the free world against the U.N.'s intervention in Katanga was as dramatic as it was massive. If Gizenga had been on active duty as Vice Premier during the fateful months of last November and December, if the U.N. action against Katanga had been undertaken in the name of supporting Adoula and Gizenga, I doubt that American public opinion would have tolerated our vote for the Afro-Asian resolution in the Security Council or the subsequent U.N. military action against Katanga.

With Gizenga absent and apparently defiant, the proponents of the Katanga action were provided with a face-saving rationalization. The Gizenga secession, they were able to argue, is a very serious danger; but in order to put it down, we have first to put down the danger presented by the Katanga secession.

The third phase in the Soviet approach got underway before phase No. 2 had run its course. The Communist bloc embassies, which had been driven out by General Mobutu, had now opened up shop again in Léopoldville. The constitution of a coalition government, in which the Lumumbaist bloc had massive influence, was a situation ready made for the proven Communist techniques of infiltration, corruption, and subversion.

At this point it was not utopian for the Communist experts, working from their embassies, to think in grandiose terms of taking over the whole Congo, including the precious and recently subjugated province of Katanga.

For such a design they do not need a mass Communist Party. After all, Cuba has demonstrated that a very tiny crypto-Communist nucleus can succeed in capturing control of a nationalist movement in countries far more sophisticated than the Congo.

At the point where they began thinking in these terms, Gizenga, for all practical purposes, ceased to be the Kremlin's No. 1 man in the Congo. He was not a spellbinder like Lumumba, nor did he have Lumumba's powerful national organization. On top of this, despite his unquestioned dedication to the Communist bloc, Gizenga was a man of unimpressive ability.

In this situation, logic dictated that the Kremlin should cast about for an alternative or alternatives to Gizenga, to be selected in terms of influence within the government, organizational facilities, and demonstrated capability as a welder or wielders of power.

That the Soviets were preparing to ditch Gizenga has been apparent from a number of things over the past several months. What individuals or groupings they have now selected as their potential instruments or dupes, is something that we shall have to decide on the basis of a careful scrutiny of events.

All of this may sound too suspicious, too neatly packaged, to some of my friends. But I submit that this is how the Communists plan, and this is how they operate. They make a practice of looking far ahead. They leave little to chance. They have no scruples about abandoning their lackeys when it serves their purposes. They regard all setbacks as temporary and they react flexibly to them. And they are past experts at inducing the free world to believe that certain actions will serve the cause of freedom, when the fact is that they have been carefully calculated to serve the cause of communism.

In issuing this warning, I do not mean to cast doubt upon or belittle the personality of Prime Minister Adoula. I must say that my impression of Adoula surpassed my expectations. I found him an exceedingly able, thoughtful, and dedicated man, and I am convinced, from certain of his statements, that he is strongly anti-Communist.

I was also very favorably impressed by General Mobutu and President Kasavubu.

But there are dangerous men as well as good men in the Leopoldville coalition; and this is something we cannot afford to close our eyes to.

The second danger inherent in any blindly optimistic attitude is that we will take no measures to curb the extremists in the Léopoldville Government in their desire to destroy Tshombe completely.

The Kitona agreement can provide the basis for an agreement that has the voluntary assent of both sides.

But this will only happen if the further discussions between the Central Government and the Katanga Government are pursued in the spirit of good will and mutual concession.

If, on the contrary, the extremists in Léopoldville insist on interpreting the Kitona agreement as a document of unconditional surrender, if they regard it as a kind of first step in a "Carthaginian peace" which culminates in total destruction, then the consequences are unpredictable.

Perhaps an unconditional surrender could be enforced if we were willing to keep a U.N. army of occupation in Katanga for the next 10 years or 20 years.

But short of this, wisdom and charity dictate that we should strive for an agreement that has validity and durability precisely because it reflects a genuine mutuality of interest.

It is my belief that such an agreement can be achieved. It is my belief, for that matter, that such an agreement could have been achieved without all the bloodshed and violence and hatred engendered by the U.N. action.

But the consummation of an agreement based on true assent will require far greater willingness than the Adoula government has thus far displayed to compromise.

It will require that we direct our pressure and influence toward both sides with equal energy, instead of exerting pressure on Tshombe only.

It will require that we unbend from our own rigidly negative attitude toward Tshombe and offer him a few concrete manifestations of our own good will.

Above all, it will require that we attempt to avoid the substitution of a Gbenye-Adoula coalition directed against Tshombe for the previous Gizenga-Adoula coalition which, by its very nature, was also directed against Tshombe.

The third danger in the Congo situation relates to the second.

Because it has concentrated 9,000 of its 15,000 troops as an army of occupation in Katanga, the U.N. has not been able to do an adequate job of maintaining public order in the rest of the Congo.

Worse than this, there is now serious evidence that the U.N., in its desire to exercise political pressure on Tshombe, has encouraged and facilitated the movement of Gizengaist troops into north Katanga.

In doing so, the U.N. has brought the chaos and bloodshed of the north Congo into areas where there was complete public order so long as they were administered by the Tshombe government.

In the Congo, everything depends upon public order and upon the maintenance of race relations.

The mayhem and rape and pillaging that accompanied the army mutiny in July of 1960 resulted in the exodus of almost 50 percent of the white technicians and administrators from the country.

Most of the Congolese army have remained in a permanent state of mutiny since that time, looting stores and banks and terrorizing the populace, both black and white. With the exception of a few disciplined units, the national Congolese army has been the chief source of national insecurity in the Congo and the prime promoter of chaos.

The scale of the chaos in the northern Congo is already terrifying enough.

In the cities, the U.N. has been able to maintain order and a semblance of social organization.

But in the jungle villages which make up most of the Congo, the bush hospitals and dispensaries and agricultural stations are closed and the doctors and missionaries have left. The jungle villages have gone back 80 years to the control of the witch doctors and sorcerers.

Tin production is down to 50 percent of prewar level; cotton production down to 30 percent; rice production down to 25 percent. And with each new massacre or racist incident, there is another exodus of white technicians and doctors and advisers—and the economy and social order of the Congo spiral down another turn, in the direction of complete chaos and an eventual Communist takeover.

In the northern Congo, the U.N. has unquestionably done some good in maintaining public order. But it has never acted to disarm the bandit army units, nor has it, until very recent days, taken

any action against units owing allegiance to Antoine Gizenga.

It even failed to take action against the Gizengaist troops responsible for the massacre of the Italian airmen at Kindu.

The last few days has brought several indications that the U.N., at long last, is beginning to give some attention to the bandit army units that have been terrorizing north Katanga. But prior to this there was evidence that the U.N. forces in the Congo had provided transportation and connived with the Gizenga units that have in recent months invaded Katanga.

The situation is a complicated one because all of these units, at least theoretically, belong to the National Congolese Army and are under the control of the Léopoldville Government.

The Léopoldville Government, in fact, has appointed Vice Premier Jason Sendwe as administrator for the liberated areas in north Katanga.

Whenever news has arrived of the occupation of another town by units of the so-called National Congolese Army, the Léopoldville Government has been prone to accept responsibility for the "liberation." But whenever news has arrived of atrocities committed by these units, no time has been lost in making it clear that the units responsible for these atrocities were under Gizenga's personal influence.

The north Katanga town of Albertville was captured by units of the National Congolese Army in mid-November.

Tshombe charged publicly that the U.N. had disarmed his units there and had provided transportation for the invading forces. The London Daily Telegraph carried a detailed account of how the U.N. transported the National Congolese Army troops.

These charges the U.N. denied.

But the fact is that the two U.N. officials, Dr. Conor Cruise O'Brien and George Ivan Smith, had flown to Albertville and were on hand to greet the "liberating" army when it arrived.

Twenty-four hours later, the so-called army of liberation was rampaging through the streets, attacking whites, pillaging and raping. A large part of the white population fled from Albertville as a result of these terrorist acts.

Under the Tshombe administration, Albertville was a peaceful, prosperous city, where white people lived in harmony with blacks.

Today, I have been told, it is an economic desert, where race relations have been poisoned for many years to come by the terrible events that took place under Dr. Conor Cruise O'Brien's "liberation."

While I was in Léopoldville, I received through the Embassy, a telegram from the Indian U.N. commander in Albertville, which read, almost verbatim: "I invite you to visit Albertville so you may see with your own eyes how effectively the U.N. forces are maintaining public order there while the National Congolese Army continues its advance into northern Katanga."

The consequences of the advance of the National Congolese Army into northern Katanga, as we all know now, was the terrible massacre of 20 Catholic

missionaries in the town of Congola, and the probable massacre of another five missionaries and their assistants in the town of Sola.

That the U.N. has provided transportation for at least some of the invading Gizengaist forces is now a matter of public admission. A long dispatch in the Washington Post on January 14 contained this significant paragraph:

Diplomatic sources today revealed a closely guarded secret: that it was United Nations aircraft which transported Gizenga's forces to north Katanga 2 weeks ago in response to his request. The U.N. apparently wisely calculated that, with only the rump of his army left in Stanleyville, Gizenga would be vulnerable to Adoula pressure.

I wonder how the massacred missionaries of Congola would feel about this purported stratagem. I also wonder whose decision it was to move more Gizenga troops into north Katanga 6 weeks after the animal quality of these troops had been revealed by the rape of Albertville and by the terrible massacre of the 13 Italian airmen at Kindu.

The events that have taken place since the military "liberation" of northern Katanga got underway in mid-November, raise several important questions.

That the U.N. has welcomed and encouraged the invasion as an instrument of pressure on Tshombe is a matter of record. That the central government claimed responsibility for the "liberation" at several different points is also a matter of record.

But was the invasion ordered by Antoine Gizenga in his capacity as Vice Premier? Or was it ordered by Gen. Victor Lundula, who, as commander in chief of the Gizenga forces under the Stanleyville regime, is still supposed to be in command of the Stanleyville units that have been moving into northern Katanga and Kivu provinces? This question is all the more important because the newspapers are now publicly discussing the possibility that General Lundula may be appointed Minister of Defense in the Adoula government.

In asking this question, I do not mean to condemn General Lundula, or to close the door to him because he once displayed the bad judgment to serve under Gizenga. General Lundula is a brave officer, and it would be a blessing if he now truly realizes the dangers of pro-Soviet extremism and is willing to identify himself with the forces of moderation. We should let people like General Lundula know that the door is always open to those who have erred but who now sincerely desire to serve the cause of freedom. But we should also let them know that in the free world men are judged by their actions rather than by mere professions of good faith.

The final question I should like to ask is whether the State Department had foreknowledge of the plan to move more National Congolese Army troops under Gizengaist influence into northern Katanga. And if it did have foreknowledge, did it oppose the projected movement in the light of the unhappy experiences at Albertville and Kindu?

If it did not oppose the movement, then I say that we are at least indirectly guilty for the terrible massacres that

have been perpetrated by these troops in Congola, Sola, and other centers.

The fourth danger inherent in the Pollyanna interpretation of Gizenga's decline, is that the U.N. action in Katanga, because it appears to have succeeded, will be construed as a precedent for the future. Nothing, to my mind, could be more dangerous.

If the Katanga intervention is accepted as a precedent, it will sanctify the abdication of our foreign policy to the United Nations; it will open the way to U.N. intervention in the internal affairs of member nations; and it may commit us to supporting a whole series of wars that are favored by the Afro-Asian bloc and the Soviets.

If we had the virtue of consistency, the stand we have taken on Katanga would have led us to propose that the United Nations should be authorized to intervene militarily, upon the request of any central government, to prevent the secession of any national minority or grouping. Had such a principle been incorporated into the U.N. Charter or adopted as a general resolution, the U.N. would have been involved in half a dozen wars in recent years. It would have intervened to prevent the separation of Pakistan from India, of Sudan from Egypt, of Syria from the United Arab Republic, of Senegal from the Mali Federation, and of Mauritania from Morocco.

How preposterous our position in Katanga really is becomes apparent the moment you attempt to convert this position into a general principle. And, if our position in Katanga does not flow from any general principle, then it remains to be explained why we have decided to make an exception in the case of Katanga.

Morally, Katanga had every right to secede, given the deep-rooted ethnic and cultural differences between the tribes of Katanga and those of the northern Congo, and given the incredible chaos and the serious Communist infiltration which exists in the north. From the standpoint of political realism, however, Katangese secession would certainly be inadvisable because it is true that a completely independent Katanga could not survive if the rest of the Congo went Communist. On this point I am in basic agreement with the State Department.

For that matter, Tshombe himself has never held out for complete secession. He has instead advocated a loose confederation, with the central government controlling currency, customs, foreign affairs, the army and other essential instruments of national policy, but with a very large measure of autonomy in other fields reserved to the member governments.

But, as desirable as Congolese unity may be, I remain opposed to the U.N. military action against the so-called Katanga secession. The mere fact that a political solution may be desirable does not lead, ipso facto, as some of our State Department logicians have argued, to the conclusion that the U.N. must be authorized to use military force to achieve such a solution.

I am opposed to the socially and morally unjust discrimination against

American Negroes which still exists in most of our States. But I would resist with all my powers any effort on the part of the U.N. to terminate this state of affairs by sending Ghurka and Ethiopian troops into Little Rock or Washington or Hartford. This is the internal business of the United States; and any attempt to give the U.N. authority over the internal affairs of this Nation or other nations would, as I see it, spell its doom.

That is why I am so concerned over the U.N. action in the Congo. Because, despite all the pious statements to the contrary, it unquestionably did constitute intervention in the affairs of the Congo in an attempt to impose by military force a political solution advocated by the Afro-Asian nations, the Communist bloc, and, regrettably, by the United States.

There are those who regard the U.N.'s action in Katanga with joy, hailing it as proof that the U.N. is at last beginning to function in its proper role as a "parliament of man." I wonder if they have ever thought through the implications of this position.

If we permit the Katanga action to be regarded as a precedent, we may soon find ourselves supplying and footing the bill for U.N. military actions all over the world that have been duly authorized by a Communist bloc-Afro-Asian coalition in the General Assembly.

Mr. President, in the interest of the Congo, in the interest of the United Nations, the U.N. operation in the Congo must return to the path of legality and propriety. It must return to its primary functions, which are the maintenance of public order, the maintenance of social services, the safeguarding of human life, and the conciliation of disputes.

There are other grave lessons to be learned from the tragedy of the Congo.

Perhaps the chief lesson to be learned is that when we abdicate control of our foreign policy to the uncertain mercies of the U.N., we get our friends into a mess, we get ourselves into a mess, and we get the U.N. into a mess.

I believe that to a large extent the errors of which we have been guilty have stemmed from misinformation and lack of information. I have been amazed, for example, to discover how fastidiously the State Department has ignored the information submitted by American missionaries of various denominations who have until recently worked in the Congo or are still working there today.

I met some 30 or 40 of these missionaries while I was in the Congo. To my thinking, missionaries are an important and proper source of information, especially in a primitive country. Not merely are they honest, dedicated men without any political axe to grind, but their vocation gives them a unique opportunity to live with the people, to learn their languages, and to understand their psychology. To my thinking, in fact, a man like the Methodist missionary, Howard Brinton, who has spent most of his 43 years in the Congo and who speaks three native languages like a native, has an infinitely greater understanding of the Congo than a State Department desk

officer who may have spent 1 year somewhere in Africa.

I hope that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in the course of its current hearings on the Congo, will not neglect to take the testimony of men like Howard Brinton and Bishop Booth and the many other wonderful American missionaries I met in the Congo. I am certain that Congress will be interested in their evaluation of the situation in Katanga and of the terrible damage which the U.N. action has done to the delicate fabric of social order and race relations.

I note in passing that we once disregarded the advice of American missionaries in China, who tried to tell us the simple truth that the Chinese Communists were not really agrarian reformers. Instead, it was fashionable at the time to ascribe all such alarmist statements to the so-called China lobby. By the time we had rubbed this sand out of our eyes, China had gone Communist. I recall this precedent by way of replying to those who have in recent months raised the specter of a Katanga lobby.

I shall have more to say about the lessons of the Congo experience at a later date. But meanwhile I should like to say that I have no fear for the future of the Congo—on two conditions.

The first condition is that we no longer passively abdicate the conduct of our foreign policy in the Congo to Krishna Menon and his Afro-Asian cohorts in the U.N.

The second condition is that we pursue a policy dedicated to unifying and strengthening the precious forces of moderation in the Congo.

We must build this unity around the indispensable figures of Prime Minister Adoula and President Tshombe, whom I consider two of the greatest statesmen free Africa has yet produced.

There are those who hold up the bogie of a possible confrontation between the free world and the Communist world in the Congo if we reduce the U.N. role there. To them I say that if we are not prepared to confront the Communists in an area so remote from the centers of Soviet power, then we will not be prepared to confront them anywhere.

Once we decide that the Congo will remain free, it will remain free.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record at this point several letters and statements by American missionaries in Katanga, and a number of newspaper articles dealing with the events I have described.

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

EGLEISE METHODISTE,

Kolwezi, Katanga, November 29, 1961.

Senator THOMAS DODD,

Care of the Consulate of the United States of America, Elizabethtown, Katanga.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: My wife and I are missionaries under the board of missions of the Methodist Church of the United States of America, and are presently stationed at Kolwezi in the Katanga. We are Americans, both born and raised in New Haven, Conn., both teachers by profession, my wife having attended New Haven State Teachers College (now Southern Connecticut State College).

and I Yale University. We have been in the Katanga now for 1 year; our current assignment is with the educational and social program of the Methodist Church in the district of Kolwezi.

Like most of the American missionaries here in the Katanga, we have been deeply impressed by your efforts to bring about a change in the policy of the United States toward the territories of the former Belgian Congo. You have been a source of inspiration and hope for us during the last dismal months.

At the height of the fighting between the United Nations and Katanga forces last September, I managed to send a hurried message to my father in New Haven, in which I condemned the United Nations for preparing the way for a possible Communist takeover in central Africa. I asked my father to send copies of this message to a number of persons in the United States, among them you. Now that you are paying a visit to the Katanga, I am taking the liberty to express my views to you more fully, by means of this letter.

What follows is an excerpt, slightly altered, from a letter that I sent on November 24 to our supporting church, the Strathmoor Church of Detroit, Mich.:

"To begin with, the situation is appallingly complicated, so much so that few missionaries here—and certainly not we—feel that they can speak with absolute assurance. Nevertheless, it is true that most of the missionaries in the Katanga, along with the other whites, are strongly opposed to the policies of the United Nations. The U.N.'s resort to naked force in September was an action unworthy of the ideals of that organization, and one which ultimately will do it serious, perhaps even mortal, harm. Thus, even if we had no sympathy for the position of the Katanga Government, our concern for the future of the U.N. would oblige us to oppose the U.N. action here.

"But in point of fact we have a great deal of sympathy for the position of the Katanga Government. To be sure, it is far from being a perfect government. But you are not going to get a better government in any newly independent African country for many years to come. And you may get far worse. (You need look no further than the governments presently installed in Leopoldville and Stanleyville to get an inkling of how much worse.)

"There are two specific criticisms which crop up time and time again, and which seem to be uppermost in the minds of many of the Katanga's opponents in the U.N. First is the condemnation of the Katanga's secessionist move in July of 1960. No doubt, as the critics claim, the desire to keep the riches of the Katanga for the Katanga was a very important consideration to its leaders. It should be borne in mind, however, that at the time the whole of the Congo was falling into Communist-inspired chaos. By cutting itself off from the rest of the Congo, the Katanga did effectively preserve order within its own territory.

"The second specific criticism is that the Katanga is a puppet of Belgian capitalistic circles. Again, there is a bit of truth to this claim. The Belgian mining interests do exert considerable influence in the Government, as do individual Belgian advisers who have been placed in sensitive positions in the administration. But somebody has to help the Katanga to govern itself. There are simply not the trained, experienced leaders among the African population that every civilized country requires to run its affairs. As long as the elected African ministers retain ultimate control over governmental policies (as they assuredly do), then why should they not enlist the aid of Belgians in the shaping and implementing of those policies? Who could do a better job than the Belgians? This same argument holds with respect to

the mercenaries in the Katanga Army. There have been white mercenaries—Belgians and others. They have been engaged by the Katanga Government to provide certain needed skills in the running of the army. In comparison with the number of Africans in the army, they were but a handful of men. They may have helped to maintain discipline among the African troops, but they could scarcely have forced them to fight against their will.

"Now, admittedly, one could accept all my arguments thus far, and still advocate the continued application of pressures on the Katanga in order to force it into union with the rest of the former Belgian Congo. One might reason—as many do—that the central government of Joseph Kasavubu in Leopoldville needs the support of the Katanga in order to resist the encroachments of Antoine Gizenga's leftist regime in Stanleyville. Now we are on very uncertain ground. If Kasavubu's Government is so weak that it needs substantial bolstering to stand up against the Communists, then who can say that the addition of the Katanga will give that government the strength it needs? Isn't there at least an equal chance that the only result will be the needless sacrifice of the Katanga to communism?

"Thus far, all my arguments have been negative. Can one, you may well ask, present a truly positive case for the Katanga? I shall state my view succinctly: the Katanga, with its staunchly anti-Communist government, its quite successful attempt to build a harmonious multiracial society, its solid economic base, and its strategic position in the center of Africa, is one of the most important assets the West has in Africa right now.

"Let me hasten to add that, like just about everyone else, I hope that one day the Katanga will rejoin the rest of the Congo in a unified state. Right now, however, I think we ought to settle for a loose confederation, with provision for the placing of funds from the admittedly rich Katanga at the disposal of the central government, to be used in less favored regions. President Tshombe himself has agreed in principle to such an arrangement, pointing out that such a loose confederation was the stepping stone that the newly-independent British colonies in North America used in moving toward truly unified government.

"In the meantime, let me venture to suggest that, despite what the alarmists say, the rest of the Congo does not really need the resources of the Katanga in order to survive economically. Even without the Katanga, the Congo would be very well off, in comparison with other African lands. It has rich diamond mines, as well as sizable workings of gold and tin; it has fantastic hydroelectric potential at the mouth of the Congo River; it has a well-developed agriculture, including such export crops as coffee and cotton; it has large timber resources; it has a superb natural system of communications in the Congo River and its principal tributaries. But under the Belgians, the rest of the Congo became accustomed to being subsidized by Katanga copper, and of course it wants to continue with that arrangement.

"All of this may help to explain our dismay at the persistence of the U.N. in its campaign against the Katanga. Now that the U.N. has gotten into difficulty in the Central Congo, the pressure on the Katanga has been eased momentarily. But from recent pronouncements in the U.N. we judge that the ultimate aim of the U.N., to bring the independent Katanga to its knees, has not been altered.

"A goodly number of Methodist missionaries have tried to bring some of these considerations to the attention of the American public and of American policymakers. We have been gratified to read articles and edi-

torials in leading American newspapers and magazines expressing serious reservations about the U.N.'s policies in the Congo. But official U.S. policy seems changed scarcely a whit. The efforts of Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, and Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, both of whom have been in close touch with missionaries here, to point out the hazards of America's unquestioning support of the U.N.'s Congo adventure appear thus far to have been to little avail."

These, then, are some of our thoughts on the current Congo crisis. We recognize that we may be wrong, and certainly welcome any and all comers who wish to debate the issue. In any case, we are convinced that it is important enough to merit the careful contemplation of all Americans.

My wife and I extend to you our best wishes for a successful completion of your African journey, and for a fruitful continuation of your important work in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES BROUWER.

[From the Salisbury (South Rhodesia) Daily News, Nov. 15, 1961]

BISHOP BACK FROM STRIFE-TORN COUNTRY REPORTS FEDERAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT SEEN AS ONLY SOLUTION TO CONGO PROBLEM—SUBDUING TSHOMBE BY FORCE CAN HAVE TRAGIC CONSEQUENCES

SALISBURY, Wednesday.—Any attempt by the United Nations or the Congolese Central Government to secure by force a unitary form of government in the Congo will lead on to tragic results, said Bishop N. S. Booth who is in charge of the Katanga, Kasai, and Kivu sections of the Methodist Church, in an exclusive interview with the Daily News this morning.

Bishop Booth who arrived in Salisbury from the Congo yesterday said it was vital, if peace was to be maintained in the Congo, that all those concerned should recognize that a solution to the Congo troubles can come about only through the establishment of a Federal form of government.

Bishop Booth said the widespread belief that the resistance of Katanga and its determination for the maintenance of its autonomy is due to European population is a mistaken view.

"The Katangan Government is definitely an African government and the decision to resist a unitary form of government is its own, not that of foreigners. Truly there are European advisers but the basic decisions are not in their own hands but that of the Katangan Government," Bishop Booth declared.

IMMENSE PROBLEM

Asked to state what he thought was the basic problem in the Congo, Bishop Booth said the Congo comprised 1 million square miles and about 14 million people whose ethnic grouping was as diverse as it was varied. "Even under the Belgian colonial rule, no attempt was made to administer these diverse provinces on a unitary basis because of the immense problem this would have brought about," he said.

He dismissed as false, "an apparently widespread belief that all the Balubas are anti-Tshombe. In fact, four leading members in Tshombe's government are Balubas," he claimed.

Bishop Booth said, however, that despite the diversity in the Congo's ethnic groupings, the whole Congo region should, and can, work together. But an attempt to force it would be tragic and the strong concentration of power in the Leopoldville government would compromise its success.

ENORMOUS SUPPORT

Bishop Booth said President Tshombe enjoyed an enormous support from many people in Katanga than is normally recognized. "He has built a strong, stable government

which is the envy of the confused Congolese central government," he said.

Dealing with the economic situation of the whole Congo, Bishop Booth said the economic interdependence of the Congo region is evident. The rest of the Congo needs the industrial development of Katanga, while, on the other hand, Katanga needs interior market of the Congo as a whole. "But I am satisfied that this economic interdependence can be possible under a federal form of government and not a unitary setup. On a point of fact, President Tshombe has called for this on several occasions. I think he is right and I am sure more people will realize, as time goes on, that his suggestion for political settlement in the Congo is the wisest."

Bishop Booth leaves this evening for Nairobi enroute to India where he is to attend the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches. He was interviewed by the Daily News at the Methodist Church this morning.

COPY OF A LETTER SENT FROM MISS JULIA HOEL, AMERICAN SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST MISSIONARY, TO MRS. ROBERT E. BARTLETT, 2154 WOODWARD AVENUE, LAKEWOOD, OHIO

ELISABETHVILLE, December 6, 1961.

DEAR IRMA JEAN: Since I wrote last our plans have not materialized as I mentioned. Yesterday Dr. Schaffner (medical head of the mission), Ronnie, and I were ready to fly back to Songa (near Kamina) while Edith was going to drive her car up. Dr. Schaffner went to get Ronnie's road pass (no one can go from one town to another without one) and found the road to the (Elisabethville) airport blocked. A little later it was opened and the men from Leopoldville and Usumbura got through and went on their way. We went to lunch at Wentland's and while eating saw 17 truckloads of United Nations troops with machineguns and bazookas go by. Shortly after, the firing started.

In the morning we had been watching U.N. troops dig a fox hole across the road and called others from time to time to watch them put the guns in, and that may be the reason they fired on us with their mortars. When we heard the firing coming nearer, we came over here in the main building and took refuge in the corridor.

Edith and I have been staying at the Thomases, so was Elder Pierson, the president of the African Mission Board. He, Edith, and Elder Thomas went back over there when the firing let up a little, and we were just looking for them, when a bomb hit the bathroom and tore out the wall, and a piece flew as it exploded just over Elder Pierson's head and made a big hole in the door on the opposite side of the room. The ventian blinds were thrown clear out into the hall in a heap of junk. Plaster flew everywhere. They (Elder Pierson, Edith, and Elder Thomas) all came back quickly over here (to the main building of the mission).

While I am writing this, mortars are booming off from the United Nations camp. Mr. Wentland called Mr. Urquart and told him what his U.N. troops were doing. Urquart promised to do everything militarily possible to prevent another incident (bombing of the American mission). Just about that time the U.N. started firing into Wentland's home and the bedroom where Elder Torrey was staying was a shambles of broken glass and plaster. Elder and Mrs. Wentland were in the kitchen but they hastened over here after it quieted down a bit, with only a few mortar shots in the distance. Dr. Schaffner and Ronnie went upstairs to their apartment to finish packing. Then the machineguns started. Ra-ta-ta. So they lay down on the floor and continued arranging their suitcases. Then a mortar shell crashed out the wall between the two windows and exploded over them. It devastated the whole apartment and made such a cloud of dust for

awhile that they couldn't breathe, but lay there choking for air.

Windows broke out in the chapel below, and many holes were punctured in the three cars out in the garage. It was such a crashing noise that we all fell or slid down flat. (The U.N. forces are now booming their mortars overhead with returning shots from the Katangans.) Dr. Schaffner crawled out and shouted that he and Ronnie were all right.

Mr. Wentland called Mr. Urquart again and asked him why they were bombing American missionaries, saying that we had nothing to do with their war. Mr. Urquart was shocked and cursed the U.N. troops and promised again that he would order them to stop. The U.N. shot a few more times into the Wentland's house during the night.

While I was writing that, Mr. Urquart called and told us it had all been fixed up with the troops and there would be no more firing on us. He had no more than hung up when the U.N. shot into the main office with a round of machinegun fire.

We blocked all the windows with tables and boxes of books and put mattresses in front of each door leading out into the hall. We put more mattresses along the length of the corridor and sat on them singing songs and listening to newscasts until time to have worship and go to bed. Thirty-one of us in all. Nobody did too much sleeping but there was not a great deal of shooting during the night. (There goes some that are closer.)

We really looked a sight this morning all along the length of the hall when the lights went on. The baldheaded ones asked the rest of us why we didn't comb our hair.

We went over to Wentland's for breakfast, and two men from the UP and AP came out to see what had happened. They took telegrams to send out for us. The men are trying to make plans for us to get out, but it is not safe to leave in this firing.

December 7: I finished that (the above paragraphs) yesterday before lunch and had gone over to Wentland's for lunch. We had no more than filled our plates when the firing began right around us. Elder Wentland said we had better get down on the floor. Some of us got under the table and some in the corners. The shots flew by with a zing and many of them hit on the house and roof, and some came through the windows. We ate flat on our stomachs under the table. The bullets kept zinging with a whir close by us, so we decided to crawl into the bedroom where it was more protected. It was announced over the radio that the U.N. had shot off 3,000 rounds of ammunition. For over an hour there was such a barrage of machinegun fire, recoilless rifles, and bazookas that we did not dare raise our heads. Elder Pierson said for us to keep our heads down and pray.

You cannot imagine what the combination of all of them together sound like, if you have not heard it. After it finally ceased, a bit, and splintering glass ceased to fall, we got up and started to take another cob of corn or look around a bit when a bazooka hit the bathroom ceiling from the U.N. camp. It blew the roof off. It tore off the cupboards and hit the tub making a 4-inch gash through a pipe. Water spurted out in a small geyser and soon flooded all the floors and soaked up the rugs. They probably aim at bathrooms because of the small window that someone might be hiding behind. The roof hit Elder Torrey and Wentland on their heads, knocking down the former. We called him a couple times but he did not answer. We were really frightened but the third time he answered and came out with blood running down his face and on his shirt and hands. I made pressure on the bleeders till they stopped. A rafter fell in the bedroom where we had just been crouching. We were frightened to

move again till the people in the main building began to fear we had been shot, or injured in that last awful blast.

Fred Wilson came over to see if we were alive and then we gained courage to go over there again. I washed the blood off Elder Torrey and the doctor came to look at his wounds. There was nothing severe but he did have a bad headache the rest of the day and all night. We gathered together to have a thanksgiving service for having our lives spared. There have been a few shots and bombs from time to time since, but no heavy firing. Tshombe said in Paris that the United States is financing and siding this war in Katanga to appease the Communists at the price of the lives of many innocent people. What Adlai Stevenson and S. Williams said doesn't help out the Americans over here. In fact, it might close up missionary work. If we try to evacuate, it is doubtful if the Katangans will let any Americans across a roadblock. They have Hoffacker, the American consul, in house arrest already.

December 8, 1961, Queen Elisabeth Hospital, Elisabethville: Yesterday we did not go out of the building for lunch. (I wrote that and had to run to the bomb shelter here at the hospital.) I wanted to send out some cables but the telegraph office is not functioning. The day before yesterday there were many reporters who came out to see us from time to time to take pictures and interview us. I hope you get some report from it. They were wonderful to us and kept calling Urquart and the consuls. The former tried to tell us it was the Katangans who were bombing us but anyone could see that would be impossible with them just across the street where the big rifle shots and mortars were coming from. The reporters said that the more of it they went through with us, the more they felt like starting an anti-U.N. campaign. Fred and some of the others went into the front office and made the mistake of lowering the venetian blind. Immediately a shot came through the window. The men came tumbling out and we thought they were hit, but they weren't. Soon the firing increased and a bazooka hit the main office building, shaking the whole building. We saw a flash of fire and the whole front wall looked like it might collapse on us. The reporters all flattened out on the mattresses with us till it let up a little. Then they called the International Red Cross to come and take us out. They came, but were fired on, so they went back. Then a blast shattered a big hole in the apartment above, knocking out the door to the kitchen and breaking water pipes. The water is still running out there. The house was full of gunpowder smoke and dust. We crowded down further toward the end of the hall and put up a barricade of mattresses halfway down the hall. The journalists leaped up on it and over to call consuls and U.N. officials. They gave them a very straight report of what was going on and insisted that the U.N. do something about it. Thomas' house was hit again, ruining the whole building. Nothing was done about taking us out. Mr. Urquart said he would stop the firing on the mission if he had to go out into the foxhole himself. He must have had trouble getting there as it was getting dusk, and we wouldn't dare move around after dark. The journalists said they could not ask or advise us to leave because of the danger from both sides shooting at us. We decided to make a run for it though and they said they would take the lead. We started filling our cars when a bomb struck fairly close and we all leaped back through the windows and onto the floor. Then a little pause and Elder Pierson (though it sounded like the voice of God) said, "Let us get in our cars and go." We drove off with bombs still falling. I made room in the back seat for one of our faithful Africans and his small children.

Two more terrified workers came and they crowded back there, too, standing and leaning as they could. They wanted to stay there with us till the last.

Helen Devos went with me, too. We thanked God that He had kept us through the bombing and trusted He would keep us on our journey. We stayed close together as possible and heard only a few shots before arriving at the hospital. The white-robed priests came out to meet us and took us to rooms in the refectory where we slept on mattresses on the floor and ate in their dining room. We helped set tables and clean up as there were other refugees and their African helpers were afraid to come to work. There was no one to do the laundry either so Edith Amelle and I ironed priests' robes all afternoon. There were a few rounds of machinegun fire near by and each time we took shelter in a safe corner where the priest showed us, and he chatted with us there till it was safe to come out.

December 10, 1961: We just stayed in the refectory one night. The next afternoon when we were finished ironing the soutanes, we went back to join the rest. Leonard Robinson was negotiating with Tshombe to see if we could get a military escort to take us out. Fred Wilson took my car and went over to the native city to see our workers there. The natives were inflamed by Stevenson's speech in Washington (N.Y.) and demanded what tribe Fred belonged to. He knew better than to say he was an American but said he was a missionary. They were not satisfied, and grabbed the keys to the car. Another walked up and pointed a gun in his face and told him to leave. He said he couldn't when that other man had his keys. He said we were fleeing from the U.N. bombings of our mission and was trying to get some money to our pastors. Then they let him have the keys, but he had not driven far till another put a gun in his face and he went through the same experience. We could see that we hardly could hope to go overland because of the hatred that had been aroused against Americans. Mr. Pierson, Dr. Schaffner, and two others were praying that they would make the right decision while Leonard went to call President Tshombe. There was a call for him coming in, as he reached the telephone, from the American Embassy. They said for us to be ready to leave in 5 minutes and follow the leader without any comments. Elder Wentland was quickly packing his suitcases and snipped a bit of flesh off the end of his finger. He held it till it stopped bleeding, and a little later someone gave him a bandaid to put on it. He carefully bandaged the wrong finger and didn't know the difference till the next morning when he took it off. I think laughing over that one silly little incident has done more to brighten our outlook than anything else.

Just as we started out they told us we were going to the American consulate. We knew very well we could be shot if any of the Africans saw us going there. We took as circuitous a route as possible and turned on our parking lights only. The group the Schaffners and Wilsons were in was shot at but not hit. Everything was dark and gloomy at the vice consul's with only candles burning. Other refugees were there, too. Some woman sat down at the piano and played "What a Friend and How Great Thou Art." It was a lovely thing for her to do just before the most perilous part of our journey.

We were instructed to drive down to the Indian camp that had been bombing us for several days. By the way, the U.N. colonel said the reason they bombed us was because there were Katangans behind the building firing at the camp. (Note: Thus, the U.N. Indian commander admits he shelled the American mission with the missionaries in it.)

We thought they were, too, and that we were under crossfire, but it still doesn't explain to me why they had to aim their bazookas right in the building. They knew there were no Katangans inside. The first bomb that almost hit the doctor and his son was fired before any shot at all had been fired in the vicinity. The journalists could have told them there was no one in the building if they didn't believe us.

As we drove off, a Belgian man stood by the road and cursed Americans, telling us to get out. We heard that after we left he threw gas on Leonard's car and burned it. We hope that is not true.

We were to go out to the airport behind two immense armored cars, more like tanks, with recoilless rifles on top, and one of them to bring up the rear. It was really eerie with those horrible things in the darkness and the fear of death every minute. We drove out on the road where most of the fighting had taken place. We barely crept along, praying all the time. I thought to myself that to the Christian, death is a small matter and when we woke up we would see Jesus, and the thought gave me peace. Some of our party got out of the line and we felt it was sure death for them. They came to an Indian barricade and were really treated rough for awhile till they persuaded them to call headquarters on their phone. Amelle was riding with me and said she was so fearful the flesh was shaking off her bones. She said she didn't want me to think she didn't have confidence in me, but she did wish there were a man with us. Pretty soon Bob Osmunson went by and he gladly came in and drove for us. It did seem better to have him there. We crept along and stopped to check to see if all were there. We didn't know why, though, and expected to hear shooting. It seemed like the airport was never so far away. We went by the mission and looked at the gaping holes. Amelle said for me to open the door and let her go crawl under a mattress rather than take favors from the ones who had blown it up. (Note: They would have otherwise been dependent on the U.N.).

After a terrifying half hour we drove into the airport. They told us we had to stay there for the night. We slept on camp cots and sat on benches under the planes. We asked an Indian where the ladies' room was and he said we could go out behind one of the planes. (Note: In normal times the airport had ample normal facilities of this sort.)

December 10, 1961: The next morning they brought us down to Ndola in three trips in an American DC-4. We found the mission plane had been broken into and the doctor's camera gone. He patched up the window and later found it had been broken again while we were there and all the papers torn to bits on the floor. Elder Osmunson was going to fly it down but they could not get clearance for first one thing and then the other till the last trip was ready to start. He had to get in and leave our plane. The motors had started and were warming up for the takeoff when someone came banging on the door and said his clearance had just come through. He got out and went over to start it and found the microphone had been stolen and the emergency kit, too. He called the Indian colonel and told him he could not take off without a microphone. They found an old one some place and gave it to him. He came in just a little after the others arrived at Ndola. (Note: Indian troops were in control of the airport, and no one else could have done the thieving.)

We just thank God for His protection and mercies beyond number, that all of us reached here safely. It seemed in each advance step we took in our flight that He just opened the door enough for us to go through and it closed straightway behind us. Some have lost their cars and homes, but they do not complain. It only makes us

long the more for Jesus soon coming. May this hope burn bright in our hearts and nothing be allowed to come between us and our Savior and the peace it gives to our hearts.

Today we heard the Katangans went into our building and launched a heavy attack against the Indian camp. The water is cut off in the whole town and people are suffering from hunger. The hospital was bombed by the Indians and 700 patients fled including one woman they were just starting to do a caesarian section on. They have not seen her since. Dr. Schaffner left a man with a colostomy. He promised to close it as soon as we returned. The man begged him to close it then, saying that we might not come back and he would have to go through life like that. The doctor could not do it because he would have to be there to see if it would function after closing.

Lovingly,

JULIA.

THE BOMBING OF SHINKOLOBWE HOSPITAL BY UNO

Dr. Bekaert's report on the aerial attack against Shinkolobwe hospital on December 12, 1961:

"The fact that the Shinkolobwe hospital buildings are used for the purpose of hospitalization is indicated by an enormous red cross painted on the roof of the administrative block. This hospital is completely isolated from any other construction within a radius of 1,500 meters, except for the checkerboard pattern of houses in the settlement, the nearest of which is several hundred meters from the hospital.

"Upon arrival from Kambove with my medical team I was welcomed in the entrance hall of the hospital by families loudly lamenting their dead and by the wounded who lay there stoically but hopelessly.

"Two men and one child were dead. Four seriously wounded victims were evacuated to Jadotville and I took 10 more to Kambove. Several dozen other wounded were treated locally.

"The state of the buildings shows that the attack was very accurate—the more so because the air crews knew that there was no risk of any riposte. The wounded told me that at about 8 o'clock two pairs of low flying aircraft passed several times over the hospital.

"The administrative block, the left-hand row of four wards and the kitchen, dining and laundry building were attacked and hundreds of bullet holes bear witness to the machinegunning.

"In one of the wards—the maternity ward—four expectant mothers and a nursing mother were wounded, and a 4-year-old visitor was killed.

"The roof, ceiling, walls, beds, tables, and chairs are all riddled with bullets. The blood of the victims makes the place look like a battlefield. A bomb exploded in a second ward—fortunately unoccupied. The roof, ceiling, half of the walls, and the equipment have all been blasted.

"Thousands of bullet holes and bomb craters of all sizes in the buildings and equipment are proof of the attack against the other two wards, the administrative block and the kitchen-laundry building.

"The hospital, without water and electricity, had to be evacuated."

[Excerpt from the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 1961]

CENTRAL TROOPS IN BIG MOVE, KATANGA CLAIMS

ELISABETHVILLE, KATANGA, THE CONGO, November 8.—Katanga's armed forces commander claimed today that about 1,500 Central Congolese Army troops with 20 trucks were moving through Kivu Province toward Albertville, about 100 miles inside secessionist Katanga Province.

But Gen. Norbert Moke was unable to tell a press conference whether the troops already had crossed into Katanga.

Central government troops last week fought soldiers of Katanga President Moïse Tshombe as part of the Leopoldville regime's campaign to end the secession of the province. The clashes took place in north Katanga with the invading forces being driven back to neighboring Kasai Province.

Moke also said a group of Indian United Nations troops left Albertville yesterday and were allegedly on their way to attack the town of Kongolo, which has a pro-Tshombe administration.

He also said that the U.N. in Albertville told Katangan officers there today to support and obey the Central Government or face attack by U.N. forces.

Moke claimed several persons were killed in troubles between Baluba and other tribesmen in the Albertville area. He accused the U.N. of "supporting the Balubas and provoking the trouble."

Much of the Albertville and Kongolo area in northeast Katanga is peopled by Baluba tribes hostile to the Tshombe government.

Meantime, Congolese Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula told reporters in Léopoldville that all soldiers found guilty of a reported rampage and rape of white women November 2 in the Kasai capital of Luluabourg would be severely punished. Adoula had just returned from a flying trip to the panic-stricken town for an on-the-spot inquiry with Congolese army chief Gen. Joseph Mobutu, U.N. military commander Gen. Sean McKeon, and U.N. civil administrator Mahmoud Khiri.

[Excerpt from the New York Post, Nov. 16, 1961]

CONGO MUTINEERS SLAY 13 U.N. FLIERS

LÉOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, November 16.—The United Nations today announced that insurgent Congolese troops had "brutally murdered" 13 Italian U.N. airmen at the Kivu Province town of Kindu.

A U.N. spokesman said the unarmed fliers were shot by unruly troops shortly after their arrest last Saturday afternoon.

Some of their bodies were dismembered and hurled into the Lualaba River, the spokesman added, by soldiers who apparently suspected them of being Belgian paratroopers.

The 13 Italian airmen had flown into Kindu in 2 C-119 transports on a routine mission Saturday. Congolese troops attacked the airmen in the U.N. Malayan officers' mess, manhandled and beat them and took them off to the town prison.

Eyewitness reports to the U.N. said the men were shot before a crowd. When U.N. officials later confronted the local Congolese commander, he pleaded ignorance of the events and intimidated his men were beyond his control.

"You know how soldiers are," he reportedly told the U.N. officials.

The U.N. spokesman, George Ivan Smith, said the U.N. command was presenting "specific proposals" to the central Congo government for forceful action to investigate and punish those responsible for the murder and to prevent a repetition.

If the government response seems insufficient, Smith said, the U.N. is prepared to act immediately on its own. He added that Malayan troops, prepared for any necessary action, already are being flown to reinforce the 200-man Malayan U.N. garrison in Kindu.

The U.N. already had threatened military action if the rebellious soldiers—part of a disorderly command of more than 2,000 claiming allegiance to leftist Vice Premier Antoine Gizenga—failed to give up the Italians.

U.N. headquarters here in teletype consultation with Acting Secretary General U

Thant in New York throughout the night to decide on the next steps to be taken by the world body.

The murder of the Italians was announced after word that Congolese Gen. Victor Lundula had returned to Kindu for another attempt to secure the Italians' release and to quell what was described as an open mutiny against the authority of the central government. Diplomats in Léopoldville said Gizenga himself was responsible for the mutiny.

Orders went out, too, for an end to army lawlessness in the Congolese occupation of Albertville, a Lake Tanganyika port in secessionist Katanga Province. There soldiers and their Baluba tribal allies looted homes, stole cars, arrested various whites and Africans and wandered the streets demanding money, free food and beer.

The U.N. instructed its Indian contingent in Albertville, which has about 150 combat troops, to halt mutinous and lawless acts by force if necessary. Albertville, 320 miles southeast of Kindu, fell last week to Baluba foes of Katanga President Moïse Tshombe. The 100 Congolese troops who took over Sunday were met by Smith and by Conor Cruise O'Brien, the chief U.N. representative in Katanga, giving an air of U.N. sanction to the operation.

[Excerpt from the New York Times, Nov. 16, 1961]

MUTINY IN CONGO: U.N. LINKS GIZENGA TO TROOPS' REVOLT—MILITARY ACTION THREATENED AGAINST REBELLIOUS TROOPS WHO HOLD 13 ITALIANS—THANT ORDERS STEPS—AUTHORIZES EVERY MEASURE POSSIBLE TO RESTORE LAW AND ORDER IN PROVINCES

(By David Halberstam)

LÉOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, November 15.—Congolese troops loyal to Eastern Province have mutinied, and United Nations officials today linked their action to an attempt by Antoine Gizenga to establish control of the Congo in defiance of the Central Government.

The United Nations threatened to take most energetic military action against the mutinous Congolese soldiers, who are holding 13 Italian airmen prisoner in the town of Kindu in Kivu Province. The United Nations said it would act promptly unless there was some positive step toward freeing the men.

The situation appeared grave. High diplomatic and United Nations officials said Mr. Gizenga, who is Vice Premier of the Central Government, was in Kindu and that 2,000 Stanleyville troops had arrived there.

CONCERN FOR AIRMEN GROWS

Concern for the safety of the Italians increased when it was learned that an attempt by Maj. Gen. Victor Lundula, commander of the troops from Eastern Province, to free the men had failed.

General Lundula flew to the area to talk with the troops, who ostensibly are his own men. But they refused to obey his orders. Later it was reported that General Lundula and Christophe Gbenye, Minister of the Interior, who also attempted to negotiate for the release of the airmen, virtually had to flee to the airport from the meeting.

The United Nations also warned Congolese National Army troops that crossed into north Katanga Province at Albertville that it would use force against them to keep law and order in that town.

The troops arrived in Albertville yesterday and apparently went on a rampage, stealing cars, looting houses, and setting up roadblocks to demand money from anyone who passed.

The United Nations said it had the support of the Central Government in its warnings to the troops in both Kindu and Albertville.

MILITARY ACTION PLANNED

Plans for a military strike against the garrison in Kindu are being made by the United Nations. It apparently will be carried out tomorrow—unless some positive word on the release of the airmen arrives here before then.

The United Nations is concerned over just what kind of military action to take to avoid jeopardizing the lives of the Italians. There is considerable support here, however, for an attack by Indian Canberra jets on the garrison.

Both Dr. Conor Cruise O'Brien, the United Nations representative in Katanga, and Gen. Sean McKeown, the United Nations commander in the Congo, left for New York for urgent meetings with the Acting Secretary General U Thant, on problems regarding the secession of Katanga Province.

It has been confirmed here that the Italians were badly beaten by Congolese on Saturday and that several of them were dragged unconscious to trucks to be taken to jail.

The troops at both Albertville and Kindu are technically under the command of General Lundula. The units at Albertville were sent into Katanga as the forerunner of an invasion force. There also has been a buildup of Eastern Province troops at Kindu, ostensibly in preparation for an invasion of Katanga.

There is some uncertainty, however, whether the buildup at Kindu was for an invasion of Katanga or to back a move by Mr. Gizenga for power.

Ironically, it was the two close associates of Mr. Gizenga, General Lundula and Mr. Gbenye, both followers of the late Patrice Lumumba, who failed in the first step of the negotiations for the release of the Italians.

Mr. Gbenye has remained loyal to the Central Government and General Lundula has just sworn loyalty to it. Mr. Gizenga, however, after pledging loyalty, returned to Stanleyville where he is believed to be leading an undeclared secession.

Mr. Gizenga is reported to be playing a major role in the Kindu rebellion, according to reliable sources. He has been there since Saturday and appears to be leading a faction in open defiance of the Central Government.

There are only about 200 United Nations troops in Kindu, all Malayan.

FEAR FELT FOR AIRMEN

No one has reported seeing the 13 Italians since they were arrested and fear is felt for their lives. The commander of the troops at Kindu told General Lundula that he himself had not seen the troops and believed it would be very dangerous to go to see them.

Last night, Central Government officials received a message from the soldiers at Kindu saying, "The mercenaries have escaped." This was presumed to be an allusion to the Italians. The word "escape" is often used here before announcing that the escapees have been killed.

The United Nations account of what happened to the Italians said they were lunching when several trucks full of troops arrived at the messhall and about 80 soldiers of the Congolese National Army rushed inside.

Apparently they had heard reports that some planes had landed with Belgian paratroopers and they were looking for the so-called Belgians. The Congolese appeared to have been drinking heavily.

[Excerpt from the Baltimore Sun, Nov. 20, 1961]

KINDU WARNS PLANES OFF—MUTINOUS CONGO UNIT CLAIMS IT WILL SHOOT THEM DOWN

USUMBURA, RUANDA URUNDI, November 19.—The commander of Congolese Army units in Kindu, site of the massacre of 13 Italian airmen, has warned that he will shoot out of the sky any planes which appear over the town.

The commander, a colonel named Pakassa, yesterday sent out radio messages—picked up by United Nations stations elsewhere in Kivu Province and passed on to all airports in the vicinity—saying he refuses to allow any aircraft to fly in the Kindu region.

Pakassa's first message indicated he was willing to allow a plane carrying Gen. Victor Lundula, commander of the Stanleyville government forces, to land. But he asked Lundula to send a signal by radio before leaving Goma, where the general has been for the past couple of days and to announce his time of arrival. Pakassa added: "Every other aircraft is to run back to Goma or we will shoot them down."

About this time a DC-4 of Air Congo left Usumbura, capital of this neighboring Belgian trust territory, for Goma, where it planned to pick up Lundula and take him back to Stanleyville. It appeared Lundula has talked with United Nations authorities in Goma and decided to return to Stanleyville rather than risk landing at Kindu.

In any event Pakassa sent a second message which said:

"We forbid any aircraft—without exception—to fly to Kindu. They would risk great danger if they try. I refuse to change this order. My artillery will open fire without hesitation."

Two planes which had left Goma for Kindu returned on receipt of these messages. The United Nations apparently had not carried through its announced plan to ferry in Malayan United Nations battalions to surround and disarm the Kindu garrison.

[Excerpt from the New York Times, Nov. 23, 1961]

U.N. NEGLIGENCE SEEN IN MURDERS—CONGO AIDE IS SAID TO MAKE CHARGE ON ITALIANS

LEOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, November 22.—The Interior Minister of the Congo was reported today to have cited negligence by the United Nations as one of the reasons for the recent massacre of 13 Italian airmen.

The Italians, who flew military vehicles into the Congo for the United Nations, were slain by mutinous Congolese troops in Kindu, Kivu Province.

Informed sources said the Interior Minister, Christophe Gbenye, made his charge in a report to the Central Government after a visit to Kindu and Stanleyville, capital of Eastern Province. In Stanleyville Mr. Gbenye met with Antoine Gizenga, First Vice Premier of the Central Government.

PLANE NUMBER NOTED

The Gbenye report was said to have charged that United Nations negligence was one of the immediate causes of the murder of the Italian airmen. The sources said the report contended that the numerical identification of the Italians' plane did not tally with numbers given to Congolese troops in Kindu in advance of the Italians' arrival.

As a result, the report said, the Congolese were under the impression that the plane was landing mercenaries.

Mr. Gbenye was said to have reported that Mr. Gizenga was not responsible for the murders. Mr. Gizenga is the political heir to the slain Patrice Lumumba, leftist and former Premier.

Mr. Gbenye's report, it was said, indicated that Mr. Gizenga did not arrive in Kindu until November 11, 3 days after the Italians were murdered.

FRICION WITH GIZENGA

There has been friction between Mr. Gizenga and the Central Government since he returned to Stanleyville for what was to be a brief visit and then remained there. The Central Government threatened to expel him from his high post if he did not return.

The Central Government still has not appointed delegates to the joint Congolese-United Nations committee that is to investi-

gate the slaying of the Italians. This indicated there was no agreement on how Mr. Adoula's promise that the guilty will be punished was to be put into effect.

The United Nations command here indicated yesterday it would take action against the guilty soon with or without a joint commission.

[From the New York Times]

U.N. DROPS PLAN TO DISARM CONGOLESE AT MURDER SITE

(By David Halberstam)

LEOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, November 25.—The United Nations gave up today its plan to disarm the 2,000 Congolese troops at Kindu in a hunt for the killers of 13 Italian airmen. Instead, the United Nations announced that it would support a plan of the Congolese Government to move the guilty soldiers to another city, probably Léopoldville, for punishment.

The United Nations decision, made public here today, was contained in a letter from Dr. Sture C. Linner, United Nations representative here, to Premier Cyrille Adoula of the central Congolese Government.

In effect, it marked a change in United Nations policy for two reasons.

PLAN CALLED IMPRACTICAL

First, the feeling was growing here that the United Nations plan was tactically impractical, since it might lead to widespread bloodshed between Congolese troops and United Nations personnel.

Second, the move represented a gesture to domestic Congolese politics. If the United Nations had handled the case and punished the guilty, it was said, the already shaky Adoula government would be made extremely susceptible to pressure from the left.

There would also be charges, it was said, that the United Nations was punishing an entire garrison of brave Congolese soldiers who would thus be prevented from fighting the real Congolese enemy in secessionist Katanga Province.

It was believed that if the United Nations insisted on disarming the soldiers around Kindu, Premier Adoula might face a vote of censure in the Congolese Parliament.

In his letter, Dr. Linner conceded that it would be inopportune to attempt to disarm the Kindu garrison.

Both the United Nations and Premier Adoula retreated from earlier statements when Mr. Adoula met strong opposition in Parliament on the plan to disarm the garrison. Thus, on Thursday, Mr. Adoula sent Dr. Linner a letter that called the United Nations plan to seal off the area impractical. The Premier insisted that the Congolese Government was capable of bringing the guilty men to justice.

After the airmen were captured and slain November 11, the United Nations announced that it would take energetic action whether the Congolese Government cooperated or not.

SOLDIERS HEAD FOR KATANGA

Feeling is growing in most quarters here that with each passing day it will be increasingly difficult to find the guilty soldiers. They are known to have headed for the Katanga border. If necessary, they will shed their uniforms and head for the bush, it is believed.

Mr. Adoula has told Dr. Linner that the central Congolese Government is convinced that approximately 200 men from two units are responsible for the crime.

Dr. Linner agreed to Mr. Adoula's proposals after lengthy communications with U Thant, Acting United Nations Secretary General in New York. But he renewed the United Nations proposal for a joint United Nations-Congolese commission to investigate the case.

Mr. Adoula has said the commission is unnecessary. The United Nations has appointed its five members to the commission, but so far the Congolese have appointed none. It is believed no Congolese wants to serve.

At Kindu, the United Nations has found itself ensnared in a command conflict between the Malaysians and Ethiopians in its force. Its contingent there is also considered too small to complete a sealing-off operation.

TSHOMBE VOWS TO MEET FORCE

ELISABETHVILLE, THE CONGO, November 25.—President Moïse Tshombe of Katanga warned the United Nations and the central Congolese Government today that he would "meet force with force."

Mr. Tshombe replied to the resolution adopted yesterday by the United Nations Security Council that said Katanga's secession must be ended "by force if necessary."

The President called a special news conference and said: "We are prepared for any negotiation and solution of the problem by peaceful means. However, if we are attacked we will reply with force."

"Even if the whole Katanga population—black and white—has to die and our economy to be destroyed we will resist."

"If the United Nations forces a repetition of the events of September 19, it will be the United Nations' fault and the new Secretary General, U Thant, will bear more responsibility for what happens than did the late Mr. Hammarskjöld."

This was a reference to an attempt by United Nations forces in September to expel white mercenaries from Katanga's army. This effort ran into unexpectedly fierce resistance. The fighting ended only with a cease-fire that favored Katanga.

[Excerpt from the New York Times, Dec. 22, 1961]

IN THE NATION: THE FRUITS OF VICTORY ARE YET TO RIPEN

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, December 21.—Nothing succeeds like success except the success that is enduring. Therefore, even those who deplore the methods employed must concede that the United Nations achieved a success in the Congo when President Tshombe of Katanga signed the pact with Premier Adoula that was described today by the central Congo regime; and that Prime Minister Nehru was successful in aggrandizing Portuguese India.

Involved in these developments also was a double success for Soviet Russia, which promoted the U.N. war against Tshombe and, speaking through Premier Khrushchev, endorsed India's annexations by armed force as fully lawful and justified. By the same measurement of achievement, Nehru was another two-time winner because Indian troops on U.N. pay made an important contribution to the military result in Katanga. The Government of the United States, without whose material assistance the U.N. Army could not have subdued Tshombe's capital of Elisabethville, can lay claim to one of these victories. But its effort to have the U.N. rebuke Nehru for his aggression not only failed; it was limited to one try on the what's-the-use ground that he had "got by with it."

WILL IT LAST?

The next step will be a test of the constructive value and enduring quality of these triumphs in the attainment and preservation of world peace. Such are the proclaimed purposes of all the victors in the two acts of militancy, and such are the charted purposes and functions for which the U.N. was created. The Congo test will center largely on events after Tshombe sub-

mits to his Parliament the paper he signed under U.N. military and U.S. military-cum-political pressure. And among these events will be the future activity of Antoine Gizenga, whose Eastern Province was also in a state of secession but thus far has been excluded from the punitive military actions of the U.N. in the Congo.

It seems improbable that Gizenga's activity will include a refusal, if urged, to make whatever signed commitment Tshombe made to Léopoldville. There is no substantial reason why he should refuse. He is Vice Premier in the central Congo Government to which Tshombe has been obliged to yield, on paper at least. And Gizenga is also the protégé of the Kremlin, which supported the U.N. Katanga military action with everything—except a financial contribution toward the cost. So the prospect, on his previous record, is that Gizenga will do what he can as Vice Premier to gain control of the Central Government and, as far as he is able, subvert it to the aims of Soviet African policy.

This measure of the test to come is drawn on assumptions that (1) the pact Tshombe signed with Adoula establishes the authority of Léopoldville in Katanga and the other provinces as totally as the spokesman of the central regime said it does; (2) that Tshombe, his Parliament and the tribal chieftains in Katanga and elsewhere in the area will execute this kind of agreement in full degree; and (3) that native resentments against the U.N. and the United States created by the deaths and destruction wrought by bombing and mortar-fire in and around Elisabethville, and made possible by supply transports on which the legend "U.S. Air Force" was visible to all the military and civilians under fire, will not take form in a renewal of the Congo civil war.

ONLY TIME WILL TELL

It will be days, maybe weeks, and could be months and years before the consequences, good and bad, of the recent events in the Congo and Portuguese India can be soundly estimated. But the immediate successes have been won. And the various official statements made by the governments whose acts prevailed are very naturally based on this paraphrase of the ancient axiom: "Sufficient unto the day is the attainment thereof." Also, in the list with which the Kennedy administration will seek to refute the critics of its U.N. policy there can be cited the recent assembly votes by which Communist China was denied membership and the militant acts of world communism in Hungary and Tibet were denounced.

And Nehru's cup of happiness, almost filled by the action on Tibet by an organization which refused to censure him for the seizure of Portuguese India by force, will overflow when he is honored by the projected visit of the wife of the President of the United States.

[Excerpt from the New York Times, Dec. 30, 1961]

TSHOMBE SAYS U.N. JETS BACK NEW CONGO ASSAULT

ELISABETHVILLE, THE CONGO, December 29.—President Moïse Tshombe charged today that a new attack had been opened against North Katanga by troops of the Central Government with the assistance of the United Nations.

The President of secessionist Katanga Province made protests and appeals for aid to President Kennedy, the United Nations Acting Secretary General, U Thant, the British Government and Premier Cyrille Adoula of the Congo.

There was no confirmation of the attack from United Nations sources.

(A United Nations spokesman in New York said reports had been received in the last few days of minor skirmishes in the area.

But he categorically denied that the United Nations force was participating in any joint military operations with the Congolese, or had given any help to Central Government forces in the skirmishes.)

CONGO LEADERS IN PACT

Mr. Tshombe agreed in a meeting with Mr. Adoula last Friday at Kitona to surrender his independence and recognize the authority of the Léopoldville Government, but said later the agreement had to be ratified by the Katanga Assembly.

He reported the new attack at a news conference as the Adoula Government and the United Nations mission waited to see if he intended to carry out the agreement.

Mr. Tshombe said two battalions and two commando companies of the Congo Army attacked villages near Kongolo, about 400 miles north of Elisabethville and forty miles south of the Kivu provincial border. The United Nations helped mount the attack, he charged, by providing transport and support with Indian Canberra jet bombers.

From the previous pattern of military movements in the area it seemed likely that any Congolese force from Kivu would be under the command of Gen. Victor Lundula. General Lundula was army chief for the late Premier Patrice Lumumba and for several months supported Mr. Lumumba's political successor in Stanleyville, Antoine Gizenga, but recently swore allegiance to Léopoldville's army chief, Gen. Joseph D. Mobutu.

Following a cease-fire between United Nations and Katangan forces last September, when General Mobutu's army attempted an invasion of Katanga from Kasai Province, General Lundula's troops assembled in Kivu for a similar attack.

The United Nations announced last Saturday that it would accept 1,000 of General Mobutu's men in the United Nations Army. Reports from Léopoldville said today, however, that an advance guard of 90 men to have been flown 3 days ago to Kamina, 250 miles southwest of Kongolo, had not yet moved. The Adoula government apparently was having second thoughts about putting its soldiers under United Nations command.

The Katanga Assembly is scheduled to meet here Wednesday to consider ratification of the Kitona Agreement with Mr. Adoula. Some informed Katanga sources believe it is likely to agree in principle to the Kitona Agreement—provided the Congo's provisional Constitution is modified to give Katanga wide home-rule powers.

It is almost certain to do whatever Mr. Tshombe bids it do. In theory it consists of 60 elected deputies, plus appointed chiefs, with 27 of the deputies from Mr. Tshombe's Conakat Party and 25 from the opposition Balubakat. But 8 seats never have been filled and the opposition deputies long ago walked out.

In the last day or two, tension between the Katangese and the United Nations has increased, and some Katangese have been reacting against United Nations patrols, roadblocks and arrests.

United Nations spokesmen said African townships outside Elisabethville had been isolated and many arrests made to prevent attacks on anti-Tshombe Baluba tribesmen and to halt looting.

[Excerpts from the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1962]

ATTACK REPORTED AT CONGO MISSION—40 GIRLS IMPERILED AT SCHOOL—BURNING HOUSES SIGHTED

(By David Halberstam)

LÉOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, January 19.—Rebel Congolese troops have apparently overrun a Roman Catholic mission station at the Katanga-Kivu border town of Sola, the United Nations said tonight.

Two United Nations jets flew over the mission station and the pilots saw two Congolese soldiers rush for cover in a church building. The pilots also saw two military trucks on the mission grounds, and several houses burning in the town.

(Church officials in Leopoldville told the Associated Press that there were 40 teenage African girls at the mission's teacher-training college and a European staff of 6 white priests and 5 or 6 white nuns of the Franciscan Order.)

The jets were sent by the United Nations after a report from G. C. Senni, the International Red Cross representative in Elisabethville, that the Congolese troops were planning to attack the mission.

The United Nations spokesman said everything possible would be done to stop the rebel troops.

But the spokesman added that it would be tactically difficult to move troops into the area. The United Nations has no paratroops at its disposal here and no troops within 200 miles of Sola. Troops would have to be moved in by helicopter.

The rebel Congolese are believed to be the same troops accused of slaying 19 Roman Catholic clergymen and a number of civilians at the north Katanga town of Kongolo, January 1.

Col. Alphonse Pakassa, commander of the troops at Kongolo and Kindu, where 13 Italian airmen were murdered November 11, was arrested yesterday in Stanleyville by Gen. Victor Lundula.

Earlier in the day here, the United Nations promised to give all military aid necessary to the Central Government to apprehend the soldiers if reports of the Kongolo slayings were true.

The United Nations spokesman refused to give details on what form the military aid would take. But he said that the United Nations and the Central Government were conferring on the situation.

At the request of the Central Government the United Nations sent a plane to Stanleyville to transport Antoine Gizenga, the deposed vice premier, to Léopoldville. He will be questioned about the fighting in Stanleyville over the weekend and will face possible punitive action.

Mr. Gizenga requested the plane. The United Nations said his departure depended on an agreement with the authorities of Eastern Province, who have started legal proceedings against Mr. Gizenga.

The United Nations reported that factional clashes had broken out between Congolese soldiers in the North Katanga town of Albertville.

The United Nations said that the commander of the troops and five officers had been placed under United Nations protection and would be flown to General Lundula in Stanleyville.

The spokesman added that the trouble apparently started after the commander ordered five of his men shot. The 5 soldiers were part of a group of 50 men arrested earlier in Kabalo for rebellious behavior.

The troops at Albertville, at Kongolo, and at Kindu were among those who left Stanleyville last year for an invasion of Katanga Province. They have caused disturbances in virtually every town in the area. While General Lundula was their nominal commander, the troops at Kindu and Kongolo were considered to be more loyal to Colonel Pakassa.

[Excerpts from the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1962]

KATANGA REPORTS VILLAGES BURNED—CENTRAL GOVERNMENT REBELS BLAMED IN NEW ATTACKS

ELISABETHVILLE, THE CONGO, January 21.—The secessionist Katanga Government reported today that central Congolese troops had entered central Katanga, burned villages and massacred women and children.

The assertion was made in a communique signed by President Moïse Tshombe. It said the troops had gone into the district of Kiliwa, about 250 miles from Elisabethville, where they were repulsed by Katangese police troops.

In a veiled reference to the United Nations, the communique said the Katanga Government held responsible for the alleged massacres "those who facilitated the entrance to Katanga and Premier Cyrille Adoula, who called this a police action."

Travelers arriving in Elisabethville from the north said central Congo troops were invading the territory in patrol strength but did not occupy the areas affected.

GENERAL CURBS VIOLENCE

Gen. Victor Lundula, commander of the Congolese troops in Eastern Province, is nominally in command of rebellious troops believed responsible for recent massacres. The general has been cooperating with the central government in an effort to prevent new violence.

On January 1, Congolese rebels murdered 19 Roman Catholic priests and workers at Kongolo, 20 miles south of Sola. At Sola, 13 priests and nuns were missing from a mission station that was attacked and burned by rebel Congolese troops. It is believed they may have escaped.

General Lundula went to Kongolo to investigate and arrested Col. Alphonse Pakassa, commander of the troops at Kongolo and Kindu. It was at Kindu that 13 Italian airmen were slain November 11.

PRIESTS MAY HAVE FLED

LÉOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, January 21.—Bishop Richard Cleire of Kasongo, in Kivu Province, said here it was possible that the six priests and seven nuns at the Roman Catholic mission station at Sola had managed to flee before the station was overrun by rebel Congolese troops.

But a Katanga Government communique issued in Elisabethville said the rebel soldiers were continuing their pillaging and killing in northern Katanga.

The communique gave no figures for the number of dead, but said an entire jungle area called Kiona-Ngoy had been overrun, with men, women, and children massacred and houses destroyed.

Usually reliable sources in Elisabethville said two rebel Congolese army companies left Kongolo Friday to attack a mission and village at Bulula, 20 miles east of Kongolo.

Northern Katanga was left without United Nations troops when fighting broke out in Elisabethville in early December. The rebel Congolese drifted in from Eastern and Kivu Provinces.

Bishop Cleire said there were usually two cars at the mission in Sola. The priests and nuns could have escaped to Albertville on Lake Tanganyika, he said.

"But we have no confirmation that they left or arrived in Albertville," the bishop said. "All we can do now is hope that after the New Year's Day massacre (in Kongolo) they took heed and left. They may also have left earlier when told about the advance of the troops."

REBEL TROOPS HOLD MISSION

LÉOPOLDVILLE, January 21.—The United Nations said today that the Roman Catholic mission at Sola was apparently occupied by Congolese troops.

A United Nations spokesman said two Indian Canberra jets flew over Sola today and the pilots reported that the mission and college appeared to be in the hands of Congolese troops.

In addition to the staff of nuns and priests at the mission, about 40 teenage African girls attended a teachers' training college here.

[Excerpt From the Washington Post, Oct. 30, 1961]

LIFTING OF KATANGA'S VISA SCORED BY ACLU

The American Civil Liberties Union said yesterday that the cancellation by the United States of the visa of the director of the Katanga Information Service was a clear infringement of free speech and due process of law.

In a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Patrick Murphy Malin, executive director of ACLU, urged that the cancellation be rescinded or that the information service director, Michael Struelens, be granted a new visa.

Struelens' visa was invalidated on October 4 "on the ground that he had entered the United States as a newspaperman and not as an information officer," ACLU said.

Malin said that when Struelens first obtained a visa in Brussels in 1960 and that when he had it renewed in Brazzaville last August "the American consuls, in their own handwriting, wrote that Mr. Struelens was coming to the United States as director of the Katanga Information Service."

Malin also said that Struelens was treated unfairly when he was requested to appear at the New York office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service on October 4.

An ACLU investigation showed, Malin said, that Struelens went to the office in response to a request from officials who said that they wanted to look at his visa.

But, Malin went on to say, "when Mr. Struelens appeared, the visa was invalidated, without any statement specifying the reasons for the action or giving him an opportunity to defend himself."

Immigration regulations provide that "if practicable" a person "be notified of the proposed action and given an opportunity to show cause why his visa should not be revoked or invalidated."

"We are also concerned," Malin added, "about the impact of the State Department's action on the vital first amendment principle of freedom of speech."

Malin said that Struelens' visa was canceled after Members of Congress and other public figures had used material supplied by the Katanga Information Service as a basis for criticism of United Nations policies in the Congo.

In his letter Malin declared that "the definite impression has been created that the visa was revoked because of the information and opinion presented by Mr. Struelens."

"Unless this impression is corrected," Malin added, "the State Department faces the charge of censorship."

Katanga is one of the Congo provinces that sought to remain independent from a Central Congolese Government. Belgian investments in Katanga are heavy. It has been frequently charged that Belgium still controls Katanga, although it and the rest of the Congo have been nominally independent for more than a year.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 314)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am informed that the message on trade negotiations has been read in the House. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD without having been read, and appropriately referred.

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

The message was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Twenty-eight years ago our Nation embarked upon a new experiment in international relationships—the reciprocal trade agreements program. Faced with the chaos in world trade that had resulted from the great depression, disillusioned by the failure of the promises that high protective tariffs would generate recovery, and impelled by a desperate need to restore our economy, President Roosevelt asked for authority to negotiate reciprocal tariff reductions with other nations of the world in order to spur our exports and aid our economic recovery and growth.

That landmark measure, guided through Congress by Cordell Hull, has been extended 11 times. It has served our country and the free world well over two decades. The application of this program brought growth and order to the free world trading system. Our total exports, averaging less than \$2 billion a year in the 3 years preceding enactment of the law, have now increased to over \$20 billion.

On June 30, 1962, the negotiating authority under the last extension of the Trade Agreements Act expires. It must be replaced by a wholly new instrument. A new American trade initiative is needed to meet the challenges and opportunities of a rapidly changing world economy.

In the brief period since this act was last extended, five fundamentally new and sweeping developments have made obsolete our traditional trade policy:

The growth of the European Common Market—an economy which may soon nearly equal our own, protected by a single external tariff similar to our own—has progressed with such success and momentum that it has surpassed its original timetable, convinced those initially skeptical that there is now no turning back and laid the groundwork for a radical alteration of the economics of the Atlantic alliance. Almost 90 percent of the free world's industrial production (if the United Kingdom and others successfully complete their negotiations for membership) may soon be concentrated in two great markets—the United States of America and the expanded European Economic Community. A trade policy adequate to negotiate item by item tariff reductions with a large number of small independent states will no longer be adequate to assure ready access for ourselves—and for our traditional trading partners in Canada, Japan, Latin America, and elsewhere—to a market nearly as large as our own, whose negotiators can speak with one voice but whose internal differences make it impossible for them to negotiate item by item.

The growing pressures on our balance-of-payments positions have, in the past few years, turned a new spotlight on the importance of increasing American exports to strengthen the international position of the dollar and prevent a steady

drain of our gold reserves. To maintain our defense, assistance and other commitments abroad, while expanding the free flow of goods and capital, we must achieve a reasonable equilibrium in our international accounts by offsetting these dollar outlays with dollar sales.

The need to accelerate our own economic growth, following a lagging period of 7 years characterized by three recessions, is more urgent than it has been in years—underlined by the millions of new job opportunities which will have to be found in this decade to provide employment for those already unemployed as well as an increasing flood of younger workers, farmworkers seeking new opportunities, and city workers displaced by technological change.

The Communist aid and trade offensive has also become more apparent in recent years. Soviet bloc trade with 41 non-Communist countries in the less-developed areas of the globe has more than tripled in recent years; and bloc trade missions are busy in nearly every continent attempting to penetrate, encircle, and divide the free world.

The need for new markets for Japan and the developing nations has also been accentuated as never before—both by the prospective impact of the EEC's external tariff and by their own need to acquire new outlets for their raw materials and light manufactures.

To meet these new challenges and opportunities, I am today transmitting to the Congress a new and modern instrument of trade negotiation—the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. As I said in my state of the Union address, its enactment "could well affect the unity of the West, the course of the cold war and the growth of our Nation for a generation or more to come."

I. THE BENEFITS OF INCREASED TRADE

Specifically, enactment of this measure will benefit substantially every State of the Union, every segment of the American economy, and every basic objective of our domestic economy and foreign policy.

Our efforts to expand our economy will be importantly affected by our ability to expand our exports—and particularly upon the ability of our farmers and businessmen to sell to the Common Market. There is arising across the Atlantic a single economic community which may soon have a population half again as big as our own, working and competing together with no more barriers to commerce and investment than exist among our 50 States—in an economy which has been growing roughly twice as fast as ours—representing a purchasing power which will someday equal our own and a living standard growing faster than our own. As its consumer incomes grow, its consumer demands are also growing, particularly for the type of goods that we produce best, which are only now beginning to be widely sold or known in the markets of Europe or in the homes of its middle-income families.

Some 30 percent of our exports—more than \$4 billion in industrial goods and materials and nearly \$2 billion in agricultural products—already goes to the

members and prospective members of the EEC. European manufacturers, however, have increased their share of this rapidly expanding market at a far greater rate than American manufacturers. Unless our industry can maintain and increase its share of this attractive market, there will be further temptation to locate additional American-financed plants in Europe in order to get behind the external tariff wall of the EEC. This would enable the American manufacturer to contend for that vast consumer potential on more competitive terms with his European counterparts; but it will also mean a failure on our part to take advantage of this growing market to increase jobs and investment in this country.

A more liberal trade policy will in general benefit our most efficient and expanding industries—industries which have demonstrated their advantage over other world producers by exporting on the average twice as much of their products as we import—industries which have done this while paying the highest wages in our country. Increasing investment and employment in these growth industries will make for a more healthy, efficient and expanding economy and a still higher American standard of living. Indeed, freer movement of trade between America and the Common Market would bolster the economy of the entire free world, stimulating each nation to do most what it does best and helping to achieve the OECD target of a 50-percent combined Atlantic community increase in gross national product by 1970.

Our efforts to prevent inflation will be reinforced by expanded trade. Once given a fair and equal opportunity to compete in overseas markets, and once subject to healthy competition from overseas manufacturers for our own markets, American management and labor will have additional reason to maintain competitive costs and prices, modernize their plants, and increase their productivity. The discipline of the world marketplace is an excellent measure of efficiency and a force to stability. To try to shield American industry from the discipline of foreign competition would isolate our domestic price level from world prices, encourage domestic inflation, reduce our exports still further, and invite less desirable governmental solutions.

Our efforts to correct our adverse balance of payments have in recent years roughly paralleled our ability to increase our export surplus. It is necessary if we are to maintain our security programs abroad—our own military forces overseas plus our contribution to the security and growth of other free countries—to make substantial dollar outlays abroad. These outlays are being held to the minimum necessary, and we are seeking increased sharing for our allies. But they will continue at substantial rates—and this requires us to enlarge the \$5 billion export surplus which we presently enjoy from our favorable balance of trade. If that surplus can be enlarged, as exports under our new program rise faster than imports, we can achieve the equilibrium in our balance

of payments which is essential to our economic stability and flexibility. If, on the other hand, our surplus should fail to grow, if our exports should be denied ready access to the EEC and other markets—our overseas position would be endangered. Moreover, if we can lower the external tariff wall of the Common Market through negotiation our manufacturers will be under less pressure to locate their plants behind that wall in order to sell in the European market, thus reducing the export of capital funds to Europe.

Our effort to promote the strength and unity of the West are thus directly related to the strength and unity of Atlantic trade policies. An expanded export program is necessary to give this Nation both the balance-of-payments equilibrium and the economic growth we need to sustain our share of Western military security and economic advance. Equally important, a freer flow of trade across the Atlantic will enable the two giant markets on either side of the ocean to impart strength and vigor to each other, and to combine their resources and momentum to undertake the many enterprises which the security of free peoples demands. For the first time, as the world's greatest trading nation, we can welcome a single partner whose trade is even larger than our own—a partner no longer divided and dependent, but strong enough to share with us the responsibilities and initiatives of the free world.

The Communist bloc, largely self-contained and isolated, represents an economic power already by some standards larger than that of Western Europe and hoping someday to overtake the United States. But the combined output and purchasing power of the United States and Western Europe—nearly a trillion dollars a year—is more than twice as great as that of the entire Sino-Soviet world. Though we have only half the population, and far less than half the territory, we can pool our resources and resourcefulness in an open trade partnership strong enough to outstrip any challenge, and strong enough to undertake all the many enterprises around the world which the maintenance and progress of freedom require. If we can take this step, Marxist predictions of "capitalist" empires warring over markets and stifling competition would be shattered for all times—Communist hopes for a trade war between these two great economic giants would be frustrated—and Communist efforts to split the West would be doomed to failure.

As members of the Atlantic community we have concerted our military objectives through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We are concerting our monetary and economic policies through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It is time now to write a new chapter in the evolution of the Atlantic community. The success of our foreign policy depends in large measure upon the success of our foreign trade, and our maintenance of Western political unity depends in equally large measure upon the degree of Western economic unity. An integrated Western Europe, joined in trading partnership with the United States, will

further shift the world balance of power to the side of freedom.

Our efforts to prove the superiority of free choice will thus be advanced immeasurably. We will prove to the world that we believe in peacefully "tearing down walls" instead of arbitrarily building them. We will be opening new vistas of choice and opportunity to the producers and consumers of the free world. In answer to those who say to the world's poorer countries that economic progress and freedom are no longer compatible, we—who have long boasted about the virtues of the marketplace and of free competitive enterprise, about our ability to compete and sell in any market, and about our willingness to keep abreast of the times—will have our greatest opportunity since the Marshall plan to demonstrate the vitality of free choice.

Communist bloc nations have negotiated more than 200 trade agreements in recent years. Inevitably the recipient nation finds its economy increasingly dependent upon Soviet goods, services and technicians. But many of these nations have also observed that the economics of free choice provide far greater benefits than the economics of coercion—and the wider we can make the area of economic freedom, the easier we make it for all free peoples to receive the benefits of our innovations and put them into practice.

Our efforts to aid the developing nations of the world and other friends, however, depend upon more than a demonstration of freedom's vitality and benefits. If their economies are to expand, if their new industries are to be successful, if they are to acquire the foreign exchange funds they will need to replace our aid efforts, these nations must find new outlets for their raw materials and new manufactures. We must make certain that any arrangements which we make with the European Economic Community are worked out in such a fashion as to insure nondiscriminatory application to all third countries. Even more important, however, the United States and Europe together have a joint responsibility to all of the less-developed countries of the world—and in this sense we must work together to insure that their legitimate aspirations and requirements are fulfilled. The "open partnership" which this bill proposes will enable all free nations to share together the rewards of a wider economic choice for all.

Our efforts to maintain the leadership of the free world thus rest, in the final analysis, on our success in this undertaking. Economic isolation and political leadership are wholly incompatible. In the next few years, the nations of Western Europe will be fixing basic economic and trading patterns vitally affecting the future of our economy and the hopes of our less-developed friends. Basic political and military decisions of vital interest to our security will be made. Unless we have this authority to negotiate and have it this year—if we are separated from the Common Market by high tariff barriers on either side of the Atlantic—then we cannot hope to play an effective part in those basic decisions.

If we are to retain our leadership, the initiative is up to us. The revolutionary changes which are occurring will not wait for us to make up our minds. The United States has encouraged sweeping changes in free world economic patterns in order to strengthen the forces of freedom. But we cannot ourselves stand still. If we are to lead, we must act. We must adapt our own economy to the imperatives of a changing world, and once more assert our leadership.

The American businessman, once the authority granted by this bill is exercised, will have a unique opportunity to compete on a more equal basis in a rich and rapidly expanding market abroad which possesses potentially a purchasing power as large and as varied as our own. He knows that, once artificial restraints are removed, a vast array of American goods, produced by American know-how with American efficiency, can compete with any goods in any spot in the world. And almost all members of the business community, in every State, now participate or could participate in the production, processing, transporting, or distribution of either exports or imports.

Already we sell to Western Europe alone more machinery, transportation equipment, chemicals, and coal than our total imports of these commodities from all regions of the world combined. Western Europe is our best customer today—and should be an even better one tomorrow. But as the new external tariff surrounding the Common Market replaces the internal tariff structure, a German producer—who once competed in the markets of France on the same terms with our own producers—will achieve free access to French markets while our own producers face a tariff. In short, in the absence of authority to bargain down that external tariff, as the economy of the Common Market expands, our exports will not expand with it. They may even decline.

The American farmer has a tremendous stake in expanded trade. One out of every seven farmworkers produces for export. The average farmer depends on foreign markets to sell the crops grown on 1 out of every 6 acres he plants. Sixty percent of our rice, 49 percent of our cotton, 45 percent of our wheat, and 42 percent of our soybean production are exported. Agriculture is one of our best sources of foreign exchange.

Our farmers are particularly dependent upon the markets of Western Europe. Our agricultural trade with that area is 4 to 1 in our favor. The agreements recently reached at Brussels both exhausted our existing authority to obtain further European concessions, and laid the groundwork for future negotiations on American farm exports to be conducted once new authority is granted. But new and flexible authority is required if we are to keep the door of the Common Market open to American agriculture, and open it wider still. If the output of our astounding productivity is not to pile up increasingly in our warehouses, our negotiators will need both the special EEC authority and the general 50-percent authority

requested in the bill described later in this message.

The American worker will benefit from the expansion of our exports. One out of every three workers engaged in manufacturing is employed in establishments that export. Several hundred times as many workers owe their jobs directly or indirectly to exports as are in the small group—estimated to be less than one-half of 1 percent of all workers—who might be adversely affected by a sharp increase in imports. As the number of job seekers in our labor force expands in the years ahead, increasing our job opportunities will require expanding our markets and economy, and making certain that new U.S. plants built to serve Common Market consumers are built here, to employ American workers, and not there.

The American consumer benefits most of all from an increase in foreign trade. Imports give him a wider choice of products at competitive prices. They introduce new ideas and new tastes, which often lead to new demands for American production.

Increased imports stimulate our own efforts to increase efficiency, and supplement antitrust and other efforts to assure competition. Many industries of importance to the American consumer and economy are dependent upon imports for raw materials and other supplies. Thus American-made goods can also be made much less expensively for the American consumers if we lower the tariff on the materials that are necessary to their production.

American imports, in short, have generally strengthened rather than weakened our economy. Their competitive benefits have already been mentioned. But about 60 percent of the goods we import do not compete with the goods we produce—either because they are not produced in this country, or are not produced in any significant quantity. They provide us with products we need but cannot efficiently make or grow (such as bananas or coffee), supplement our own steadily depleting natural resources with items not available here in quantity (such as manganese or chrome ore, 90 percent or more of which must be imported if our steel mills are to operate), and contribute to our industrial efficiency, our economic growth, and our high level of consumption. Those imports that do compete are equal to only 1 or 1½ percent of our total national production; and even these imports create jobs directly for those engaged in their processing, distribution, or transportation, and indirectly for those employed in both export industries and in those industries dependent upon reasonably priced imported supplies for their own ability to compete.

Moreover, we must reduce our own tariffs if we hope to reduce tariffs abroad and thereby increase our exports and export surplus. There are many more American jobs dependent upon exports than could possibly be adversely affected by increased imports. And those export industries are our strongest, most efficient, highest paying growth industries.

It is obvious, therefore, that the warnings against increased imports based

upon the lower level of wages paid in other countries are not telling the whole story. For this fear is refuted by the fact that American industry in general—and America's highest paid industries in particular—export more goods to other markets than any other nation; sell far more abroad to other countries than they sell to us; and command the vast preponderance of our own market here in the United States. There are three reasons for this:

(a) The skill and efficiency of American workers, with the help of our machinery and technology, can produce more units per man-hour than any other workers in the world—thus making the competitive cost of our labor for many products far less than it is in countries with lower wage rates. For example, while a U.S. coal miner is paid 8 times as much per hour as the Japanese miner, he produces 14 times as much coal—our real cost per ton of coal is thus far smaller—and we sell the Japanese tens of millions of dollars worth of coal each year.

(b) Our best industries also possess other advantages—the adequacy of low-cost raw materials or electrical power, for example. Neither wages nor total labor costs is an adequate standard of comparison if used alone.

(c) American products can frequently compete successfully even where foreign prices are somewhat lower—by virtue of their superior quality, style, packaging, servicing, or assurance of delivery.

Given this strength, accompanied by increasing productivity and wages in the rest of the world, there is less need to be concerned over the level of wages in the low-wage countries. These levels, moreover, are already on the rise and, we would hope, will continue to narrow the current wage gap, encouraged by appropriate consultations on an international basis.

This philosophy of the free market—the wider economic choice for men and nations—is as old as freedom itself. It is not a partisan philosophy. For many years our trade legislation has enjoyed bipartisan backing from those members of both parties who recognized how essential trade is to our basic security abroad and our economic health at home. This is even more true today. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is designed as the expression of a nation, not of any single faction, not of any single faction or section. It is in that spirit that I recommend it to the Congress for prompt and favorable action.

II. PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

New negotiating authority: To achieve all of the goals and gains set forth above—to empower our negotiators with sufficient authority to induce the EEC to grant wider access to our goods and crops and fair treatment to those of Latin America, Japan, and other countries—and to be ready to talk trade with the Common Market in practical terms—it is essential that our bargaining authority be increased in both flexibility and extent. I am therefore requesting two basic kinds of authority to be exercised over the next 5 years:

First, a general authority to reduce existing tariffs by 50 percent in recip-

cal negotiations. It would be our intention to employ a variety of techniques in exercising this authority, including negotiations on broad categories or sub-categories of products.

Second, a special authority to be used in negotiating with the EEC, to reduce or eliminate all tariffs on those groups of products where the United States and the EEC together account for 80 percent or more of world trade in a representative period. The fact that these groups of products fall within this special or dominant supplier authority is proof that they can be produced here or in Europe more efficiently than anywhere else in the world. They include most of the products which the members of the Common Market are especially interested in trading with us, and most of the products for which we want freer access to the Common Market; and to a considerable extent they are items in which our own ability to compete is demonstrated by the fact that our exports of these items are substantially greater than our imports. They account for nearly \$2 billion of our total industrial exports to present and prospective Common Market members in 1960, and for about \$1.4 billion of our imports from these countries. In short, this special authority will enable us to negotiate for a dramatic agreement with the Common Market that will pool our economic strength for the advancement of freedom.

To be effective in achieving a breakthrough agreement with the EEC so that our farmers, manufacturers, and other free world trading partners can participate, we will need to use both the dominant supplier authority and the general authority in combination. Reductions would be put into effect gradually in stages over 5 years or more. But the traditional technique of trading one brick at a time off our respective tariff walls will not suffice to assure American farm and factory exports the kind of access to the European market which they must have if trade between the two Atlantic markets is to expand. We must talk instead in terms of trading whole layers at a time in exchange for other layers, as the Europeans have been doing in reducing their internal tariffs, permitting the forces of competition to set new trade patterns. Trading in such an enlarged basis is not possible, the EEC has found, if traditional item-by-item economic histories are to dominate. But let me emphasize that we mean to see to it that all reductions and concessions are reciprocal—and that the access we gain is not limited by the use of quotas or other restrictive devices.

Safeguarding interests of other trading partners: In our negotiations with the Common Market, we will preserve our traditional most-favored-nation principle under which any tariff concessions negotiated will be generalized to our other trading partners. Obviously, in special authority agreements where the United States and the EEC are the dominant suppliers, the participation of other nations often would not be significant. On other items, where justified, compensating concessions from other interested countries should be obtained as

part of the negotiations. But in essence we must strive for a nondiscriminatory trade partnership with the EEC. If it succeeds only in splintering the free world, or increasing the disparity between rich and poor nations, it will have failed to achieve one of its major purposes. The negotiating authority under this bill will thus be used to strengthen the ties of both common markets with, and expand our own trade in, the Latin American Republics, Canada, Japan, and other non-European nations—as well as helping them maximize their opportunities to trade with the Common Market.

The bill also requests special authority to reduce or eliminate all duties and other restrictions on the importation of tropical agricultural and forestry products supplied by friendly less-developed countries and not produced here in any significant quantity, if our action is taken in concert with similar action by the Common Market. These tropical products are the staple exports of many less-developed countries. Their efforts for economic development and diversification must be advanced out of earnings from these products. By assuring them as large a market as possible, we are bringing closer the day when they will be able to finance their own development needs on a self-sustaining basis.

Safeguards to American industry: If the authority requested in this act is used, imports as well as exports will increase; and this increase will, in the overwhelming number of cases, be beneficial for the reasons outlined above. Nevertheless ample safeguards against injury to American industry and agriculture will be retained. Escape clause relief will continue to be available with more up-to-date definitions. Temporary tariff relief will be granted where essential. The power to impose duties or suspend concessions to protect the national security will be retained. Articles will be reserved from negotiations whenever such action is deemed to be in the best interest of the Nation and the economy. And the four basic stages of the traditional peril point procedures and safeguards will be retained and improved:

The President will refer to the Tariff Commission the list of proposed items for negotiations;

The Tariff Commission will conduct hearings to determine the effect of concessions on these products;

The Commission will make a report to the President, specifically based, as such reports are based now, upon its findings of how new imports might lead to the idling of productive facilities, the inability of domestic producers to operate at a profit, and the unemployment of workers as the result of anticipated reductions in duties; and

The President will report to the Congress on his action after completion of the negotiations. The present arrangements will be substantially improved, however, since both the Tariff Commission recommendation and the President's report would be broader than a bare determination of specific peril points; and this should enable us to make much more informed use of these recommendations than has been true in the past.

Trade adjustment assistance: I am also recommending as an essential part of the new trade program that companies, farmers, and workers who suffer damage from increased foreign import competition be assisted in their efforts to adjust to that competition. When considerations of national policy make it desirable to avoid higher tariffs, those injured by that competition should not be required to bear the full brunt of the impact. Rather, the burden of economic adjustment should be borne in part by the Federal Government.

Under existing law, the only alternatives available to the President are the imposition or refusal of tariff relief. These alternatives should continue to be available.

The legislation I am proposing, however, provides an additional alternative called trade adjustment assistance. This alternative will permit the executive branch to make extensive use of its facilities, programs, and resources to provide special assistance to farmers, firms, and their employees in making the economic readjustments necessitated by the imports resulting from tariff concessions.

Any worker or group of workers unemployed or underemployed as a result of increased imports would, under this bill, be eligible for the following forms of assistance:

1. Readjustment allowances providing as much as 65 percent of the individual's average weekly wage for up to 52 weeks for all workers, and for as many as 13 additional weeks for workers over 60, with unemployment insurance benefits deducted from such allowances to the extent available;
2. Vocational education and training assistance to develop higher and different skills;
3. Financial assistance for those who cannot find work in their present community to relocate to a different place in the United States where suitable employment is available.

For a businessman or farmer adversely affected by imports, there should be available:

1. Technical information, advice and consultation to help plan and implement an attack on the problem;
2. Tax benefits to encourage modernization and diversification;
3. Loan guarantees and loans otherwise not commercially available to aid modernization and diversification.

Just as the Federal Government has assisted in personal readjustments made necessary by military service, just as the Federal Government met its obligation to assist industry in adjusting to war production and again to return to peacetime production, so there is an obligation to render assistance to those who suffer as a result of national trade policy. Such a program will supplement and work in coordination with, not duplicate, what we are already doing or proposing to do for depressed areas, for small business, for investment incentives, and for the retraining and compensation of our unemployed workers.

This cannot be and will not be a subsidy program of Government paternalism. It is instead a program to afford

time for American initiative, American adaptability, and American resiliency to assert themselves. It is consistent with that part of the proposed law which would stage tariff reductions over a 5-year period. Accordingly, trade adjustment assistance, like the other provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is designed to strengthen the efficiency of our economy, not to protect inefficiencies.

Authority to grant temporary tariff relief will remain available to assist those industries injured by a sudden influx of goods under revised tariffs. But the accent is on adjustment more than assistance. Through trade adjustment prompt and effective help can be given to those suffering genuine hardship in adjusting to import competition, moving men and resources out of uneconomic production into efficient production and competitive positions, and in the process preserving the employment relationships between firms and workers wherever possible. Unlike tariff relief, this assistance can be tailored to their individual needs without disrupting other policies. Experience with a similar kind of program in the Common Market, and in the face of more extensive tariff reductions than we propose here, testifies to the effective but relatively inexpensive nature of this approach. For most affected firms will find that the adjustment involved is no more than the adjustment they face every year or few years as the result of changes in the economy, consumer taste, or domestic competition.

The purpose of this message has been to describe the challenge we face and the tools we need. The decision rests with the Congress. That decision will either mark the beginning of a new chapter in the alliance of free nations—or a threat to the growth of Western unity. The two great Atlantic markets will either grow together or they will grow apart. The meaning and range of free economic choice will either be widened for the benefit of freemen everywhere—or confused and constricted by new barriers and delays.

Last year, in enacting a long-term foreign aid program, the Congress made possible a fundamental change in our relations with the developing nations. This bill will make possible a fundamental, far-reaching and unique change in our relations with the other industrialized nations—particularly with the other members of the Atlantic community. As NATO was unprecedented in military history, this measure is unprecedented in economic history. But its passage will be long remembered and its benefits widely distributed among those who work for freedom.

At rare moments in the life of this Nation an opportunity comes along to fashion out of the confusion of current events a clear and bold action to show the world what it is we stand for. Such an opportunity is before us now. This bill, by enabling us to strike a bargain with the Common Market, will strike a blow for freedom.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1962.

GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK IN NEVADA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1760) to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the pending business is S. 1760, the so-called Great Basin National Park, located within the State of Nevada.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to the committee amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to my distinguished friend from Idaho, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator intend to give an explanation of the bill at this point?

Mr. BIBLE. Just as soon as the committee amendments have been adopted en bloc I shall give a brief explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the committee amendments were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

On page 2, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "5 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 1, township 12 north, range 67 east;

"Thence due west 1 mile to a point; thence due north approximately 2 miles to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 24 and 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 1½ miles to a point; and insert "7 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 2½ miles to a point;"; on page 4, line 2, after the word "approximately", to strike out "three-quarters" and insert "one-half"; in line 4, after the word "of", where it appears the first time, to strike out "the south half of"; at the beginning line 6, to strike out "south one-sixteenth latitudinal" and insert "east-west quarter"; in line 7, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "northeast corner of the south half of the southeast quarter" and insert "east quarter corner"; in line 9, after the word "approximately", to strike out "one-quarter" and insert "one-half"; on page 6, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "124,500" and insert "123,360"; on page 8, after line 5, to strike out:

"Sec. 7. Where any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park were legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes pursuant to a lease, permit, or license, issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the person so occupying or utilizing such lands, and the heirs, successors, or assigns of such person, shall upon determination of such lease, permit, or license, be entitled to have the privilege so possessed or enjoyed by him renewed from time to time, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe, for a period of twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act, and thereafter during the lifetime of such person and the lifetime of his heirs, successors, or assigns, but only if they were members of his immediate family on such date, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That

grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto after reasonable notice of default. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest or estate in or to any Federal lands."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"SEC. 7. Where any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease permit or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges on the date of approval of this Act, their heirs, successors, or assigns, to renew the privileges from time to time subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however,* That no such privilege shall be extended beyond the period ending twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act except as specifically provided for in this section. The Secretary shall permit a holder of the grazing privilege to renew such privilege from time to time during the holder's lifetime beyond the twenty-five-year period, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands. The Secretary, by regulation, may limit the privileges enjoyed under this Act to the extent that they are appurtenant to the private lands owned by the persons who held such privileges on the date of approval of this Act, and may adjust such privileges to preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury. Grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto and after reasonable notice of any default."

On page 10, after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 8. There are hereby eliminated from the Humboldt National Forest all those lands comprising the Snake Division of the forest which lie in:

"NEVADA

"MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

"Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 68 east;

"Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 69 east; and

"Townships 10, 11, 12, and 13 north, range 70 east."

And, on page 11, line 2, to change the section number from "8" to "9"; so as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit and inspiration of the people a representative segment of the great basin processing outstanding ecological resources and significant geological and scenic values, there is hereby established the Great Basin National Park in the State of Nevada which, subject to valid existing rights, shall consist of lands and interest

in lands within the following described boundary:

"Commencing at the quarter section corner of sections 17 and 20, township 11 north, range 70 east, Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada; thence west 1½ miles along the south boundaries of sections 17 and 18 to the westerly common corner of sections 18 and 19; thence due west 8 miles over unsurveyed land to a point; thence due north over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 5 and 8, township 11 north, range 68 east;

"Thence westerly over unsurveyed land to said easterly common corner of sections 5 and 8; thence north along the east boundary of section 5 to the northeast corner of said section; thence due north approximately one mile over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 25 and 36, township 12 north, range 67 east, thence due east one mile over unsurveyed land to a point; thence due north approximately 7 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 2½ miles to a point; thence due north approximately 3 miles over unsurveyed land to the quarter section corner on the south boundary of section 6, township 13 north, range 68 east; thence 2 miles north through the center of section 6, township 13 north, range 68 east, and section 31, township 14 north, range 68 east, to the quarter section corner common to sections 30 and 31;

"Thence east 1½ miles along the south boundaries of sections 30 and 29 to the common corner of sections 28, 29, 32, and 33; thence north 2 miles along the east boundaries of sections 29 and 20 to the common corner of sections 16, 17, 20, and 21; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 16 to the common corner of sections 15, 16, 21, and 22; thence north 1 mile along the east boundary of section 16 to the common corner of sections 9, 10, 15, and 16; thence east 3 miles along the south boundaries of sections 10, 11, and 12 to the easterly common corner of sections 12 and 13 on the east boundary of township 14 north, range 68 east;

"Thence north approximately three-quarters of a mile along the west boundary of township 14 north, range 69 east, to the westerly common corner of sections 7 and 18, said township and range; thence east approximately one-half mile along the north boundary of said section 18 to the north quarter corner of said section 18, thence south approximately one-half mile along the north-south quarter line of said section 18 to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of said section 18;

"Thence east approximately one-half mile along the east-west quarter line of said section 18 to the east quarter corner of said section 18; thence south approximately one-half mile along the east boundary of said section 18 to the southerly common corner of said section 18 and section 17; thence east approximately one-half mile along the north boundary of section 20 to the north quarter corner of said section 20;

"Thence east approximately one-half mile along the north-south quarter line of said section 20 to the north quarter corner of section 29; thence east approximately one-half mile to the northeast corner of said section 29; thence north approximately 4.89 chains along the west boundary of section 28 to the northwest corner of said section 28; thence east approximately one mile along the north boundary of said section 28 to the northeast corner of said section 28;

"Thence south along the east boundaries of sections 28 and 33, township 14 north, range 69 east, and of what probably will be when surveyed section 4, township 13 north, range 69 east, to the east quarter corner of said section 4; thence east approximately two

miles along the east-west quarter lines of sections 3 and 2 to the east quarter corner of said section 2; thence south approximately one-half mile along the east boundary of section 2 to the common corner of sections 1, 2, 11, and 12.

"Thence east approximately two miles along the north boundaries of said section 12, township 13 north, range 69 east, and section 7, township 13 north, range 70 east, to the common corner of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8; thence south 5 miles along the west boundaries of sections 8, 17, 20, 29, and 32, to the southerly common corner of sections 31 and 32, township 13 north, range 70 east; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 32 to the northerly common corner of sections 4 and 5, township 12 north, range 70 east;

"Thence south 1 mile along the west boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 3, 4, 9, and 10; thence south 5 miles along the west boundaries of sections 10, 15, 22, 27, and 34, to the common corner of sections 3 and 4, township 11 north, range 70 east, and sections 33 and 34, township 12 north, range 70 east; thence west 1 mile along the north boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 4 and 5, township 11 north, range 70 east, and sections 32 and 33, township 12 north, range 70 east;

"Thence south 1 mile along the west boundary of section 4, township 11 north, range 70 east, to the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; thence west one-half mile along the north boundary of section 8, to the quarter section corner common to sections 5 and 8; thence south 2 miles through the center of sections 8 and 17 to the quarter section corner common to sections 17 and 20, township 11 north, range 70 east, the point of beginning, containing about 123,360 acres.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as described above, is authorized to procure by purchase, by donation, with donated funds, or by such means as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands. The Secretary is authorized further to convey Federally owned lands and interests in lands within the park in exchange for non-Federal lands and interests in lands of approximately equal value within the park if, in his judgment, such exchange is in the public interest. Federal lands lying within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as established pursuant to this Act, and hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for preservation and administration as a part of such park.

"SEC. 3. The Lehman Caves National Monument, established on January 24, 1922, by proclamation of the President pursuant to authority contained in the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), is hereby abolished. Lands and interests in lands heretofore comprising such monument shall, from the date of approval of this Act, be a part of the Great Basin National Park.

"SEC. 4. The Great Basin National Park shall be administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled 'An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes', as amended.

"SEC. 5. Nothing contained herein shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States or the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his lands.

"SEC. 6. Within the Great Basin National Park, all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States, exclusive of the land containing them, and minerals subject to leasing under

the mineral leasing laws of the United States shall be subject to exploration and disposal under such laws, with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic, scientific, and recreation values of the area. The provisions of the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended, shall have no application within the Great Basin National Park.

"Sec. 7. Where are any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges on the date of approval of this Act, their heirs, successors, or assigns, to renew the privileges from time to time subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however*, That no such privilege shall be extended beyond the period ending twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act except as specifically provided for in this section. The Secretary shall permit a holder of the grazing privilege to renew such privilege from time to time during the holder's lifetime beyond the twenty-five-year period, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands. The Secretary, by regulation, may limit the privileges enjoyed under this Act to the extent that they are appurtenant to the private lands owned by the persons who held such privileges on the date of approval of this Act, and may adjust such privileges to preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury. Grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto and after reasonable notice of any default.

"Sec. 8. There are hereby eliminated from the Humboldt National Forest all those lands comprising the Snake Division of the forest which lie in:

"NEVADA

"MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

"Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 68 east;

"Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, 69 east; and

"Townships 10, 11, 12, and 13 north, range 70 east.

"Sec. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as a co-sponsor of the bill now before the Senate, and as chairman of the Interior Committee subcommittee that processed this legislation, I am much pleased to have this opportunity to comment on it and to commend it to my colleagues.

The term "Great Basin" refers to that aggregation of about 100 separate basins and their associated mountains in which drainage generally does not reach the sea. It includes all but the extreme western and south portions of my own State of Nevada, the western half of Utah, a section of south-central Oregon, and two small portions of California. The principal characteristics of the Great Basin today are the isolated mountain ranges separated by desert plains. The total area of the basin is about equally divided between ranges and basins.

There is no more outstanding example of Great Basin physiography than that portion of the Snake Range that is proposed for establishment as a national park under the provisions of S. 1760. At the present time there is no characteristic portion of the Great Basin in the national park system. As cosponsors of this legislation, my colleague, Senator CANNON, and I are extremely enthusiastic about the prospect of this truly outstanding area being established as the first national park in our State.

I wish it were possible for all Members of the Senate to see this marvelously scenic area in the Snake Range. Within the area proposed for park development are 14 mountain peaks with elevations in excess of 10,000 feet. The tops of six of these peaks stand a mile or more above the adjacent lowland deserts. Wheeler Peak, which dominates the southern Snake Range, is 13,063 feet high and towers nearly a thousand feet above the nearby second highest peak. These peaks and others nearby are pyramidal in form, or were before glaciers carved cirques, or amphitheaters, in their flanks. This aggregation of mountains, some with spectacular vertical walls and alpine lakes, presents a most inviting scene which is somewhat unbelievable in its arid setting. With the exception of those associated with the salt-encrusted sinks, all natural phenomena associated with life in the Great Basin are exemplified within this proposed park area. Herein exist an amazing variety of plantlife, ranging from those identified with lowland deserts to types of vegetation representative of the Canadian and Arctic regions.

Within the proposed boundaries of the Great Basin National Park is Lehman Caves National Monument. This unit of the park system would be abolished as such and would become a part of the park.

With all deference to my friends from other States, in which great caverns are located, such as in the State of Kentucky and the State of New Mexico, I must state that the cave, the subject of the pending bill, is actually one of the most beautiful in the world. When properly developed, I am sure it will compare favorably with the celebrated Carlsbad Cavern in the State of New Mexico.

Fortunately, this splendid area is easily accessible to the public. U.S. Highway 6-50, the scenic transcontinental highway across Nevada, crosses the Snake Range just north of the proposed area. One of the main north-

south traffic arteries in Nevada, U.S. Highway 93, skirts the west side of the Snake Range. Ely, Nev., some 70 miles to the west, is served daily by United Airlines.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, I have become particularly conscious of the costs of land acquisition in connection with the development and improving of our national parks. One aspect of this Great Basin proposal that is most gratifying to me is the relatively modest land acquisition cost. While some 123,000 acres will eventually comprise this park, only 2,100 acres of non-Federal land are involved. Estimated costs for land acquisition approximate \$150,000, or \$30,000 annually during the 5-year acquisition program. The balance of the land to be incorporated in the park is presently in Federal ownership. The greater part of this acreage is now in the Humboldt National Forest and is administered by the U.S. Forest Service. The balance of the land, some 5,000 acres, is public domain land administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

S. 1760 affords protection to all individuals having valid existing rights within the proposed exterior boundaries as of the date of enactment of the proposed legislation.

Section 5 of the bill makes that very clear in this language:

Sec. 5. Nothing contained herein shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States or the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his lands.

Mr. President, I may say that located within the proposed national park are a number of patented mining claims and claims which are held on open location. These claims would be completely protected under the provisions of this particular section of the law.

I would likewise comment that new activity, if there should be new mining activity in this particular area, would be permitted, subject to the provisions of section 6 of the bill in accordance with general regulations designed to protect scenic, scientific, and recreation values in the area.

The grazing of livestock in this proposed park would be eliminated eventually, but the bill affords interim recognition and protection to those permittees having grazing privileges at the present time on U.S. forest and public domain land within the suggested boundaries.

Mr. President, public hearings on this legislation have been held both in Nevada and in Washington, D.C. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The recommendations of the Department of the Interior have been incorporated in the bill by way of amendments which were adopted en bloc just a few minutes ago.

The Department's cost data statement and facts concerning our park programs, including the effect they may have on our overall budgetary requirements, are contained in the committee report, beginning on page 11.

The overall cost will be approximately \$5.2 million including, first, the cost of the land, which will be some \$150,000. Two witnesses from the Department have indicated that the cost of the eventual development and full use of the proposed national park would be in the neighborhood of \$3.8 million over a period of 5 years. In addition, the operational costs are estimated at approximately \$230,000 to \$240,000 a year.

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

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the Senator's understanding as to the continuation of hunting and fishing on the land after it has been incorporated into the park system?

Mr. BIBLE. Fishing would be permitted. I may say, though, that there is very little fishing. This is really desert area. There would be very little fishing; however, fishing will be permitted in the same manner as it is at the present time. There are a few streams. There are some upland lakes which are attractive in the spring of the year. There would be no change in the fishing.

Hunting would be prohibited. There has been an annual harvest, if my memory serves me right, of some 105 to 110 deer. Such hunting would be prohibited immediately.

Mr. AIKEN. Then there has been a comparatively small take of deer on the land?

Mr. BIBLE. In relation to the total number of deer which are taken in places that are open throughout the State of Nevada, 110 is really a small number. There has been some dispute, I should say in complete honesty and frankness, about the number of deer taken from this particular area. However, as best we have been able to check it, based on the average annual take, the number would be approximately 110 deer a year, because there is no boundary within which it can be said that deer are taken. The best testimony is that an average of 110 deer a year have been taken from this area over the past 5 years.

Mr. AIKEN. Fishing would be permitted under the laws of the State of Nevada?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any forest on the land?

Mr. BIBLE. There is a reasonable amount of forest. The testimony showed that there had been some use of it. There were a couple of little sawmills, one located over the border in the State of Utah. The amount of timber removed from this particular area has been almost negligible.

Mr. AIKEN. Was there opposition from sawmill operators?

Mr. BIBLE. Actually, the sawmill operators as such consist of, I think, either two or three farmers, who occasionally go in and saw some timber for their own use, either for fenceposts or for burning or other operations. But there were no going, operating sawmills there, and there are none there now.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. I asked the question in connection with

other proposals of the Park Service which would seem to be, perhaps, more applicable to eastern conditions.

Mr. BIBLE. This area is located in the Great Basin. It would be a rather unusual type of national park. It would be truly a desert national park.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho, the very able and influential ranking member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Nevada has referred to the special consideration, if not the concessions, which have provided in the bill for continuing grazing and mining operations within the area of the proposed national park. Does not the Senator feel that these concessions may in some way establish a precedent which may plague us in the future, as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considers the creation of other national parks?

Mr. BIBLE. I certainly hope that it is not true. Mining has already been permitted in some of the national parks—for example, within Mount McKinley National Park, I believe, and also in Glacier Bay National Monument, and also in the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument and in the Death Valley National Monument. I recognize that mining is not permitted in many of the national parks—for instance, it is not permitted in Yellowstone Park or Grand Canyon National Park or Yosemite National Park, to name a few. But mining has already been permitted in some of the national parks, and I believe that is not a disservice to the national park concept. Neither do I think this part of the bill would establish a precedent. For example, in connection with the Cape Cod National Seashore, which was established during the last session, the homeowners are permitted to live in the park area and to continue to do so and to hold their land in fee simple for an indefinite period of time. That area is a national seashore, but it is very much in the nature of a national park.

Likewise, at Point Reyes National Seashore, in California, which was passed by the Senate at the last session—dairy farming will be permitted in the central area. Similarly, in the proposed Padre Island National Seashore—the measure creating it is still in committee—oil and gas producing operations will be permitted to be carried on.

So I say frankly that I do not believe this provision will come to plague us. I believe there are some such areas in which mining will do no harm; and if the Senator will visit these areas I believe he will observe that many of them will not be harmed by permitting mining.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It seems to me that we are gradually establishing a new concept of national parks which is rapidly closing the gap between national forest areas and national parks. Can the Senator from Nevada tell us how many acres of the former Federal for-

est areas in his State will be included in the proposed new park area?

Mr. BIBLE. Yes, I shall be happy to state that figure. Of this 123,000 acres, substantially the largest amount is at the present time composed of national forest land. I believe it amounts to 116,000 acres, out of the total of 123,000 acres. At any rate, it is the greater part of the national park area.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator from Nevada tell us why the establishment of this park would be to the benefit of the people of his State, as compared with the uses which in the past have been made of the area when it was national forest land?

Mr. BIBLE. Yes. I believe the status of a national park will increase the national significance of the area, and I believe it will thus become more attractive to those who travel in the West. We in Nevada conceive of this park as being part of a group of great western scenic attractions located in Utah and Nevada. For example, it will tie in very well with Zion National Park, Bryce Canyon National Park, Lake Mead Recreational Area, and Grand Canyon National Park, which is located in northern Arizona. I am convinced that the establishment of a national park in this area will give it far greater attractiveness and will make it of far more national significance than if the land continued to be operated by the Forest Service.

I may say that until the present time, until an attempt was made to create a national park in the area, the whole area rather fell into disuse. But when the Forest Service found that a national park may be created there, the Forest Service showed intense interest in improving the area itself. But I am convinced that it would be better to establish a national park there.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Let me say to the Senator that although I am not in the confidence of the officials of the executive branch of the Government, I believe that the Forest Service officials did register vigorous opposition to elimination of the national forest area and the inclusion of this land in a national park. Is that correct?

Mr. BIBLE. I do not know that I would characterize it as "vigorous opposition"; but they maintained that the area could be operated equally well under their jurisdiction—in other words, under the Forest Service. That statement is made in the Department of Agriculture's report which last year was made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, pages 21343-21344. I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the RECORD be printed at this point, in connection with my remarks.

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

[FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 26, 1961]

ESTABLISHMENT OF GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK, NEV.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on September 12 the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] filed Report No. 983 relative to S. 1760, a bill to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, from the Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs. The committee's report did not contain the report received by the committee from the Department of Agriculture on the bill. On behalf of the Senator from Nevada, I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the report on S. 1760 received from the Department of Agriculture, dated June 20, 1961, be printed as a part thereof.

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

The report is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1961.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: This is in response to your letter of May 5, 1961, for a report on S. 1760, a bill "to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes."

Approximately 94 percent of the lands making up the national park that this bill would create are national forest lands and have been under the jurisdiction and management of this Department for more than 50 years.

We believe that the public interest has been, and would continue to be, adequately served by retention of the lands in national forest status and continued management under principles adopted by the Congress for the national forests in the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960. We further believe that the bill could have undesirable results from the standpoint of both the national parks and the national forests. However, if the Congress concludes that the creation of a national park from these national forest lands is desirable, the Department of Agriculture will not raise objection if the bill is amended as hereinafter recommended.

S. 1760 would (1) establish a specifically described area of land in eastern Nevada as the Great Basin National Park, (2) transfer federally owned lands within the described area to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for preservation and administration as a part of such park, (3) authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure by purchase or donation, or with donated funds, lands or interests in lands within the park, (4) authorize the exchange of federally owned lands within the park area for non-Federal lands or interests in lands of approximately equal value within that area, (5) abolish the Lehman Caves National Monument, which is within the described area, and make it a part of the Great Basin National Park, and (6) prescribe that the park be administered pursuant to the act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish the National Park Service and for other purposes," as amended.

The bill would also provide that the establishment and administration of the national park would be subject to the following provisions: (1) Valid existing claims, locations, or entries under the land laws of the United States would not be affected by establishment of the national park; (2) all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States, exclusive of the land containing them, and minerals subject to leasing under the mineral leasing laws of the United States would be subject to exploration and disposal with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as might be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals; and (3) where Federal lands included within the national park were legally occupied or utilized at the time of enactment for grazing purposes, the person, his heirs, successors, or assigns, would be entitled to renewal of such grazing privileges for a period of 25 years or during the lifetime of the person

or those of his heirs, successors, or assigns who were members of his immediate family on the date of approval of the act. With respect to the latter the bill specifically provides that nothing therein "shall be construed as creating any vested rights, title, interest, or estate in or to any Federal lands."

The 117,100 acres of national forest land which make up almost all of this proposed national park are a part of the Snake division of the Humboldt National Forest, created by Executive Order No. 908 on July 1, 1908. As a part of the national forest system these lands and their resources have been, and are being, protected, husbanded and made available for utilization under the multiple-use principles applicable to national forest lands.

The recreational resources are getting increased use each year. To accommodate the 51,000 recreation visits in 1960, picnic, camping, and trailer parking facilities have been provided. Additional facilities are planned to meet future needs as these develop. The timber resources, though not large, would sustain an annual sustained cut of 1 to 1½ million board feet. Some 1,200 Christmas trees are sold annually, and an estimated 6,000 pounds of piñon nuts are harvested in good years. The area provides key summer range for 2,811 sheep and 857 cattle under national forest grazing permits. The mineral resources have been prospected and are being developed under the general mining laws. The area's estimated game herd of 3,000 mule deer has been actively hunted each year by some 500 hunters. The water resource is characteristic of high mountain ranges that rise out of desert surroundings. It provides domestic water and water supply for some 10,000 acres of nearby farms and ranch lands.

This Department believes that the land and resources of this area and the demands for resources and services meet the criteria for national forest land; that our administration of this area has been in accord with the policies and directives of Congress; and that such administration has been a direct benefit to the surrounding economy and people.

Normally, national parks serve two primary purposes—preservation and recreation. They are not normally open to mineral exploration and development, to livestock grazing, nor to hunting under State laws; likewise, the timber in national parks is not available for commercial utilization.

Under S. 1760, however, special provisions are included which would permit continuation of prospecting and mining and livestock grazing. The minor amount of fishing in the area would also continue as in other parks. These special provisions of the bill would dictate the same type of use for the proposed national park that the area now receives as a national forest with the exception that the small amount of logging now underway would be precluded and hunting would no longer be permitted under State laws. Some form of hunting could, we understand, be carried on under regulations of the Secretary of the Interior. Arrangements to allow this have been under consideration.

Enactment of this bill to establish a national park with these specially permitted uses would make the park similar in its objectives to the national forests and would partially destroy what has been the traditional and well-understood distinction in both purpose and management between the national parks and the national forests. This, we believe, to be undesirable.

The uses that would be permitted in the proposed park and their similarity to the national forest uses that are now underway indicate that no special purpose would be served by converting this area from national forest to national park status. It is possible that advocates of a national park seek pri-

marily to attach the national park name to this area with the hope of capitalizing commercially on that name by developing sufficient additional tourism.

We believe the national forest can make fully as great a contribution in developing recreation resources. We recognize the upsurge in demand for outdoor recreation opportunities. Over the past several years we have intensified the development of recreational areas within the national forests; we have increased our informational program to bring to the public attention the availability of these facilities; we are giving increasing emphasis to the public information services provided in such areas. The increased use of and interest in national forest recreation areas is clearly demonstrating both the awareness of the public of these areas and the value of them to local communities in attracting tourists.

If the bill were enacted with the boundaries essentially as now proposed, it would leave in national forest status about 55,000 acres located primarily at the south end of the park. This acreage would be isolated from other parts of the Humboldt National Forest. We believe it would be desirable that this residual area be added to the park or even more preferably be returned to public domain. The Department of Agriculture believes that it would be undesirable to continue this acreage in national forest status and recommends that the bill be so amended.

The apparent intent in establishing the boundary at the north end of the park was to follow the national forest boundary. There is, however, one place in section 18, T. 14 N., R. 69 E., where the boundaries do not coincide. We recommend that the bill be amended to correct this discrepancy.

The above recommendations can be accomplished as follows:

Page 3, line 23, change "three-quarters" to "one-half".

Page 3, line 25, strike the words "the south half of".

Page 4, line 2, strike the words "south one-sixteenth latitudinal" and insert the words "east-west quarter".

Page 4, line 3, strike the entire line and insert in lieu thereof "east quarter corner".

Page 4, line 4, change "one-quarter" to "one-half".

Page 9, following line 2, add a new section 8 as follows:

"SEC. 8. There are hereby eliminated from the Humboldt National Forest all those lands comprising the Snake Division, being situated in townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 68 east; townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 69 east; and townships 10, 11, 12, and 13 north, range 70 east, Mount Diablo Meridian."

Page 9, line 3, renumber present section 8 as section 9.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Mr. BIBLE. In the report it is stated that they believe that the public interest has been and will continue to be adequately served by retention of the lands under the control of the Forest Service; and they analyze the national park bill, and conclude by saying that if the bill were to be enacted, they would not have objection, provided certain specific amendments were adopted. Those amendments were adopted. They take out of the jurisdiction of the Forest Service a parcel of land lying to the south of the park, and put it under the administration of the Bureau of Land Management, as public domain.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to address several questions to the able Senator from Nevada.

First, I wish to read from lines 12 to 16 of section 2 of the bill, beginning on page 6:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as described above, is authorized to procure by purchase, by donation, with donated funds, or by such means as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands.

Does that mean that if the Secretary of the Interior deemed it to be in the public interest, he could exercise the right of eminent domain?

Mr. BIBLE. I think the answer is definitely yes. For example, if he were to find that the operation of a patented mining claim might interfere with the best use of the national park, he could, by means of condemnation, acquire for the park such interests.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How does that square with the provisions of sections 5 and 6 of the bill, particularly the provisions of section 5, which reads as follows:

SEC. 5. Nothing contained herein shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States or the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his lands.

If the Secretary is to have the power of condemnation, would not he be able to condemn such entries?

Mr. BIBLE. I believe he would be able to do so as a matter of law, in accordance with this particular provision of the act. The section to which the Senator from South Dakota alludes—section 5—represents the committee's attempt to make it abundantly clear that anyone who has an existing valid claim will be protected. We intend that these titles will be respected by the U.S. Government; they do not fall or end by reason of the enactment of a bill creating a national park.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But what good does it do to have the bill set forth that such a person has a valid claim, if in another paragraph of the bill it is provided that the Secretary may procure it by such means as he deems to be within the public interest? For example, he could condemn it.

Mr. BIBLE. The only means which could be used would be condemnation, under due process of law, and on paying the value determined by the court or by a jury, as the case might be. The power to condemn property is authorized to give full effect to the land acquisition program. Such authority as is created in section 2 could well be brought to bear on the interests otherwise protected by section 5 but only, in my judgment, if the utilization of the protected right became grossly inconsistent with the basic

or essential purposes for which the park is being established.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, if this matter is acceptable to the people of Nevada and to the Senator from Nevada, I would not dispute it.

However, if this were to be a precedent or were to be applicable to other States, I personally would have some reservations. I would not want a park to be created in a State when, in one part of the act it stated, "We will recognize the claim," and in another paragraph it stated, "The Secretary can practice the right of condemnation." I would give the Secretary the right to purchase or exchange, but I would personally not want the Secretary to have the right of condemnation for this particular purpose.

I note that in section 6 of the bill mineral deposits are dealt with, and the language proposes—

Minerals subject to leasing under the mineral leasing laws of the United States shall be subject to exploration and disposal under such laws, with right of occupation.

And so forth. Would the Senator care to state whether that language would limit the development of claims to prospecting and removal of the minerals, and yet not permit the milling of the minerals?

Mr. BIBLE. I would be of the opinion that this provision was primarily for prospecting or developing and for actual mining. I would not think the provision carried with it the right to have a mill site or any other elaborate practice that was not directly associated with the actual mining.

I may say that the problems which the Senator from South Dakota raises, and those which the Senator from Idaho commented upon, are good suggestions. They are problems which concerned the committee a great deal.

I think one has to know this particular area and the geology of it to understand whether or not this provision is going to cause any problem in the future. Let me illustrate. For many years explorations have taken place on the western slopes of this particular park. First explorations for uranium took place. Now it is thought that beryllium may be discovered. To make it abundantly clear that there would be no conflict as to the prospecting and mining for beryllium, we excluded the particular section of the park that gave some prospect for development of the beryllium. It was carefully worked out and negotiated.

I would think that if the bill were enacted into law today, hereafter if a prospector were to go into that area and stick a pick into the ground and by chance find some type of mineral wealth, his activity would be limited to prospecting and mining. I think he could put a mill there only if the Secretary of the Interior said it would not disrupt the overall, paramount use of the area as a national park.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator's reference to beryllium is of interest. Ninety-five percent of beryllium produced in this country is produced within 15 miles of my hometown. We

are thought to be the beryllium capital of the country. However, in view of the growing uses for beryllium, we would certainly have no objection to exploring for beryllium in other parts of the country.

I raise the question, however, because, in connection with a reserve made some years ago in the Black Hills of South Dakota, within a national forest area, specifically within the so-called Norbeck Wildlife Reserve, we attempted to work out regulations and legislation which would make it possible for the prospecting and the mining of minerals, but not permit milling, on the ground that the use of the streams for milling in the particular recreation area would defeat the purposes of creating the park.

As the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, one needs to know the geology and conditions of a particular area to know how various developments would affect them. It may be that milling would not be objectionable to the purpose of the Great Basin National Park. I have thought it was desirable, where we could, however, to preserve for future generations, and for the present generation, the opportunity to remove minerals, particularly those of strategic or critical importance to the country, and that it should be possible to look for them and remove them if it could be done without necessitating the development of mills or processes which would clutter up or perhaps defeat the purpose of the park. That was the reason why I raised the question.

Mr. BIBLE. I think it is a timely question, and I think the colloquy and discussion are very helpful. In my considered judgment, if some strategic or critical mineral were to be discovered sometime in the future, prospecting and mining would be permitted. I doubt whether the Secretary of the Interior would or could or should permit the location of a mill within the confines of the park. I do not think the mining would be stopped.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I read the language as meaning only mining and removal. I rather hoped the limitations of the regulations would be consistent with the needs to conserve the purpose of a national park.

Mr. BIBLE. I think they would be. There is very little water feeding down into the streams, and it is rather seasonal, because this area is in the heart of the Great Basin area, where the climate is extremely dry and rainfall exceedingly scarce. I doubt if a mill could be located within the confines of the park at that altitude. It would not be a good millsite.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. One other question has to do with the committee amendments in section 7. I note, at the bottom of page 9, that a 25-year continuation of grazing rights is provided. This language is contained in section 7:

Subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's

immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior of the date of the approval of this Act.

For the purpose of clarity in the RECORD, it is intended that the only extension of the grazing privilege shall be to one who was a member of the person's immediate family who was the original holder of the grazing privilege?

Mr. BIBLE. I think that is correct, with this qualification: that provision goes only to the protection beyond 25 years. The immediate family would be protected for lifetime.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. During the period beyond the 25-year period, the protection is only for a member of the immediate family, and heir, successor, or assign. Is that correct?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct. This language is adopted word for word from the language written into the Grand Teton National Park Act, and has had some basis of experience. It has worked out reasonably well.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator realizes that when we deal with legislation of this sort affecting any of the Western States, certain precedents or principles are written into the act and they become advisory or precedents in other States.

While I would have some reservations to the bill if applicable to my State, if the bill is acceptable to the Senator from Nevada and the people of Nevada, I shall interpose no objection. I wanted the RECORD clear as to the intent and purpose.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I think the discussion has been very helpful. I appreciate his views. I think they have cleared the RECORD in this respect.

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

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems important, if the recreational needs of the people are to be met, that there be an expansion of our system of national parks and other publicly held recreational grounds. Though it may be easy to establish a national park out of lands in the national domain, yet some expansion is needed in other areas where entirely different conditions prevail. In establishing principles and rules for the use of national parks which may be chosen in the future, is it not highly important, and probably necessary, to establish those rules and principles in accordance with conditions which prevail where it is proposed to establish a new park?

Is it not almost impossible to lay down blanket rules which would be applicable all over the country, without committing grave injustices and possibly putting large numbers of people out of their regular employment?

Mr. BIBLE. I could not agree with the Senator from Vermont more. I think the examples of two of the bills which we passed last year are illustrative of the point the Senator is making.

Many years ago people would have said we could not permit dairy cows and national parks to go together, but this is exactly what may happen in the State of the distinguished senior Senator from

California, north of San Francisco, in the Point Reyes area.

Many people would have said we could not create a seashore or a national park in an area as populous as the area of Cape Cod, which lies to the east of Boston, but nevertheless this has been done.

The Padre Island bill may become law. It is before the committee for consideration. It would permit oil wells to be developed out in the gulf or on the island and to exist side by side with a very attractive long spit of the island which runs more than 80 miles along the gulf, from Corpus Christi to Brownsville.

All of these are a recognition of the different criteria which are found on the eastern seaboard and on the Pacific coast, as well as on the gulf.

I could not agree more. There may be different problems, if there is a national park in Vermont, and the criteria certainly would not be the same as those to be applied to the desert area of the Great Basin National Park.

Mr. AIKEN. That is why I am so interested. The Secretary of the Interior is suggesting a national park in a sparsely populated area in Vermont.

I understand that in the establishment of the Cape Cod National Park the small villages within the area are to be permitted to continue their existence.

Mr. BIBLE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Instead of losing their means of living, the people in those villages will probably find it enhanced.

I believe also, in the setting up of the Cape Cod National Seashore, the fishing and the hunting will be continued. I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr. BIBLE. I am not sure with respect to hunting, I say in complete honesty. Fishing and shell fishing are permitted. The Senator could well be correct as to the hunting. I am not completely advised on that point. I shall be glad to discuss it with the Senator after I check the record. I do not wish to make any mistake. I do not recall offhand, whether we permitted hunting. We did permit fishing, and we did permit shell fishing. I do not know about the hunting.

There are five towns involved in the Cape Cod area. They will continue to exist and to operate. They will have their governing councils and town form of government, the same as now.

Mr. AIKEN. And the towns and communities, I believe, are each authorized to appoint members of an advisory committee for the operation of the park.

Mr. BIBLE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether it is important to know whether hunting is permitted in the park or not. The fact remains that if Congress decided hunting should be permitted it could be permitted.

Mr. BIBLE. My best recollection is that we left the issue to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. AIKEN. When we consider the establishment of recreational areas, wilderness areas, or national parks in the East, we have to consider entirely different conditions from those existing in the West. That is why I say, in the

expansion of the park system, it will be virtually impossible to lay down rules to apply to all the areas which are in the national park system.

Mr. BIBLE. I agree with the Senator from Vermont. I thank the Senator very much for his participation and the contributions he has made to the discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, before any final action is taken with respect to the bill, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the statement of my junior colleague. I had hoped my colleague would be able to be present and to participate in the discussion. He has been detained at a committee meeting. I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by my junior colleague, Senator CANNON, who is a cosponsor of the bill, may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOWARD W. CANNON

It was my privilege to cosponsor, along with my colleague, Senator BIBLE, the bill now before the Senate. S. 1760 would establish a national park in the Great Basin region in Nevada.

Many people think of Nevada as a land of large open spaces, which it indeed is. But it is much more than that. Within the State are many tree-covered mountain ranges and fresh water lakes. This bill would designate one such area as a national park. The site, lying within the Great Basin region, is the culminating point of the Giant Snake range. It is a unique region of startling contrasts. It encompasses desert valleys and mountain peaks rising more than 13,000 feet toward the sky; the plant and animal life are characteristic of five of the seven life zones of the world; the Lehman caves, already designated as a national monument, include what Secretary Udall has described as "some of the most delicately beautiful cave formations thus far discovered anywhere."

Fourteen peaks within the park area have elevations of over 10,000 feet, and six of these stand a mile or more above the surrounding plains. The most monumental of these heights is Wheeler Peak, which is snow capped during most of the year. The sheer beauty of these peaks is enhanced by vertical cliffs 1,000 feet high and majestic amphitheaters carved into the mountainside by prehistoric glaciers. The area boasts an icefield which has many characteristics of a glacial formation, and a unique body of moving rock which geologists have defined as a rock glacier.

On the summits of these mountains can also be found mountain mahogany, manzanita, sagebrush, and bristlecone pine which have been estimated to be over 4,000 years old. Perhaps most striking in beauty are the three alpine lakes which nestle within these rugged surroundings.

I have described some of the features from which visitors to the park would benefit. Equally important from an economic view is the benefit which would accrue to the community of Ely upon the establishment of this park. Ely is largely a one-industry community, and the diversification which would be afforded by the park would help to boost a stilted economy. The community has repeatedly suffered from the curtailment in mining activity. The park would create new opportunity and new employment. Most important, it would preserve an area which cannot be duplicated on this continent.

In an effort to satisfy those who claim that a park would adversely affect grazing, hunting, and mining, there has been modification and refinement of the bill we are presently considering. The National Park Service has made a genuine effort to make those adjustments which would minimize the adversity and yet not impair the administration or the attractiveness of the park. The boundaries have been redefined to exclude the best grazing areas, and provision has been made for the continued use of range under permits now held. The bill also contains provision, of course, for the eventual termination of those privileges.

A rather unique, though not unprecedented, provision has been made for the continuation of mining and mineral leasing activities. These activities would be allowed, but there could be no acquisition by locators or entrymen of title to the land.

During field hearings on this legislation in December 1959, I assured my constituents that the degree of adversity which might result from park designation would be minimized. I am convinced that this has been done to the full extent consistent with sound park management practices.

A great amount of work has gone into this bill. The National Park Service has been most cooperative; the Great Basin Park Association, formed to foster the establishment of the Great Basin National Park, has worked tirelessly to generate support; and the committee has reported a good bill. It is my view that we need to take steps to protect areas within our national borders possessing attractive and utilitarian features. If we fail to do so, they will gradually be overrun and reformed until they no longer exist for the benefit and pleasure of future generations.

Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, has graphically illustrated this danger. He said, "The inexorable march of progress brings many and varied benefits for which all can be deeply thankful. But inevitably the march imperils other values, old and often deeply loved. This surging tide of modern progress has rolled over vast areas of our pristine * * * country, wiping out, one after another, the natural open spaces so long serene and undisturbed. Houses, business, resorts of all kinds continue ever more rapidly to invade, disturb, and destroy the very beauties we seek most to enjoy."

I hope that Senators will take this opportunity to add to the national park system the legend of the Great Basin. If they do, future generations will laud their foresight and thoughtfulness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1760) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit and inspiration of the people a representative segment of the great basin possessing outstanding ecological resources and significant geological and scenic values, there is hereby established the Great Basin National Park in the State of Nevada which, subject to valid existing rights, shall consist of lands and interest in lands within the following described boundary:

Commencing at the quarter section corner of sections 17 and 20, township 11 north, range 70 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Nevada; thence west 1½ miles along the south boundaries of sections 17 and 18 to the westerly common corner of sections 18 and 19; thence due west 8 miles over unsurveyed

land to a point; thence due north over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 5 and 8, township 11 north, range 68 east;

Thence westerly over unsurveyed land to said easterly common corner of sections 5 and 8; thence north along the east boundary of section 5 to the northeast corner of said section; thence due north approximately one mile over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the easterly common corner of sections 25 and 36, township 12 north, range 67 east, thence due east one mile over unsurveyed land to a point; thence due north approximately 7 miles over unsurveyed land to a point which is due east of the northeast corner of section 25, township 13 north, range 67 east; thence due west 2½ miles to a point; thence due north approximately 3 miles over unsurveyed land to the quarter section corner of the south boundary of section 6, township 13 north, range 68 east; thence 2 miles north through the center of section 6, township 13 north, range 68 east, and section 31, township 14 north, range 68 east, to the quarter section corner common to sections 30 and 31;

Thence east 1½ miles along the south boundaries of sections 30 and 29 to the common corner of sections 28, 29, 32, and 33; thence north 2 miles along the east boundaries of sections 29 and 20 to the common corner of sections 16, 17, 20, and 21; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 16 to the common corner of sections 15, 16, 21, and 22; thence north 1 mile along the east boundary of section 16 to the common corner of sections 9, 10, 15, and 16; thence east 3 miles along the south boundaries of sections 10, 11, and 12 to the easterly common corner of sections 12 and 13 on the east boundary of township 14 north, range 68 east;

Thence north approximately three-quarters of a mile along the west boundary of township 14 north, range 69 east, to the westerly common corner of sections 7 and 18, said township and range; thence east approximately one-half mile along the north boundary of said section 18 to the north quarter corner of said section 18, thence south approximately one-half mile along the north south quarter line of said section 18 to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of said section 18;

Thence east approximately one-half mile along the east-west quarter line of said section 18 to the east quarter corner of said section 18; thence south approximately one-half mile along the east boundary of said section 18 to the southerly common corner of said section 18 and section 17; thence east approximately one-half mile along the north boundary of section 20 to the north quarter corner of said section 20;

Thence south approximately one mile along the north-side quarter line of said section 20 to the north quarter corner of section 29; thence east approximately one-half mile to the northeast corner of said section 29; thence north approximately 4.89 chains along the west boundary of section 28 to the northwest corner of said section 28; thence east approximately one mile along the north boundary of said section 28 to the northeast corner of said section 28;

Thence south along the east boundaries of sections 28 and 33, township 14 north, range 68 east, and of what probably will be when surveyed section 4, township 13 north, range 69 east, to the east quarter corner of said section 4; thence east approximately two miles along the east-west quarter lines of sections 3 and 2 to the east quarter corner of said section 2; thence south approximately one-half mile along the east boundary of section 2 to the common corner of sections 1, 2, 11, and 12;

Thence east approximately two miles along the north boundaries of said section

12, township 13 north, range 69 east, and section 7, township 13 north, range 70 east, to the common corner of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8; thence south 5 miles along the west boundaries of sections 8, 17, 20, 29, and 32, to the southerly common corner of sections 31 and 32, township 13 north, range 70 east; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 32 to the northerly common corner of sections 4 and 5, township 12 north, range 70 east;

Thence south 1 mile along the west boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; thence east 1 mile along the south boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 3, 4, 9, and 10; thence south 5 miles along the west boundaries of sections 10, 15, 22, 27, and 34, to the common corner of sections 3 and 4, township 11 north, range 70 east, and sections 33 and 34, township 12 north, range 70 east; thence west 1 mile along the north boundary of section 4, to the common corner of sections 4 and 5, township 11 north, range 70 east, and sections 32 and 33, township 12 north, range 70 east;

Thence south 1 mile along the west boundary of section 4, township 11 north, range 70 east, to the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; thence west one-half mile along the north boundary of section 8, to the quarter section corner common to sections 5 and 8; thence south 2 miles through the center of sections 8 and 17 to the quarter section corner common to sections 17 and 20, township 11 north, range 70 east, the point of beginning, containing about 123,360 acres.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as described above, is authorized to procure by purchase, by donation, with donated funds, or by such means as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands. The Secretary is authorized further to convey federally owned lands and interests in lands within the park in exchange for non-Federal lands and interests in lands of approximately equal value within the park if, in his judgment, such exchange is in the public interest. Federal lands lying within the boundaries of the Great Basin National Park, as established pursuant to this Act, are hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for preservation and administration as a part of such park.

Sec. 3. The Lehman Caves National Monument, established on January 24, 1922, by proclamation of the President pursuant to authority contained in the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), is hereby abolished. Lands and interests in lands heretofore comprising such monument shall, from the date of approval of this Act, be a part of the Great Basin National Park.

Sec. 4. The Great Basin National Park shall be administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", as amended.

Sec. 5. Nothing contained herein shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States or the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his lands.

Sec. 6. Within the Great Basin National Park, all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States, exclusive of the land containing them, and minerals subject to leasing under the mineral leasing laws of the United States shall be subject to exploration and disposal under such laws, with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals; *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe such general regulations for the control of these activities as he deems necessary to preserve the scenic,

scientific, and recreation values of the area. The provisions of the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended, shall have no application within the Great Basin National Park.

Sec. 7. Where any Federal lands included within the Great Basin National Park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges on the date of approval of this Act, their heirs, successors, or assigns, to renew the privileges from time to time subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however,* That no such privilege shall be extended beyond the period ending twenty-five years from the date of approval of this Act except as specifically provided for in this section. The Secretary shall permit a holder of the grazing privilege to renew such privilege from time to time during the holder's lifetime beyond the twenty-five-year period, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, if (1) the holder is the person who held such privilege on the date of approval of this Act, or (2) the holder is the heir, successor, or assign of such person and was a member of that person's immediate family, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, on the date of approval of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands. The Secretary, by regulation, may limit the privileges enjoyed under this Act to the extent that they are appurtenant to the private lands owned by the persons who held such privileges on the date of approval of this Act, and may adjust such privileges to preserve the park land and resources from destruction or unnecessary injury. Grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Great Basin National Park established by this Act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto and after reasonable notice of any default.

Sec. 8. There are hereby eliminated from the Humboldt National Forest all those lands comprising the Snake Division of the forest which lie in:

NEVEDA

Mount Diablo Meridian

Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 68 east;

Townships 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 north, range 69 east; and

Townships 10, 11, 12, and 13 north, range 70 east.

Sec. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CLAIM OF GEORGE EDWARD BARNHART

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1065, H.R. 6025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6025) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6025) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States, which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "May 8, 1951" and to insert "December 31, 1946".

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary succinctly states the purpose of the bill, as follows:

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart, of Altadena, Calif., against the United States for the unauthorized manufacture, use, or sale by or for the United States since December 31, 1946, of inventions covered by several enumerated patents of and owned by said George Edward Barnhart. Defenses of the United States based on laches, lapse of time, or any statute of limitations are waived and nothing herein shall be construed as an admission of liability on the part of the United States.

Briefly, the facts are these: George Barnhart, for the duration of the war, gave to the Government, gratuitously, an irrevocable, nonexclusive, royalty-free license to permit the Government use of certain patented inventions pertaining to inventions concerning airplane wing construction, airfoil construction, and control, and airplane construction, and also involving such areas as flaps and hydraulic control systems. This was a gallant, patriotic thing for this citizen to do.

Subsequent to the declaration, on December 31, 1946, of the cessation of hostilities of World War II, Mr. Barnhart sought a return of the patents. A dispute arose as to what was covered during what period of time.

Mr. Barnhart seeks redress on his allegation that after the war was concluded the Government continued to use the benefit of his own patented discoveries, which he had given to the Government during the war, all of which facts are set forth in the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from the report printed in the RECORD.

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

On July 31, 1942, Mr. George Edward Barnhart gratuitously granted to the United States an irrevocable, nonexclusive, royalty-free license under a number of his patents, including those cited in the present bill, which was duly recorded on August 5, 1942. The rights granted were to remain in full force and effect for the duration of the war.

Subsequent to the declaration, on December 31, 1946, of the cessation of hostilities of World War II, Mr. Barnhart sought return of the patents or a royalty-bearing license in substitution for the royalty-free license. He was advised by the Patents Branch of the Office of the Judge Advocate General that since the war had not been officially terminated the interests, vested in the Government for the duration of the war, constituted Government property which could not be disposed of gratuitously by administrative action. That position was confirmed on June 24, 1949.

On August 18, 1950, Congress enacted Public Law 694 (81st Cong.; ch. 716, 64 Stat. 448; 50 U.S.C. App. 2371) which provided for cancellation of such licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder. On May 8, 1951, the Secretary of the Air Force, upon Mr. Barnhart's application and acting under the authority granted in said act, canceled the license effective on that date and not retroactively to December 31, 1946, as requested by Mr. Barnhart.

Mr. Barnhart made repeated claims against the Government for damages for unauthorized use or infringements of his patents and on January 5, 1959, filed a petition claiming damages therefor in the U.S. Court of Claims (case No. 4-59). The United States prevailed on its motion to dismiss claims founded on patents 1,854,444; 1,974,407; and 2,005,965, as barred by reason of expiration of said patents more than 6 years prior to the filing of the petition.

During the presentation of evidence before the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, which considered the merits of this bill, it was asserted that the remaining claims in said action have as a practical matter been seriously affected by the aforesaid ruling of the court inasmuch as two of the remaining patents in the suit expired 2 days less than 6 years prior to the filing of the petition, hence permitting infringement claims to be adjudicated for a 2-day period; one patent expired May 5, 1953, permitting adjudication for a 5-month period; one expired February 16, 1954, allowing an 11-month period; and one expired May 16, 1956, allowing adjudication for 29 months.

The patents which are the subject matter of this legislation pertain to inventions concerning airplane wing construction, airfoil construction and control, and airplane construction, and involve such areas as flaps and hydraulic control systems.

Mr. Barnhart had a long and consistent interest in aviation, having, at the age of 14, in 1909, built and flown a glider, and in succeeding years, built and flown biplanes, pusher-type airplanes, and prototypes of modern aircraft. At the beginning of World War II he had accumulated about 64 patents, most of which dealt with improvement to aircraft. He presented all of them for the war effort and on July 18, 1942, the Government accepted 19 of them "for use during the war effort" and received from Mr. Barnhart the aforesaid royalty-free license "for the duration of the present war."

Following the declaration of cessation of hostilities until he instituted suit in the Court of Claims, Mr. Barnhart persistently contended that the Government made improper use and infringed on said patents and sought damages therefor. He sought administrative relief and also information on which to determine the amount of damage ascertainable through determining the number of airplanes produced during said period and which information he also sought through court procedure after the suit was instituted.

The House report in its consideration of this case states as follows:

"It is apparent to the committee that Mr. Barnhart was motivated by patriotism in

giving the Government royalty-free use of his inventions for the period he thought was during hostility rather than, in fact, for the duration of the war. It is the opinion of the committee that the Government interest in said patents did vest in the Government for the duration of the war except that on May 8, 1951, they were duly relinquished under the provisions of law and the interest reverted, on that date, in Mr. Barnhart. From said date until suit was instituted on January 5, 1959, Mr. Barnhart had several opportunities to institute court proceedings because of the number of occasions that he asserted claims and the investigation and denial of them by the Air Force on each occasion. However, the committee recognizes that there can be a strong likelihood of believing that there was merely one continuing claim and repeated reviews thereof."

"Therefore, in consideration of all the foregoing, the committee concludes that, on the basis of fairness, equity, and justice, defenses of laches, lapse of time, or statute of limitations should be waived as they relate to Mr. Barnhart's claims against the United States since May 8, 1951, and recommends that this legislation, as amended, be considered favorably."

The committee, in its consideration of this claim, has amended the bill to restore the date of December 31, 1946, as the bill was introduced, in lieu of the date of May 8, 1951, as recommended by the House. The purpose of this amendment is to prevent the consideration of any infringement prior to December 31, 1946. The committee does not insert that date for the purpose of fixing December 31, 1946, as the commencement of any alleged infringement but, on the contrary, believes that the actual date is a matter for the court to decide, whether it be December 31, 1946, May 8, 1951, or some other date which the court may deduce from the evidence presented. In other words, the committee considers that the date upon which the patents should have been released and reassigned to the claimant is an open question for the decision of the court.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, justice delayed is justice denied. The bill should have been passed last year. There was no opposition on this side. One of my colleagues on the Democratic side did object to the passage of the bill. Therefore, it was put over. The bill is now before us by motion. It now ought to be passed and sent to the President.

Mr. President, the committee recommends the bill. I regret that the Department of Justice filed an adverse report and that the Department of Commerce made no recommendation at all. I urge that the committee position be adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 6025) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE OF NAME OF THE PLAYA DEL REY INLET AND HARBOR, VENICE, CALIF.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1095, H.R. 157.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 157) to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, all of us who are interested in the very highest standards of American education were heartened by the words of President Kennedy's state of the Union message.

The President described at some length the current needs and goals of the American educational system.

To me, however, the heart of his statement was in these words:

But excellence in education must begin at the elementary level. I sent to the Congress last year a proposal for Federal aid to public school construction and teachers' salaries. I believe that bill—which passed the Senate and received House committee approval—offered the minimum amount required by our needs, and in terms of across-the-board aid, the maximum scope permitted by our Constitution. I, therefore, see no reason to weaken or withdraw that bill; and I urge its passage at this session.

This is a very definite statement of the position of the administration. It is brief, concise, and it could not be more clear.

The question then becomes: Will Congress fulfill its obligation to American education by adopting this proposed legislation?

We again have the opportunity to take action that will do much more than make the 87th Congress one of the truly historic Congresses in our history.

Passage of such proposed legislation would be clear-cut evidence to the parents, the children, and the educators that we are prepared, at last, to bolster the very foundations of our national strength.

I use the word "again" with some sadness and frustration—but not resignation.

The Congress has abdicated its responsibilities to general education on countless occasions in the past.

Time after time bills have come before the Senate and the House to provide the vital fertilizer of Federal funds to the

grassroots of education—the elementary and secondary levels.

Those of us who were advocating this legislation long before sputnik rose into the skies, and changed the course of world history, were heartened by the furor caused by this scientific achievement.

There was a sort of national guilty conscience over the lack of attention given to American education, and we hoped this would provide the impetus needed.

It did, to some degree.

We passed the National Defense Education Act, for example, to stimulate and improve the teaching of defense-related subjects in the area of higher education.

Even more importantly, we seemed on the verge of a major breakthrough in Federal aid to general education.

In 1960 the Senate passed S. 8 to provide assistance to the States for school construction and teachers' salaries, which was the first general-aid bill to pass this body in more than a decade. An outlay of \$925 million was proposed for each of 2 years.

The same year the House passed its version of a school-aid bill, providing \$400 million a year for 4 years.

Thus, for the first time in the history of our country, both the Senate and the House demonstrated by their votes their acceptance of the principle of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools.

I need not recite at this point the details of the sorry parliamentary situation that prevented these bills from going to the usual Senate-House conference, and thus blocked final enactment.

But this past year the Senate reaffirmed its endorsement of Federal aid by passing S. 1021 by a vote of 49 to 34 and sending it on to the House.

This is the measure to which President Kennedy referred in his state of the Union message.

Another passage in his remarks on education also caught my attention. He said:

Eight million adult Americans are classified as functionally illiterate. This is a disturbing figure reflected in selective service rejection rates. And I shall recommend plans for a massive attack to end this adult illiteracy.

I agree with President Kennedy that this is disturbing. In fact, I find it shocking that 8 percent of our adult population is illiterate.

The President is right that we should launch a "massive attack" on this situation.

But simple logic indicates that the only real answer to this problem is to launch an even more massive attack on the major cause of this illiteracy, and the semi-illiteracy that encompasses many more millions of our people.

This naturally leads us right back to the premise that both our immediate and long-range educational needs require strengthening of our elementary and secondary school systems.

The subject of illiteracy raised by the President reminded me of an interesting discovery we made during research into the history of Federal aid to education.

One of the very first general school-aid bills, a measure known as "A bill to aid in the establishment and temporary support of the common schools," passed the Senate in 1884. It was sponsored by Senator Henry Blair, a Republican from the great State of New Hampshire.

Whereas our modern bill, S. 1021, would allocate funds to the States based on a combination of need and school-age population, S. 398 of the year 1884, would have distributed the funds according to the illiterate population of each State.

One can only speculate, but with considerable certainty, whether a President of the United States need speak of 8 million illiterate in 1962 had that bill passed in 1884.

It is interesting to note that Senator Blair, using the census of 1880, reported the rate of illiteracy then as 9.3 percent.

President Kennedy's report of 8 million "functionally illiterate" today represents an illiteracy rate of about 8 percent.

While the statistical bases for the 1884 and 1962 figures are not exactly the same, the conclusion is distressingly clear: We have made shamefully little progress in stamping out illiteracy and semi-illiteracy.

This demonstrates the most serious consequence of our delays in taking that action which, if we are to meet the challenges of the future or even survive as a nation, can only be considered inevitable.

Each year that action is postponed—action to end overcrowding of classrooms or to provide the needed quantity and quality of teachers—means millions of children permanently deprived of sound education.

Interestingly enough, many of the same States that would have received the most funds under Senator Blair's illiteracy formula of 1884 would still receive the major share if they were to be distributed on the same basis today.

The trouble, of course, goes much deeper than whether or not a person can read, or whether he reaches adulthood with a fourth-grade education or less.

Millions of normal children who each year finish high school and even go into the colleges have received what can only be described as a poor education.

Yes, they are literate, but do they read more than the comic strips or the paperback trash in the drugstores?

Are they taught to use their power to think? To be creative? To provide an intellectual atmosphere for their own children?

Today we still hear the cries that this is not the business of the Federal Government, that this is solely the responsibility of the community and the State and the parent.

Let us return to the report filed in the Senate nearly 78 years ago by Senator Blair. This is a remarkable document that bears re-reading today.

Senator Blair addressed himself to this very point of the responsibilities of the Federal Government "to assist in the education of the people when necessary, for its and their own preservation."

Senator Blair's report of 1884 said this in part:

Our leading proposition is that the General Government possesses the power and has imposed upon itself the duty of educating the people of the United States whenever for any cause those people are deficient in that degree of education which is essential to the discharge of their duties as citizens either of the United States or of the several States.

This does not imply that a like power and even more imperative duty do not require the people of every State to educate its own citizens. It is a power not hostile but friendly to the States.

Nor is it a power to be exercised unnecessarily. It should be exercised only in extremity, and when manifestly essential to the local, and therefore ultimately to the general welfare.

As the State may not engage in war * * * so the United States should not enter upon the duty of qualifying the citizen to bear his responsibilities to the Nation and to the State until the local power is shown to be inadequate or negligent and the necessity is apparent and imperative. But the power is there.

To relate these words to today, one may ask whether there is evidence that the States are unable to meet the full measure of their educational responsibilities to their citizens.

I think the record over the years, from 1884 on, is replete with evidence that they are unable to do so, and that most would welcome assistance from the Federal Government.

On January 3, the Office of Education announced the encouraging news that the national classroom shortage had been reduced by 15,300.

This indicates the strong efforts of the States to provide adequate facilities for the students.

But two factors temper any great enthusiasm over this accomplishment.

First, according to the Office of Education report, the shortage of public elementary and secondary classrooms is 127,200, an intolerable level.

Secondly, the report states that "the gain may be shortlived, owing to an expected decline in classroom construction this year, in the face of continuing large enrollment increases."

The report says that public school enrollment has set a new high of 37.5 million, up 1.2 million over 1960. Projections for next fall indicate an increase of another million.

While the number of teachers in the public schools rose by 55,000 over 1960, a total of 89,700 full-time teachers are reported as not having met full certification standards for teaching.

It would seem clear from these modern figures that Senator Blair's proposition of 1884 is still distressingly accurate.

His statement of that year went even deeper into the philosophy of Federal responsibilities, noting that government for the people and by the people requires a higher degree of intelligence on the part of the citizens than any other form. He asks:

How, then, can the republican form of government exist and continue to exist unless from generation to generation, in perpetual succession, the citizen sovereigns are educated?

Then follow these cogent remarks:

This primary duty of society to its individual membership is by the law of nature imposed, in the first instance, on the parent. But the parent cannot fully discharge it. What then?

Society, through the established forms of government, interferes and performs what the parent fails to perform. Is this any violation of the right of the parent? No one pretends it.

It is merely the doing of that which, for the good of the child, the parent and the whole social fabric must be done.

No parent has the right to say that his child shall remain ignorant. He has no right to breed firebrands and death to the society of which he is a part, and to which he owes everything himself. Here is the foundation of the right of compulsory education on the part of the State.

Mr. President, no one disputes that the world of today is vastly more complex than it was in 1884.

We have a pretty good idea, from the fantastic changes and events of the past 77 years, what is in store for us in the next half-century.

Already we consider the circling of our globe by a manmade satellite an almost commonplace event.

It is not a question of if man can reach the moon. It simply is a matter of when.

If we fail to provide the best possible education for our children, we will fall behind not only in the dramatic scientific achievements, but we also will jeopardize the quality of the very leadership we need for our Nation in the years ahead.

I have mentioned here two of the basic questions that arise when we discuss Federal aid to education, the need and the responsibility of Government in this area.

There is no doubt in my mind that both of these questions have been answered very positively. There is a need. We do have the responsibility.

There is still another argument raised, a relatively new argument, and one that probably can be assigned a major share of the blame for the failure to adopt a school aid bill last year.

That is the question of religion, and whether the nonprofit religious schools should share in the use of public funds assigned to school purposes.

This is a dangerous argument, not because of its logic, but because it tends to divide our American people along religious grounds. That kind of division we can never afford.

My own position on this is that religious schools do not have the constitutional right to use Federal grants for construction or teachers' salaries.

If they have the right to share in these funds, then logic would dictate that they would have the same right to share in local school tax funds, distributed by States and communities.

Yet those religious leaders who demand partnership in any Federal legislation do not make that argument at the local level.

This is despite the fact that local school taxes are, and have been for many decades, the basic source of school support.

But no effort has been made by the religious schools to share in the use of these funds for any major purpose.

I have no objection if Congress wishes to make funds available for loans to the nonprofit and religious schools at a low rate of interest.

But I have the impression that even this will not satisfy these religious leaders, that they simply are against Federal assistance to public schools. They took that position very clearly.

Why? Because they fear that the competition from better-supported public schools will detract from their own institutions?

Perhaps this would happen. But that is not our concern or our responsibility. We are in competition with the world, and the sooner we build our educational system to meet that competition the better our chances for survival.

If there is a legitimate legal question over this issue—and many agree that there is—let it be settled in the courts, and not in a dog-in-the-manger attack on Federal aid.

The courts can settle the issue after Congress passes a Federal aid bill; and while it is being thrashed out in the courts, our children can be enjoying the long-overdue benefits of the program.

I would say to those religious leaders who block Federal aid that they must bear a heavy burden on their consciences and are exacting a high price for their personal prejudices.

Mr. President, I began these brief remarks by quoting from President Kennedy's state of the Union message.

The President said he could see no reason to weaken or withdraw the bill passed by the Senate last year and sent to the House. He concluded by stating:

I urge its passage at this session.

Since he made his remarks on January 11, however, the political air between Capitol Hill and the executive department has been charged with considerable static that the administration does not really mean what it says.

These reports have it that no push will be made on general Federal aid, and that the education record will be made this year with an innocuous bill to assist higher education.

This, of course, is the easy approach. It requires no great effort; it attracts no great opposition; and it accomplishes very little. I reject this approach.

Mr. President, when we deal with the education problems of our Nation, it is necessary to establish certain priorities.

By anyone's measurement, the greatest need in education is at the level which represents the foundation of our educational system—the elementary and secondary schools.

But time after time the interests of the schoolchildren have been sold out by following the easy, uncomplicated approach of bolstering higher education.

Each time a higher education bill is passed, general aid legislation is pushed back still further, postponed again while the needs and the population multiply.

In 1958, the National Defense Education Act was the answer of Congress to the unmet needs of education.

This year, according to the reports, Congress and the administration are prepared to settle for the higher education bill now on the Senate Calendar as the latest sop to education needs.

I do not say these bills are worthless. The National Defense Education Act was a valuable program, and I was proud to support it.

I supported the current bill on the calendar (S. 1241) in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But I supported it as a companion to the general aid bill (S. 1021), not as a substitute for it.

Under these circumstances, and in view of the priority needs of education, I intend to oppose the higher education bill until general aid legislation is given the consideration that we have every right to expect.

I think the President of the United States paid a great compliment to the Senate when he said he was satisfied we had passed the kind of bill he wanted, and he called for action on the part of the other body of the Congress so that the bill the Senate passed could become law.

I recognize the argument that the Senate, at least, met its responsibility by passing the general aid bill last year and sending it to the House.

That is true, but I believe that all energies in the education field—administration and congressional alike—should be directed toward freeing that bill for the President's signature, rather than by dissipating our strength with a relatively minor and noncritical hand-out to higher education.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that when public funds were first provided for public school education in the United States, many persons took the position that education should not be for the mass of the people, but should be only for the wellborn and the rich. But that view did not prevail. Have we come full circle? Are we returning to that position? Is education too good for the masses? Must Congress pass Federal aid to education only for higher education? I do not think the American people will be satisfied with that kind of performance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "School Aid: Line of Action," published in the New York Times of January 18, 1962, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a press release of the Office of Education, dated January 3, 1962, and significant portions of the supplement to Senate Report No. 101, of March 10, 1884, submitted by Senator Henry W. Blair, of New Hampshire, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibits 2 and 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1962]

SCHOOL AID: LINE OF ACTION

President Kennedy and Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK have agreed to ask for Federal aid to higher education as a separate measure from the proposed air for public elementary and secondary schools. This separation makes sense because different problems and issues are involved.

The danger implicit in the Speaker's announcement is, however, that the relatively noncontroversial aid for college construction and scholarships will turn out to be both the first and the only education aid measure to be passed in this session. All present indications are that this is what will happen.

It is therefore particularly important for the President now to let there be no misunderstanding about the real priorities. Higher education and talented students need and deserve Federal support; but the basic strength of American education must be reinforced from the ground up. The loss of talent in the sciences and technology, as well as in all the other vital fields, about which the President this week expressed concern, begins in the schools. It is in the schools that the chain reaction either of national growth or decline will be set off.

The agreement to start with college aid is acceptable only if the leadership to get general school aid enacted is so determined, purposeful, and courageous as to leave no question about the nature of the goal.

EXHIBIT 2

PRESS RELEASE BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

JANUARY 3, 1962.

In the wake of a new record in classroom construction, the national classroom shortage as reported by the 50 States and the District of Columbia has been reduced by about 15,300 rooms, the Office of Education announced today.

There are indications in the reports, however, that the gain may be short-lived owing to an expected decline in classroom construction this year in the face of continuing large enrollment increases.

The eighth in a series of annual surveys conducted with the cooperation of State education agencies showed a shortage of 127,200 public elementary and secondary classrooms at the opening of school last fall, compared with 142,500 a year ago.

Public school enrollment last fall reached a new high of 37.5 million—up 1.2 million over fall enrollment in 1960. Classroom construction between the fall of 1960 and the fall of 1961 also hit a new high—72,200 rooms, as against 69,000 the previous year.

Next fall, enrollments will again go up by more than 1 million, but according to reports from the States, construction this year is expected to fall to a total of about 62,700 rooms.

The Office of Education emphasized that national totals obtained through the annual survey are not exactly comparable from year to year because of various changes that have occurred in methods of collecting or compiling the data in a number of States.

About two-thirds of this year's reduction in the shortage was reported by 18 States for which the data are less comparable with last year's than in the other States.

The Office of Education pointed out that such discrepancies are inherent in a national survey of this kind. However, the agency said, the survey has been improved over the years and is now considered to be on a sounder basis than ever before.

The States reported that 18,700 rooms were abandoned during 1960-61 because of population shifts, consolidation of school districts and obsolescence of buildings. The average for the last 4 years has been 17,600.

The current shortage of 127,200 classrooms as reported by the States consists of 60,200 needed to relieve overcrowding and 67,000 needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities.

Approximately 1,694,000 children were in excess of normal classroom capacity, and an estimated 2 million children were attending school in unsatisfactory facilities.

From the fall of 1960 to the fall of 1961, the number of children enrolled in excess of normal classroom capacity was reduced by less than 200,000, according to the State reports.

These children, the Office of Education pointed out, are not the only ones whose education is handicapped by inadequate classroom capacity, inasmuch as all of their classmates share the same crowded quarters.

The number of classrooms built in the last 6 years has averaged 69,100 rooms a year—a level only a little above that needed to take care of increased enrollments and replace classrooms abandoned each year.

As a result, the backlog of need as reported by the States has also remained relatively stable for several years—143,200 rooms in 1957; 141,900 in 1958; 135,264 in 1959; 142,500 in 1960.

Of the 37.5 million pupils enrolled last fall, 24.7 million were in elementary schools and 12.8 million in secondary schools. The total enrollment increase of 1.2 million was 3.4 percent greater than a year ago. Most of the increase was in secondary schools.

The survey showed 1,463,000 full-time and part-time classroom teachers this fall in the Nation's public schools, 871,000 at the elementary level, and 592,000 at the secondary level. This was a gain of 55,000 or 3.9 percent over the 1960 total.

State departments of education reported in the survey that 64,500 elementary and 25,200 secondary full-time teachers have not met full certification standards for teaching. The total of 89,700 such teachers represents a decrease of 2,600 or 2.8 percent from the number in the fall of 1960.

The proportion of teachers with less than standard certificates was reduced from 6.8 percent of the Nation's total teaching staff a year ago to 6.1 percent currently.

EXHIBIT 3

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE REPORT NO. 101, 48TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, MARCH 10, 1884, BY SENATOR BLAIR

The committee unanimously approve the amount proposed to be appropriated in the bill and its distribution on the basis of illiteracy, and a majority recommend its passage in its present form.

The matter following is largely from a presentation of the subject made by the chairman of the committee on a former occasion, for which, as matter of argument, the committee as a whole is not responsible, but the statistical tables and calculations having been prepared with considerable labor and care, and being substantially unchanged by later information, the same is incorporated with this supplementary report.

We propose to inquire into the nature and extent of the powers and obligations of the National Government to assist in the education of the people when necessary, for its and their own preservation; to develop and illustrate the actual condition of popular education in this country as revealed by the census of 1880, and from other reliable sources, and thereby to demonstrate the necessity of national aid to common schools at the present time; to explain the several measures pending in Congress having that end in view, and to briefly give reasons for supporting Senate bill No. 398, as in our belief best calculated to secure the object desired by the advocates of all.

The United States are conceded by all to be a unit and a sovereignty within the scope

of the powers expressly granted or necessarily implied in the written Constitution. The only real question between those who have held to the national idea on the one hand and that of State sovereignty on the other has been as to which had the right to decide upon their relative jurisdictions and to establish their political boundaries when in dispute. Upon this question we do not now propose to enter, because it is not essential to the maintenance of the argument on this occasion. Our leading proposition is that the General Government possesses the power and has imposed upon itself the duty of educating the people of the United States whenever for any cause those people are deficient in that degree of education which is essential to the discharge of their duties as citizens either of the United States or of the several States wherein they chance to reside.

This does not imply that a like power and even more imperative duty do not require the people of every State to educate its own citizens. It is a power not hostile but friendly to the States. Nor is it a power to be exercised unnecessarily. It should be exercised only in extremity, and when manifestly essential to the local, and therefore ultimately to the general welfare. As the State may not engage in war unless "actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay," so the United States should not enter upon the duty of qualifying the citizen to bear his responsibilities to the Nation and to the State until the local power is shown to be inadequate or negligent and the necessity is apparent and imperative. But the power is there.

There is no truth better established or more generally admitted than that the republican form of government cannot exist unless the people are competent to govern themselves. The contrary doctrine would be an absurdity, a contradiction of terms. What is the republican form of government but government of the people by the people? But how can the people govern, how exercise sovereignty, except they have the knowledge requisite to that end? Sovereignty requires as much intelligence when exercised by the people as a whole as when exercised by a single individual; it requires more. The monarch governs according to his will, not necessarily with that broad intelligence demanded by the public good. Government for the people by the people implies that degree of popular intelligence which will enable the masses of men to comprehend the principles and to direct the administration of government in such way as to promote the general welfare. Republican government, therefore, requires a higher degree of intelligence on the part of the sovereign than any other form. That sovereign is the whole body of the people. How then, can the republican form of government exist and continue to exist unless from generation to generation, in perpetual succession, the citizen sovereigns are educated?

But the question is deeper still. How can civilization exist without education? What is civilization but the result of education—of the development and training of the powers of the individual? All human progress and happiness are, in the higher and broader sense, but education, which confers the capacity both to do and to enjoy. If, then, to educate is to civilize, the great duty which society owes to the individual is to educate him, and the benefit thus conferred he is bound to return.

This primary duty of society to its individual membership is by the law of nature imposed, in the first instance, upon the parent. But the parent cannot fully discharge it. What then? Society, through the established forms of government, interferes and performs what the parent fails to

perform. Is this any violation of the right of the parent? No one pretends it. It is merely the doing of that which, for the good of the child, the parent, and the whole social fabric, must be done. The right of the mass, that is, of the State, is paramount even to that of the individual, inasmuch as the general welfare—the safety of the people—is the supreme law. No parent has the right to say that his child shall remain ignorant. He has no right to breed firebrands and death to the society of which he is a part and to which he owes everything himself. Here is the foundation of the right of compulsory education on the part of the State.

If the parent fully exercised his right to properly educate his child there would be no occasion for the interference of the State; but he fails to do it. Benevolent voluntary effort comes to his aid. This also fails. What then? The law of self-preservation at once asserts itself in behalf of the State as well as of the individual, and for the welfare of both it must put forth its power. These principles are fundamental and are so plain that their assertion may seem superfluous. But we now come to an important question in the argument.

What in our complex system of government constitutes the "state," the organization in which reside the right and duty to educate the individual when the parent and voluntary agencies fail? The term "state" has various significations, but as used in this connection it is thus defined by Mr. Webster, and by the writers upon law: "A political body or body politic; the body of people united under one government, whatever may be the form of the government."

Mr. Bouvier says:

"In its most enlarged sense it signifies a self-sufficient body of persons united together in one community for the defense of their rights and to do right and justice to foreigners. In this sense the state means the whole people united into one body-politic, and the state and the people of the state are equivalent expressions."

[There can be no doubt that under our system the word "State" includes the combined powers of both the United States and of the several States of whose Union the former is composed.] The territory which constitutes the one includes the many. The citizens of the many are individually and identically the citizens of the nation at large. Every citizen of the United States who resides in a State is a citizen thereof. "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." The rights and powers of the great community of 50 millions of people who constitute the citizens of the United States and of the several States are vested in the Government of the United States, in the governments of the several States, or in the people themselves. Although these three depositories of rights and powers are "distinct like the billows," yet they are "one like the sea." Distinct in their several jurisdictions, yet they constitute one great whole, and act together harmoniously for the individual and common good, each independent of the other in its sphere, like the independent yet concurring powers of nature in the realms of physical life, where—

All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body nature is, and God the soul.

It is only as we use the word "state" in this complete sense that the people of the United States, who are also the people of the several States and of the territories, constitute "a body of persons united together in one community for the defense of their rights, and to do right and justice to foreigners."

Now, the right of self-defense, which is the right of self-preservation, is the right to live and to be. The right of the people to be at all implies and includes the right to constitute and maintain the state—that is to say, government—and to prescribe its form, for human existence is impossible without government. The governing power must know how to govern or it cannot govern. Can a man do that which he knows not how to do? The people have distributed the functions of government between the national and the sectional or the State authorities, and have retained in themselves the initial exercise of all power through the ballot. The ballot is the republican form of government both in the Nation and in the State.

Intelligence is necessary in the individual, who is the sovereign, in the one as well as the other. The right and duty of the national portion of the Government to preserve itself and of the individual to preserve it and to exert his sovereignty through its forms perpetually are absolute. It is the right and duty of the whole to preserve the whole, and the right and duty of the whole to preserve the whole implies the preservation of all the parts by that whole, to the existence of which all the parts are necessary. It is not necessary that a man should have written permission to live. He needs no license stamped or sealed to give him the right to breathe.

His creation implied all that. Just so the people, when they created governments, both of State and Nation, republican in form, and bade them multiply their blessings and replenish the earth with their civilizing and ennobling activities, necessarily gave them the breath of life and the inherent power to preserve that life. To have written into the constitutions of the States or of the National Government the right of self-preservation would have been as superfluous as to have required a written order for the sun to shine, for water to run down hill, or for any created thing to obey the law of its being. But the right to educate the child throughout the Nation is the right to preserve the Government and the Nation. That right cannot be curtailed. It is geographically coextensive with the jurisdiction of the Government itself, and self-preservation compels its exercise by the National Government whenever there is failure for any reason on the part of the parent and the State.

OBLIGATION TO GUARANTEE GOVERNMENTS REPUBLICAN IN FORM

Still again. The whole people of the United States, that is to say, the Nation, by the primary act of the masses and by the act of their State governments, have commanded in the written terms of the constitutional law of the land that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." How is that obligation to be fulfilled? Must its performance await revolution, and must destruction precede preservation? Is it a guarantee of possession to stand by while war and tempest obliterate, and then endeavor to restore? Is reconstruction the only or is it the better way in which the obligation to guarantee a government republican in form to the States of this Union can be discharged? Is not the ounce of prevention still worth the pound of cure? Does not the duty to guarantee imply the right to prevent and to preserve even more strongly than to restore? Prevention might be possible when restoration would prove to be impossible.

It is a conceded proposition that where a duty is imposed all the power necessary to its performance is conferred, and the choice of means, so far as there is no prohibition, goes with the power.

If all this be so, what doubt can there be, not only of the power, but also of the absolute duty of the National Government, to perform its obligation of guarantee in the only effective way in which it is possible? When does the obligation to guarantee attach? Did it not commence with the adoption of the Constitution, and is it not continuous in its operation? Does it not attach, as a right in the territories, which are inchoate States? Does it not follow every movement of the concurrent life of the Nation and of the States, and enter into all their constitutional and inseparable relations?

Not to educate is to destroy. It follows inevitably that not to educate is to break the guarantee of republican government to the States. If the parent and the State fail to educate the citizen, does not this clause of the Constitution compel the Nation to educate its child?

THE GENERAL WELFARE

But Congress has express power "to provide for the general welfare of the United States," and to exert its utmost power of taxation to promote that which was one of the six greatest ends enumerated in the preamble, and to secure which the Constitution itself was ordained and established by the whole people of the United States of America. That people well understood that without intelligence it would be impossible "to preserve the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity." It goes without argument to say that in no way can the general welfare be so promoted as by the general diffusion of knowledge and the discipline of the mental powers of the masses of the people, which can only be accomplished by common schools maintained by governmental power.

Governments are but agencies established by society to secure the happiness of its individual members. Whenever they cease to promote the end for which they were created they should be destroyed, and whenever and so far as they fail they should modify or reverse their action.

If in the past the National Government has not borne its due proportion of the burdens of the education of the people, or if new conditions have arisen which require of it a degree of cooperation with the several States not hitherto necessary in securing to all citizens of the Republic that degree of intelligence which is indispensable to the safety of society and to the happiness of the individual, who is at once the subject and the sovereign in both local and national administration, then the time has come for a new departure, and the withes of straw must yield to the expanding limbs of the giant who is arousing himself for the labors of the time which has already come.

But it must not be forgotten that the fathers and mothers of this Republic never conceived of the possibility of its existence except as its foundations should be laid upon knowledge and virtue, and that the promotion of sound learning was deemed to be the fundamental duty of the national power. The time would fail to speak of the founders of the colonies, and of the constant efforts which they put forth from New Hampshire to Georgia to establish schools and colleges for the education of those who were to enjoy the rights of citizenship within their respective borders. The Revolution was the outgrowth of the school, the college, and of the free worship of God. The constitution of every State as well as the Declaration of Independence and the whole theory of the national polity depend upon the possession of knowledge and virtue by the people at large.

Hence Washington never ceased by word and deed to enforce this great truth upon

his countrymen. Adams and Franklin and Jefferson and Madison and Hamilton and Clinton and Rush, and the whole galaxy of the immortals who cradled the Nation, dwelt continually and emphatically upon the primary necessity of the universal intelligence of the masses to the perpetuation of their freedom and happiness. Nor did they confine their efforts to precept alone. The Congress of the Confederation, as well as the General Government under which we now live, at an early day proclaimed their duty and exercised their power to apply the property of the Nation to promote this great interest of all. One-sixteenth part of the public lands was devoted to the education of the children of the coming States from the foundation of the Government; three-score years afterward the amount was doubled, and from time to time during the century nearly which has elapsed since the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 the Nation has contributed of its resources to the establishment and maintenance of the public schools.

The messages of Washington and other early Presidents, who, with their associates, created and defined the national powers, and the responses of both branches of Congress, are full of the recognition of the obligation of the General Government to encourage and foster universal education, and as he passed from the scene of official life the Father of his Country solemnly adjured the American people "to promote as an object of primary importance institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge."

The promotion of learning and science, and the appropriation of the public money for that purpose, has always been recognized as within the scope of national power. Measures for the establishment of a national university have been supported by our leading statesmen, and appropriations of public money and other property have been from time to time made to establish or assist institutions like the agricultural colleges, observatories, the Smithsonian Institution, and exploring expeditions by land or sea, all which implies the possession of the undoubted power, as well as the disposition, to apply the resources of the National Government to these high purposes whenever in its judgment the general welfare will be conserved thereby. But even if all this were untrue, the case would remain the same.

Laws are silent in war. They were silent in the conflict through which we have just passed. But what is meant by this? Not that all laws are silent; but that minor regulations which appertain to more quiet times are suspended in the overmastering presence of the great first law of self-preservation.

In this sense, which is the true sense, laws may become silent in peace as well as in war. We are now in peace, but if there be laws which forbid the education of the illiterate millions of the American people by the outstretched arm and bursting Treasury and innumerable intellectual and moral agencies of the Nation at large, then those laws should, and in presence of the uprising sentiment of the people I may say they shall, be silent in this land until by the diffusion of knowledge, and of the power which knowledge gives to every child within our borders, peace may be made perpetual. Universal intelligence never makes war. Only ignorance is convertible into brute force. Ignorance is slavery. But for ignorance there would have been no slave. But for ignorance among the nominally free there would have been no rebellion. The contest we now wage is with that still unconquered ignorance of both white man and black man in all parts of the country which hurried us by remorseless fate to fields of death for 4 long years. Besides this we confront the demands of

hordes incoming from beyond both great oceans, and of the advancing generations of men.

Whenever the State or the local community is able to sufficiently instruct its youth it should do so, and the national aid should be invoked only when made necessary by local neglect or inability. But this burden is primarily one of taxation. Civilization must be paid for. Education is the insurance upon civilization. It must be kept up everywhere, for the risk is everywhere. To leave the child of the pauper uneducated is to incur as great risk of destruction by the fires or floods of ignorance and crime as if he were the scion of wealth and place. So, too, in the nicely balanced forces and relations of localities, the neglect of a county or a township may in some vital emergency destroy the institutions of the whole country by remote or even by immediate results. Hence there must be no admission of the doctrine that the general power can yield the right to educate when necessary to the general good. This power is indispensable to preserve the parts as well as the whole.

If these principles are true, we are next brought logically to the consideration of the actual condition of the United States and the territories thereof in respect to the education of the people. This must be done that we may determine intelligently the question whether the Nation should appropriate and, either directly or through State agencies, apply the public money for that use.

LINCOLN BOYHOOD NATIONAL MEMORIAL, IND.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 2470.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

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

THE JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have in mind addressing the Senate today on the

subject of my trip to the Soviet Union several months ago. However, the subject with which I shall deal now—namely, the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union—was not the only subject of my visit there. I was concerned with the issue of East-West trade, as a member of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee; but that is the subject of a report which I am making to that subcommittee, which will come out quite soon. Hence, I shall not deal with it today.

Today, Mr. President, I shall confine my statement to the status of the people of Jewish faith who are Soviet citizens in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, there is cause for great concern in the reports of continued pressures by the Soviet Union on the Jews in that country.

Soviet leaders have developed a double standard of thought and action toward Soviet Jews which places them in a unique and unprecedented category. This standard rejects them at one and the same time as a Jewish nationality and also as assimilated citizens of the Soviet Union. In this way—that is, by rejecting them as a nationality and also as within the confines of what I think is euphemistically called the Soviet Constitution—they are effectively deprived of the rights to which they are entitled under the Soviet system of nationalities, and, also, they are not treated as Soviet citizens in the same class with others. Thus, Jews have no adequate system of Jewish schools, no Hebrew or Yiddish language courses, no theater, publishing house, or other Jewish cultural facilities. Their existence as a people—in religious terms—is in deadly peril.

All the rigid Soviet protestations—and they were made to me, personally—that there is no Jewish problem in the Soviet Union and that anti-Semitism is against the law—as it is, according to statute law in the Soviet Union—cannot disguise the fact that the plight of its Jewish citizens is grave and complex.

Indeed, even during the past weekend we had indications that the pressure and the attacks on the Jews in the Soviet Union are continuing. The obviously trumped-up accusations of spying in synagogues create new elements of danger in addition to those that have already existed. Mr. President, a little later in my remarks to the Senate I shall actually detail those charges, and shall state why—couched as they are in the obscurist language of the Marxist-Leninistic idiom—they constitute a great danger to the people there.

When I was in the Soviet Union during the last 2 weeks of November I went into this question of the state of the Jews and of Jewish life and culture in the Soviet Union. This had become a matter of great interest in the United States and elsewhere in the free world, in view of the pretensions of the Communists that the Communist society is both classless and free of bigotry or discrimination. The free world had learned of the trial and conviction of three veteran Jewish leaders of the Jewish religious

community of Leningrad; and of similar arrests and imprisonment of Jewish religious leaders in Moscow. Some of the sentences were as severe as those handed down under Stalin when in 1948 he inaugurated his infamous purge of Jewish intellectuals and writers. This was confirmed by the Soviet newspaper Pravda, which said the accused men had been in communication with a foreign power—meaning the Embassy of Israel.

These charges were most vehemently denied. Later in my remarks I shall deal with the latest of such publications in the Russian newspaper Trud, and also with the denials published in the American press and, indeed, in the world press.

Other reports disclosed that Soviet authorities had quadrupled a special tax against clergymen, which was especially hard on Hebrew rabbis, because of the lack of any real means of payment, disbanded the governing council of the Moscow Jewish seminary, the only remaining one in the country, dismissed its director, and placed full responsibility for the seminary's 12 students in the hands of the chief rabbi of Moscow. Although the special tax affects all clergymen, it works a special hardship on Soviet Jews, because they are not permitted to organize regionally or nationally in the way other religious groups are allowed to do in order to meet the financial burden.

Soviet officials do not talk about Jews in the U.S.S.R., nor did anyone in the Jewish community itself dare to talk about the situation. As I have said before, anti-Semitism is against the law in the Soviet Union, but we are seeing a course of conduct which is anti-Jewish and amounts to the same thing. The anxiety which pervades the Jewish people in the Soviet cities I visited is quite obvious.

I may say that physically, at least, worship in Moscow and in Odessa, which I also visited, was apparently uninhibited. There is only 1 major synagogue in Moscow and only 1 small one, although about 500,000 Jews live in the city, and on the Saturday morning when I attended the services at the Moscow Synagogue, there was a very large congregation of worshippers. I made considerable inquiry of people who I thought would have some light to cast on the situation, but it is no exaggeration to say that even for me a blanket of silence has fallen on the entire Jewish community in the country.

Jews are recognized as a nationality in the Soviet Union—although not given the rights accorded other nationalities in the U.S.S.R., and despite more than 40 years of pressures and restrictions of all kinds to discourage religious identification, and despite the 1948 purge and the ridiculous but tragic "doctor's plot" of 1952—notwithstanding all those facts and the attempts to isolate the Jews in the U.S.S.R. from other Jewish communities throughout the world, 2,268,000 persons voluntarily declared themselves to be Jews in the January 1959 census. In addition, Mr. President, 472,000 gave Yiddish as their native tongue.

In spite of Soviet claims of religious freedom, there is clear evidence that Jews and the Jewish religion suffer greater limitations and restrictions than any other religious group. Synagogue buildings have been closed and supplies needed for religious worship cannot be obtained. No Hebrew Bibles are printed, and prayer books are almost irreplaceable. Means for training rabbis and communal officials are inadequate, and, unlike other religious groups, Jews are not permitted to establish national organizations.

The cultural life of the Jewish community is also restricted very sharply, and the Yiddish literature in books, theater, periodicals and newspapers has virtually been entirely wiped out since Stalin began his purge of Jewish intellectuals in 1948. There is one Yiddish newspaper that appears every 2 weeks, but it is antireligious and represents little more than a Soviet newspaper in the Yiddish language. Nevertheless, in the 1959 census, 472,000 Jews as stated above, had the courage to declare that Yiddish was their native language.

Mr. President, I think it is extraordinary, considering the atmosphere in which they live, that they had the courage to declare that Yiddish is their native language.

One of the really amazing phenomena of the Soviet Union is that young people of the Jewish faith—engineers, scientists, and other professionals—still want to attend services in a synagogue even though many of them are unable to read the Hebrew prayers. In spite of the Communist campaign for atheism, which has been carried on for over 40 years under the Soviet system, these young people want to be identified with their Hebrew faith.

There are no leaders of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union in the sense that we have them in this country—nothing like the B'nai B'rith or the Jewish philanthropies—but the few remaining synagogues do have their recognized leaders. They are not necessarily given the title of president and executive vice president, but they are identified with a particular synagogue in a leadership capacity—and their names are listed with the Soviet authorities. The Soviet regime has cracked down on the leading among these respected synagogue leaders, primarily as a warning at this time that it will tolerate no agitation for the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel.

This is my judgment and conclusion from what I saw and heard.

At this point I should like to read to the Senate a translation of an article in the Moscow newspaper, *Trud*, dated the 19th of January. It is an article by N. Ehrlich and is entitled "Zionism—A Mask for Spies." This article tells, allegedly, about the espionage activities of members of the staff of the Embassy of Israel in Moscow.

The article states:

Facts show that the subversive activity of members of the Israeli Embassy against the Soviet Union is conducted with the knowl-

edge of the Israeli Government and on the orders of their transoceanic masters.

The article continues:

Being in complete economic and political dependence on the U.S. imperialists, the Israeli Zionists have completely subjugated their home and foreign policy to the interests of the transatlantic bosses. The Zionist organizations and parties of Israel have actually become branches of the American intelligence service.

Here we have the propaganda effort to link the Jewish people with foreign agents and thus to develop and inculcate in the hearts of their fellow countrymen the traditional pattern which obtained under the czars just as it now obtains under the Soviet leaders—the use of protestations in an endeavor to develop hostilities against a whole group of people on the bare allegation that they are allies, in some way, with foreign powers threatening the security of their own country.

The article continues in the same vein, speaking of the leaders of synagogues who have been convicted in Soviet courts in secret trials. Their names are given.

These are the charges against them:

Soviet citizens Pechersky, Dynkin, and Kaganov, recruited by the members of the Israeli Embassy, have recently been exposed. It has been irrefutably established during the trial that besides collecting and handing over spy information to the Israeli diplomats, the traitors Pechersky, Dynkin, and Kaganov spread rumors and inventions slurring the Soviet political and public system and circulated anti-Soviet literature published in Israel, which they received secretly from staff members of the Israeli Embassy, Prat, Sharett, and others. They have also confessed, the author continues that the tape with recordings of slanders against Soviet life confiscated from them were specially prepared for their masters, who planned to use it for anti-Soviet propaganda.

Then the article ends up with what is, in the lexicon of this country, the way of countries which have a tradition for pogroms, which is true of the Soviet Union, as it was back in the czarist days, an extremely inflammatory paragraph which is most alarming for the future. I read now the translation of the article:

The Soviet people are incensed by the behavior of the Israeli diplomats, who are using their trips in the U.S.S.R. and meetings with Soviet citizens for subversive activity. It is high time for the Zionist provocateurs to realize that their subversive activity against the Soviet Union arouses the wrath and contempt of all Soviet people, regardless of nationality.

These are very incendiary words, and it is why I think the world has a right to view with alarm what is going on in the Soviet Union with respect to this matter.

It is significant that there has been a denial and denunciation of the alleged charges upon which the Jewish religious leaders were convicted.

Knowing, as we do, the tremendous concern of the Government of Israel for the approximately 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union, it is inconceivable that it would do anything to jeopardize their status in that country.

In addition, it is conceivable that a trial, prepared and carried out in secret, following the purges, the so-called doctor's plot, and other evidence of repression which has taken place in the Soviet Union, can be anything but another piece of propaganda in the Soviet Union, where there is strong fear that there will be great demand that the Jewish people who wish to go may leave the Soviet Union and where there may be some strong agitation on their part to do so.

It is evident from the construction of the wall in Berlin to what methods and extremes the Communists will go in order to avoid, if they can, clear evidence of what a fraud and deception is the alleged Communist paradise.

I continue now with my analysis.

It is for all these reasons that I consider protest on a world scale against these prosecutions to be a very necessary action. Last year the United Nations Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities adopted by a vote of 11 to 1—the Soviet delegation opposed—a resolution condemning discrimination against minorities and recognizing Jews as an ethnic minority.

Essentially the current plight of Soviet Jews grows out of the unwillingness of the Kremlin to recognize them as a national or ethnic minority, notwithstanding their legal qualification as such. Communist leaders deny Jews this status, considering them to be an integral part of the whole Soviet people, but at the same time they discriminate against them as members of a group in cultural, political, military, and economic life.

In all forms of life the Jews in the Soviet Union are discriminated against. They are particularly discriminated against in the political area. They are absolutely out of the Foreign Service. In military areas their activities are very circumscribed, as is their opportunity to teach in schools and colleges. Where the Soviet Union needs them, as it does in physics and other highly important scientific professions—there they have a place. In medicine, for instance, they have a place. But it is a place gained only because of the urgent need of the Soviet Union, and the price paid is an absolute inhibition to the idea of going anywhere else.

The Soviet leaders pride themselves in the fact that they are not subject to the same antisemitism which was endemic in czarist Russia. The Soviet rulers are very sensitive to any charge of antisemitism. That is a very important thing for the world to remember. Therefore, all the more reason for worldwide protest when it is so justified.

The fact is that prosecution of Jewish religious leaders has occurred and that discrimination does exist as an element in what is in effect the Kremlin's anti-Jewish course. All signs indicate a steadily deteriorating situation that was signaled by the prosecution of Jewish community and religious leaders in Leningrad and Moscow last October, and

unless the free world makes known its strong disapproval of these Soviet measures, the continued existence of Jews in the U.S.S.R. may be in grave danger. The immediate intent of Soviet authorities in taking these measures is apparently to warn Jews that it will not tolerate any emigration of Jews to Israel or any pro-Israel agitation toward that end—the long-range purpose, I am convinced, is quite clearly the liquidation of Judaism and Jewish consciousness in the U.S.S.R.

Protests on this basis, therefore, must be frequent and strong enough to break through the Iron Curtain barrier and reach the Communist rulers in the Kremlin.

In this same vein, I applaud the recent action of the Rabbinical Council of America, the leading orthodox Jewish organization of rabbis, in appealing to the United Nations for the release of the imprisoned Russian Jewish leaders. I believe this protest should be emulated by many other groups.

I have received a partial transcript of what the Rabbinical Council of America said at its midwinter convention, January 17, 1962. It appealed to the United Nations to seek the relief of Jewish religious leaders now in prison in Russia primarily because of their religious convictions.

They said that the entire world "can only be repelled by the fact that religious heads of the Jewish community have been placed under charge and imprisoned. It is an imperative duty of the United Nations to implement the human rights of these individuals and to secure their relief. An appeal has been directed to the Soviet Government to make real the general worship of its 3 million Jewish citizens stating that the reputation of Soviet Russia can only be enhanced by the relief of the imprisoned religious leaders."

Also, I think it is fair to say that we in the United States owe a real debt of gratitude to a crusading newspaperman who first brought the information to light, to the world, with respect to the prosecutions of these Jewish religious leaders in the Soviet Union. I refer to Rowland Evans, Jr., of the New York Herald Tribune, who first broke the story that he has consistently followed through.

I shall ask unanimous consent that various newspaper pieces written by Mr. Evans may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the other members of the American press, who, with great generosity, have given tongue to this story, carried on the investigation with respect to it, and reported the story as it has developed in fact within the Soviet Union and in reports emanating from the Soviet Union. This is journalism at its best in giving public information and public enlightenment.

Mr. President, before I make a few general observations, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD with my remarks the report by the

American Jewish Committee entitled "Jews Behind the Iron Curtain: January 1 to March 31, 1961"; the report by Rowland Evans, Jr., entitled "Told for the First Time, the Fate of a Jewish Leader in the Soviet," in the New York Herald Tribune, November 6, 1961; the editorial entitled "Spirit of Stalin" from the Jewish Chronicle of London, November 10; the report by Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Zionist Organization, entitled "The Jewish Condition in Russia," which appeared in the Jewish Forum, November 1961; and the New York Herald Tribune report on November 18 headlined "Aroused Conscience—Rabbis' Pleas to U.N.: Free Russia's Jews."

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

JEWS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN: JANUARY 1 TO MARCH 31, 1961

This report discusses events affecting Jews behind the Iron Curtain from January 1 to March 31, 1961.

THE SOVIET UNION

Criticism of Soviet discrimination against the Jews continued to make news. The Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, representing B'nai B'rith in the United States, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and the South African Board of Jewish Deputies, submitted to the U.N. Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities evidence that Soviet Jews are deprived of outlets for religious, cultural, and educational expression. Its memorandum showed that the present is far worse than the twenties and early thirties, though some improvement has followed Stalin's death in 1953.¹

U.S. Senator KENNETH KEATING addressed a letter to the chief American delegate to the U.N., Adlai Stevenson, suggesting the possibility of a U.N. remedy for the plight of the Soviet Jews. Ambassador Stevenson forwarded Senator KEATING's letter to the State Department with a request that the matter be studied further.²

The World Zionist Congress, meeting in Jerusalem, expressed its concern about the future of Soviet Jews and requested the Soviet Government to permit emigration to Israel and to make possible a normal religious life for Soviet Jews.³

Former Israeli Prime Minister Moshe Sharett, a member of the Jewish agency executive, expressed anxiety about antisemitic articles in the Soviet press.⁴

A conference of Italian intellectuals and political leaders of various political leanings and representing the major religious denominations met in Rome to discuss the problem of Soviet Jewry. Like the conference convened by Dr. Nahum Goldmann in the fall of 1960 in Paris (see "Jews Behind the Iron Curtain," July 16–Oct. 15, 1960, pp. 4–5) it discussed the many areas of national and communal life in which the Jews are discriminated against. It presented a resolution to the Soviet Ambassador in Rome requesting "revocation of the Soviet ban against Jewish schools, theaters, and newspapers" and called upon the Soviet Government to "repress the publication of anti-Jewish attacks" in the Soviet press. It also

appealed to the Soviet Government to permit the emigration of Jews. One of the speakers at the conference, a prominent Communist senator, Umberto Terracini, of Jewish origin, attempted to defend Soviet policy by citing the Soviet creation of a Jewish autonomous region in Birobidjan. He asserted that the present situation of the Soviet Jews stemmed from their refusal to settle there, and added that the Stalinist terror had affected Jews and non-Jews alike. The Italian press paid considerable attention to the conference.⁵

The Jewish Student Union of France, which is considered leftist, adopted a resolution expressing its concern over "the deprivation of legal rights" suffered by Soviet Jews. As a result of the resolution, the French Student Union, of which the Jewish group is an affiliate, planned to call upon the Soviet Government to stop its discriminatory policies against the Jews.⁶

The Moscow radio in its broadcast to North America denied the existence of any anti-Jewish discrimination in the Soviet Union and asserted that Jews enjoy the same opportunities as other national and religious groups. The broadcast, as usual, mentioned Jews prominent in the Soviet hierarchy, presumably as proof of those opportunities. The broadcast was made in response to the petition filed with the U.N. mentioned earlier.⁷ The 1960 Paris conference on the Soviet Jews was attacked in the Soviet journal New Times. An article by Zinoviy Sheinis, who specializes in anti-Israel propaganda, accused Nahum Goldmann and other Zionist leaders of a "lying campaign against the Soviet Union." The author charged that the conference was supported by the United States and West Germany and that the real goal of the meeting was not to help Soviet Jews but to intensify the cold war.⁸

The August 1960 newspaper story in Dagestan, which alleged that Jews use Moslem blood for ritual purposes (see "Jews Behind the Iron Curtain," Oct. 16–Dec. 31, 1960, pp. 1–2), continued to attract much attention. A group of leading Jews in Dagestan, including a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of that republic, declared that the Dagestani Jews enjoy full equality and experience no discrimination whatever. They conceded that the publication of the article was a mistake—for which its irresponsible author was disciplined, they added—but maintained that this was an isolated exception and that harmony prevailed.⁹ The Moscow correspondent of the Communist New York Morning Freiheit, Solomon Rabinovich, after visiting Dagestan, wrote that the article, which according to him was really a letter to the editor by a retired pensioner, was universally denounced by the Dagestanis, including the Moslem clergy. Saying that his visit to several local synagogues had showed him that the Jews were not interfered with in the practice of their religion, he alleged great progress by the mountain Jews under the Soviet regime, with all political and cultural opportunities open to them. According to him, Russian translations of books by mountain Jewish authors are published locally.¹⁰

Andre Blumel visited the Soviet Union again and was received by the Minister of Culture, Ekatarina Furtseva. The basis for this meeting was laid during Blumel's previous visit to Russia (see "Jews Behind the

¹ New York Post, Jan. 8, 1961; Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Daily News Bulletin, Jan. 31, 1961.

² J.T.A., Daily News Bulletin, Feb. 10, 1961.

³ New York Times, Jan. 10, 1961.

⁴ J.T.A., Daily News Bulletin, Feb. 15, 1961.

⁵ Ibid., Mar. 27, 1961; Jewish Chronicle (London), Mar. 31, 1961.

⁶ J.T.A., Daily News Bulletin, Jan. 9, 1961.

⁷ Jewish Observer and Middle East Review (London), Jan. 20, 1961.

⁸ New Times (Moscow), January 1961.

⁹ Jewish Chronicle, Feb. 3, 1961.

¹⁰ Ibid., Mar. 31, 1961.

Iron Curtain," Oct. 15–Dec. 31, 1960, pp. 2–7), and the purpose was to persuade her to permit greater cultural autonomy to Soviet Jewry.

This mission ended in complete failure. Furtseva cited not very relevant figures which purported to demonstrate Jewish equality and mentioned a number of recently published Jewish works as proof of the cultural opportunities available to the Jews. Blumel reminded her that in the last census about half a million Jews declared that their native tongue is Yiddish and he proposed that publication in that language be resumed, contrasting the present lack of facilities for Yiddish with the period of Lenin. Furtseva replied that "the Jews themselves will probably be offended if we push them back to this Yiddish past." She also remarked that "privileges" for Jews might arouse resentment among the other minorities. Finally she said that any concessions to Jewish culture would be not for internal reasons, "but in order to please our friends outside of the U.S.S.R."¹¹

Evidently in order to please those friends, it was announced that a magazine in Yiddish—Soviet Homeland—edited by the Yiddish writer Aaron Vergelis, would start publication in June. The initial printing is to be some 25,000 copies, but the secretary of the Writers' Union, Alexei Surkov, suggested that the number might be increased in the future. Surkov also stated that this literary magazine is for authors writing in Yiddish, and that in addition the Union of Soviet Writers will continue to sponsor translations of Yiddish works into Russian. Present with Mr. Surkov at a conference in London was Alexei Adzhubel, Nikita Khrushchev's son-in-law and editor in chief of *Izvestia*, who stated that there are no obstacles for Jews who wish to speak, read, or learn Yiddish, but that there are few such Jews in the Soviet Union today and still fewer who wish their children to learn it.¹²

At a meeting of the central committee of the Soviet Communist Party on agriculture, Nikita Khrushchev read a letter from a Jewish woman, formerly chairman of a collective farm, asserting that she has been dismissed from her post because of her Jewish origin. According to Blumel, Khrushchev said: "It is intolerable that antisemitism should persist in a Communist state," and ordered that she be reinstated.¹³

A deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian Republic, Ye. Margolin, was recalled from his position by the overwhelming majority of the voters of his district, accused of machinations and padding accounts as chairman of a collective farm in the Minsk district. He was dismissed from his job and expelled from the party and his case was turned over to the criminal authorities.¹⁴ While the recall of a deputy in the Soviet Union is not unknown, it is extremely rare.

It was reported that only in six large Soviet cities did the Jewish communities obtain permission to bake matzoth this year. Elsewhere permission was refused, and the Israeli chief rabbinate sent matzoth to the chief rabbi of Moscow for distribution to Jewish communities unable to bake their own.¹⁵

The Soviet Academy of Sciences published a pocket book entitled "The Reactionary Nature of Judaism: A Short Survey of the Origins and Class Character of the Jewish

Religion," by I. M. Shakhnovich, who had previously published studies against Judaism. The book, of which 17,000 copies were printed, depicts Judaism as a reactionary religion serving the interests of the rabbis and Zionists. It also represents Jewish organizations and leaders as traditional opponents of progressive movements of the working class. However, the author thinks that it is losing its hold over the masses.¹⁶

Ilya G. Ehrenburg was awarded his second Order of Lenin by the Soviet Government on the occasion of his 70th birthday,¹⁷ and the Soviet press reviewed his creative activity. It was pointed out that, while he had occasionally strayed from the straight Communist path, he was usually able to find the right solutions to problems, his main concern always being justice and happiness for the masses. His antiwar writings were emphasized, as was the fact that despite his age Ehrenburg is still very active in the peace movement.¹⁸

About 1,500 writers, artists, and other Soviet intellectuals attended a celebration honoring Ehrenburg. Addressing the audience, the writer declared that although he is a Russian writer, he is "a Jew and intend[s] to remain a Jew as long as a single anti-semitic is left." He said that he is proud to be designated a Jew on his passport and reminded his hearers, some of whom participated actively in the anticommunist campaign in Stalin's last years, of the bitter atmosphere that prevailed in those days.¹⁹

In his memoirs, published in a Moscow literary journal, Ehrenburg unmistakably alludes to the fate of the great poet Osip E. Mandelstam, a Jew. Mandelstam disappeared during the purges of the 1930's. Ehrenburg says he died in 1940, in some unspecified, remote place.²⁰

The Yiddish singer Emil Horowitz won first place in the Moscow competition for singers of popular songs. Horowitz has a traveling troupe.²¹ A play entitled "Good Luck," by the Yiddish playwright Motel Saktser, was staged in a large auditorium in one of Moscow's leading hotels.²²

Ralf Gerrets, Jan Viks, and Aim Mere were tried in Tallinn, Estonia, accused of having organized and participated in murders of civilians and prisoners of war during World War II. They were implicated in the murder of 125,000 in Estonia, including some who were brought there from other countries. Mere, now in England and tried in absentia, was the chief of the Estonian security police in charge of punitive operations; Gerrets was assistant commandant of the Jagala concentration camp, and Viks was a guard in that camp. Besides their other crimes, they were specifically charged with the mass murder of Estonian, Polish, Czech, and German Jews. They were all sentenced to death, and Gerrets and Viks were in fact executed.²³ The Soviet Foreign Ministry dispatched a note to the Australian Government requesting the extradition of Ervin R. Viks as a war criminal accused of participation in mass murders in Estonia.²⁴

SOVIET POLICY ON ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

An article in *Trud*, "Assemblage of Bankrupts," subjected the December 1960 World Zionist Congress to a vicious attack. It describes the congress as having taken place in an atmosphere of moral and spiritual

crisis for Zionism, and then proceeds to give the Soviet version of the historical background of Zionism, characterized as a reactionary nationalist ideology designed to distract the Jewish masses from the class struggle. It claims that Zionism is historically tied to imperialism and alleges that Zionist leaders exhorted their followers to fight against the Soviet regime after the Bolshevik revolution. It also claims that deals were then made with the pogromist leaders of the White armies. It further charges Zionist organizations with supplying the Nazis with war material on condition that it be used only against the Soviet Army.

In the new State of Israel, the article continues, power was seized by ultrareactionary Zionist elements, headed by Ben-Gurion, which, supported by American imperialists, turned Israel into a tool of imperialistic monopolies. The Arab minority as well as the Jews from Afro-Asian countries are alleged to be repressed and discriminated against, and the Israeli treatment of national minorities is said to border on racism. It is allegedly through fraud, blackmail, and the use of religious prejudice that the Zionist propagandists succeeded in persuading some unsuspecting people to come to Israel, where, instead of the promised paradise, they found unbearably harsh conditions. The Zionists are accused of being in the forefront of the anti-Soviet campaign and of spreading vicious lies about the Soviet Union. The article cites an American Jew who visited Russia recently and who discovered with his own eyes the falseness of Zionist propaganda. According to this man, Soviet Jews lead a happy life and enjoy complete equality. Against this background, Zionist demands for the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel are deemed absurd. The Zionist leaders are dismissed as obedient lackeys of the American imperialists and the partners of Nazis, now occupying high positions in West Germany, whose hands are stained with the blood of millions of Jews.²⁵

In another *Trud* article, "Rotten Goods From Under the Coattails," one N. Erikh contends that the archivist of the Israeli Embassy in Moscow, Jacob Kelman, engages in activities incompatible with his diplomatic status. It was charged that in frequent trips throughout the Soviet Union, Kelman talks to Soviet citizens and slanders Soviet life and conditions, and that often he distributes publications which libel the Soviet Union. Kelman is alleged also to attend a synagogue regularly in order to force the worshipers to take illegal anti-Soviet literature, especially *Vestnik Israellia* ("Israel Courier"), a Zionist magazine printed in the Russian language in Israel. Often, it is alleged, this propaganda is wrapped in prayer shawls given to worshipers. The members of the Moscow synagogue protested Kelman's behavior to the Council on Religious Affairs and demanded that the Soviet authorities punish him for his misdeeds.²⁶ A spokesman for the Israeli Foreign Ministry, rejecting the allegation, stated that the Soviet Embassy in Israel is free to distribute information about the Soviet Union to Israelis who ask for it.²⁷

The Soviet press published a statement by the Israeli Communist Party claiming that the resignation by David Ben-Gurion in December 1960 was due to a crisis in the reckless governmental policy.²⁸ It was announced that the Israeli Communist Party, under the leadership of its secretary-general, Solomon Mikunis, was considering the party's role in the forthcoming Knesset election

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, Feb. 10, 1961.

¹⁷ *Pravda*, Jan. 24, 1961.

¹⁸ *Izvestia*, Jan. 26, 1961.

¹⁹ *Jewish Chronicle*, Feb. 17, 1961.

²⁰ *New York Times*, Feb. 12, 1961.

²¹ *Folks-shtimme* (Warsaw), Feb. 4, 1961.

²² *Ibid.*, Mar. 4, 1961.

²³ *Pravda*, Mar. 7–12, 1961; *Izvestia*, Mar. 7–12, 1961; *New York Times*, Mar. 31, 1961.

²⁴ *Izvestia*, Feb. 26, 1961.

²⁵ *Trud*, Jan. 6, 1961.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, Mar. 16, 1961.

²⁷ *J.T.A.*, Daily News Bulletin, Mar. 17, 1961.

²⁸ *Pravda*, Feb. 2, 1961.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Feb. 3, 1961; *J.T.A.*, Daily News Bulletin, Jan. 31, 1961; *Ha-Aretz* (Jerusalem), Jan. 29, 1961.

¹² *New York Times*, Feb. 12, 1961; *Jewish Chronicle*, Feb. 24, Mar. 3, 10, 1961.

¹³ *Jewish Chronicle*, Feb. 10, 1961.

¹⁴ *Pravda*, Mar. 15, 1961.

¹⁵ *Jewish Chronicle*, Mar. 31, 1961.

campaign. Preparations were also made for the 14th congress of the party, from May 31 to June 3.²⁹

The Soviet press reprinted reports in the Italian Communist newspaper L'Unita about the mass arrests of 200 Communist and Communist sympathizers last December in Egypt. Together with 800 other "progressives" arrested earlier, they are confined in a camp in the desert. The Soviet press deplored the contradiction between United Arab Republic President Gamal Abdel Nasser's anti-imperialist stand and his arrest of "the best fighters against imperialism." This, they say, tends to weaken the struggle for Arab independence and progress.³⁰ The Soviet press also reprinted, from the London Daily Worker, an appeal from the Egyptian Communist Party asking help for these political prisoners and claiming that they are subjected to brutal treatment, including physical torture, as a result of which many of them have died.³¹

The third anniversary of the formation of the United Arab Republic was hailed in the Soviet press and a reception was held at the United Arab Republic Embassy in Moscow.³² An exchange of appropriate felicitations took place between Khrushchev and Leonid Brezhnev, on the one hand, and Nasser, on the other.³³

Before his departure from the Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic ambassador in Moscow, Mohammed al-Kouni, paid farewell visits to Khrushchev and other Soviet officials.³⁴ Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister V. S. Semenov visited Cairo and was received by United Arab Republic leaders.³⁵

The August 1960 agreement on Soviet aid for construction of the Aswan Dam was ratified by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet.³⁶ The Soviet press published a lengthy article on Aswan by Professor I. Komzin, the chief Soviet expert.³⁷ Five diesel generators and other heavy machinery were sent from the Urals region to Aswan.³⁸

The Bolshoi Ballet and the Leningrad Opera gave a number of performances in Cairo and Alexandria and met with enthusiastic receptions.³⁹ An exhibit of Soviet farming and highway machinery opened in Cairo.⁴⁰

The Iraqi military attaché in Moscow gave a reception marking the Iraqi Army Day which several Soviet leaders attended.⁴¹ The August 1960 Soviet-Iraqi agreement on economic and technical cooperation was ratified by the Soviet Union.⁴² The Soviet press published accounts of technical assistance given Iraq.⁴³

The Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee sent a message, entitled "We cannot remain silent," to Iraqi President Abdul Karim Kassim, protesting the arrest and trial of "progressive figures" and union leaders. Petitions by "the Iraqi public" for the release of political prisoners held without charges were published in Moscow.⁴⁴

The Soviet Union helped Yemen in constructing port facilities at Ahmedi. On completion of the project, the Soviet press featured articles by V. Bakayev, minister of merchant marine, and G. Pyasetsky, who was

in charge of the Soviet specialists. A Soviet delegation arrived in Ahmedi to participate in the ceremonies.⁴⁵

POLAND

The Polish Government allocated a million zlotys (there are about 100 zlotys to the dollar) and the Social and Cultural Association of the Polish Jews pledged an additional 750,000 zlotys to pay for a monument to Jews killed in the Treblinka concentration camp. It is estimated that the total cost of the monument will be about Z110 million. A special committee, consisting of representatives of governmental and municipal authorities and of Jewish organizations, was charged with building the memorial.⁴⁶ A monument is to be erected in Lublin in honor of 46,000 Jews murdered by the Nazis there, and an appeal was made to all surviving Lublin Jews in Poland and abroad to help in its building. Sculptors were asked to submit plans for the monument to a special committee.⁴⁷ A monument was built in the town of Wroclawek in honor of Jews murdered there during the war, and a public meeting was held for its dedication. Representatives of the government and of the association spoke.⁴⁸ Jewish writers, artists, and photographers have begun a campaign to register all the Jewish historical monuments in Poland, including synagogues, cemeteries, and streets and houses of Jewish interest.⁴⁹

A new Jewish cooperative was organized in Warsaw to deal in services; it will employ about 250.⁵⁰ The Association of the Polish Jews undertook a campaign to increase the number and activities of the "artistic circles" affiliated with the 27 local units of the association.⁵¹

An exhibition of works by the painter Rafal Chwales was opened in the building of the ministry of culture in Warsaw. Many of his paintings deal with Jewish themes.⁵² A Jewish writer and actor, Horacy Safrin, was awarded the order of Polonia Restituta by the government on the 40th anniversary of his work.

Among other things, Safrin is an outstanding translator of Shakespeare and other English classics.⁵³ The dean of the Yiddish theater in Poland, Abraham Morewski, celebrated his 75th birthday and was awarded the Polonia Restituta at special ceremonies in the Yiddish State Theater.⁵⁴ The Yiddish theater in Poland staged Sholem Aleichem's "Thirteen Barrels of Ducats." The performance was received very well and in reviewing it the Polish press stressed that the play succeeds in bringing to life a world which is gone forever.⁵⁵

The 13th issue of the Bulletin of the Chief Commission for the Study of the Hitlerite Crimes in Poland includes a detailed study of "The Liquidation of Jews in Camps in Poland," which contains a number of documents published for the first time.⁵⁶ At a meeting of the International Oswiecim (Auschwitz) Committee in Warsaw, the chairman, Professor Robert Weitz of France, emphasized that the chief function of the committee was still the intensive search for war criminals. Hope was expressed that the trial of Adolf Eichmann would disclose evi-

⁴⁵ Ibid., Mar. 25, Apr. 2, 1961; Izvestia, Mar. 26, 1961.

⁴⁶ Jewish Chronicle, Mar. 31, 1961.

⁴⁷ Ibid., Feb. 24, 1961.

⁴⁸ Folks-shtimme, Feb. 4, 1961.

⁴⁹ Jewish Chronicle, Mar. 24, 1961.

⁵⁰ Folks-shtimme, Jan. 21, 1961.

⁵¹ Ibid., Jan. 21, 1961.

⁵² Ibid., Mar. 18, 1961.

⁵³ Ibid., Feb. 2, 1961.

⁵⁴ J.T.A., Daily News Bulletin, Mar. 23, 1961.

⁵⁵ Folks-shtimme, Jan. 21, 1961.

⁵⁶ Trybuna Ludu, Feb. 4, 1961.

dence implicating those of his collaborators not yet brought to justice. Other speakers stated that out of a thousand war criminals listed by the committee, the West German authorities had succeeded in arresting only 16. A monument in Auschwitz to all who died there was also discussed. About 630 artists from all over the world took part in a competition for planning and designing it.⁵⁷ The Polish press published the Israeli indictment against Eichmann.⁵⁸

RUMANIA

The chief rabbi of Rumania, Dr. Moses Rosen, has been reelected a deputy to the Rumanian parliament as representative of the Jewish minority. In a pre-election broadcast Rabbi Rosen called on all Jews to vote in order "to manifest their solidarity with the policy of the regime." Several other deputies believed to be Jews were also elected.⁵⁹

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Czechoslovak Government allocated Kcs10 million (about \$1,300,000) in the 1961 national budget for repairs to religious buildings, including synagogues. Only synagogues in the large cities would be given subsidies. The government also permitted the reopening of a number of synagogues for Sabbath and festival services. In those places where the old synagogues have been destroyed or converted to other use the local authorities are to provide suitable accommodations for the worshippers.⁶⁰

BULGARIA

Israel consumer goods, especially sweaters and knitwear, are being sold for the first time in the largest department store in Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria. It was agreed that the Bulgarian circus would give a number of performances in Israel. The Central Board of Bulgarian Jewish Communities adopted a resolution at its annual meeting protesting against payment by Israel for defense counsel for Eichmann and demanding severe punishment for him.⁶¹

EAST GERMANY

In the first issue of the Union of Jewish Communities of East Germany's official monthly, Nachrichtenblatt, the leading editorial asserted that although the number of Jews in the eight Jewish communities of East Germany is small, Jewish religious and communal life is making vigorous progress.⁶²

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 6, 1961]

TOLD FOR THE FIRST TIME, THE FATE OF A JEWISH LEADER IN THE SOVIET

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—One of the most prominent Jewish leaders in Leningrad has been arrested, tried and sentenced to 12 years in jail for consorting with so-called foreign agents and other treasonable activities, it may now be reported on good authority.

The secret trial was held at Leningrad on or about October 9, and lasted 4 days. So far as could be learned on a recent tour of Russia by this reporter, no word of the trial appeared in the Soviet press.

Sources of the information that Gedalia Rubinovitch Pechersky was arrested last June and convicted in October for crimes against the state were of undoubted veracity. They cannot be revealed, for the obvious reason that to do so might expose the sources to political harassment.

⁵⁷ Ibid., Mar. 27, 1961.

⁵⁸ Ibid., Feb. 23, 1961.

⁵⁹ Jewish Chronicle, Mar. 17, 1961.

⁶⁰ Ibid., Jan. 6, Feb. 17, 1961.

⁶¹ Ibid., Mar. 3, 1961.

⁶² Ibid., Mar. 31, 1961.

²⁹ Trybuna Ludu (Warsaw), Mar. 25, 1961.

³⁰ Pravda, Feb. 5, 1961.

³¹ Ibid., Feb. 5, 1961.

³² Ibid., Feb. 21, 23, 1961.

³³ Ibid., Mar. 5, 1961.

³⁴ Ibid., Feb. 5, 8, 9, 14, 1961.

³⁵ Ibid., Feb. 24, 1961.

³⁶ Ibid., Jan. 27, 1961.

³⁷ Ibid., Feb. 21, 1961.

³⁸ Izvestia, Feb. 24, 1961.

³⁹ Pravda, Feb. 17, 1961.

⁴⁰ Izvestia, Mar. 31, 1961.

⁴¹ Pravda, Jan. 7, 1961.

⁴² Ibid., Jan. 11, 1961.

⁴³ Ibid., Mar. 17, 1961.

⁴⁴ Ibid., Feb. 8, 10, 1961.

Two lesser Jewish leaders in the Leningrad area were arrested with Mr. Pechersky. Information available to this reporter indicates that their last names are Dynkin and Kaganov, but efforts to learn their full names were unavailing.

One of the oddest aspects about the Pechersky case, and one that particularly disturbs Western observers, is that the secret trial took place just before the opening of the 22d Communist Party Congress in Moscow.

One of the chief purposes of the congress, as is now well known, was to continue and intensify the drive against the crimes of the Stalin era and to democratize the Communist Party apparatus. It was Stalin who in 1948 ended all manifestations of separate cultural life for the Jews.

The 3 million or so Russian Jews comprise the 11th largest cultural minority in the Soviet Union, out of a total of perhaps 150 cultural and ethnic minorities, many of which are permitted to run their own schools in their own languages, publish their own newspapers, and engage in similar cultural enterprises.

Shortly after Stalin took administrative measures to end virtually all Jewish communal activities, except the right to worship in synagogues, an estimated 450 Jewish writers, artists and intellectuals were arrested and eventually executed.

Since Stalin's death in 1953, this policy has been relaxed somewhat. Since 1959, for example, five Jewish classics were published and some Jewish variety shows and amateur theatrical troupes permitted. A bimonthly literary journal named *Soviet Homeland* started appearing in September of this year.

Mr. Pechersky was the former lay chairman of the Leningrad Jewish religious community. For years he was the outspoken advocate of Jewish religious life. Whether he is an isolated victim of special circumstance, or whether the action against him may be part of a new campaign against Jews could not be established. Reliable sources of information are both scarce and understandably reticent. But the history of Soviet discrimination against Russia's Jews offers evidence to support the view that the Pechersky trial, disclosed for the first time in this report, could be a harbinger of a new anti-Jewish campaign.

Last year, according to information from several unconnected sources, authorities closed up to a dozen synagogues in towns and cities off the beaten track of the tourist.

THE BLACK YEARS

The 5 years following Stalin's repressive measures in 1948 were known by Russian Jews as "the black years," culminating in the notorious "doctor's plot" which was exposed as a fraud shortly after Stalin died.

With the accession of Nikita S. Khrushchev's collective leadership in 1953, and the execution of Beria, the notorious chief of the secret police, restrictions on the Jews eased, but a strong pattern of discrimination remained. The new leaders have consistently sought to blame the "doctor's plot" on Beria, but in fact it was Beria who unmasked the plot as a fraud.

The reported closing of up to a dozen synagogues last year and the arrest and 12-year sentence of Mr. Pechersky hint at the possibility of a new and concerted campaign. On this point, however, one can only speculate.

Mr. Pechersky was elected chairman of the Leningrad Jewish community after Stalin's death, with the approval of the Leningrad head of the State Committee for Religious Affairs. His stubborn and public battle for Jewish rights, however, apparently forced his demotion in 1956 to the post of deputy chairman. In those 3 years he had suc-

ceeded in repairing the premises of the Leningrad synagogue, establishing the ritual slaughtering of fowl and gaining official approval for the baking of matzoth for the Feast of the Passover.

STRIPPED OF DUTIES

A year later, Mr. Pechersky was stripped of this lesser title and of all official duties in the Jewish life of Leningrad. He continued his public pressure for reforms and was a prominent figure, not only to Leningrad Jews, but also to important foreign visitors who toured the synagogue, which for years has served as a showplace to tourists.

The Jewish community in Leningrad is known for its aggressive stand and its stubborn struggle to restore and preserve Jewish traditions. All told, there are 250,000 Jews in Leningrad, not all of them practicing or religious Jews. This Jewish population is second only to Moscow's, where 500,000 Jews live. In all the Soviet Union, 2,268,000 citizens voluntarily declared themselves as Jews in the 1959 census, out of the estimated total Jewish population of 3 million.

On this reporter's 8,000-mile tour of the Soviet Union, there were indications of efforts to discourage contact between foreign tourists and religious Jews. There also have been recent signs that discrimination against Jews has become a controversial political matter among Soviet citizens.

The *Literary Gazette*, published in Moscow, recently reproduced a column by Yevjeny Yevtushenko, the 28-year-old poet who is much in fashion with the intellectual rebels of Moscow, entitled "Babi-Yar," an indictment of anti-Semitism that specifically lamented the failure of the Soviet Government to erect a memorial to thousands of Jews slaughtered by the Nazis in Kiev during the war and tossed into a ravine at Babi-Yar.

In Moscow recently, Yevtushenko was almost mobbed by thousands of youthful idolators who wished to hear him speak. He mounted a platform to read a poem called "You Can Call Me a Communist," in which he says he will remain a Communist to the end "but never become an unctuous bootlicker." His poem "Babi-Yar" includes these words:

"Let the 'Internationale' sound out when the last anti-Semite on earth is buried."

[From the *Jewish Chronicle*, Nov. 10, 1961]

SPIRIT OF STALIN

Whatever the real meaning of the de-canonicalization of Stalin for the Russians, for the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union the situation continues to deteriorate. The arrest, secret trial, and the imprisonment of three leading Leningrad Jews on alleged charges of consorting with foreign agents demonstrate once more Soviet determination to terrorize still further the Jewish minority and especially to isolate the Jews even more completely from any contacts with their coreligionists abroad.

As all communal Jewish life in Russia has been strictly forbidden, it is only natural that a Jewish visitor from Britain or the United States should seek contact with fellow Jews through visiting the synagogues where, despite difficulties, Jews still congregate. To restrict these contacts the Soviet authorities have resorted to a ruthless closing down of many synagogues throughout Russia. Now they have adopted a new and even harsher policy of repression and intimidation, one that must have come as a shock not only to Jews but even to those of Russia's friends abroad who still refuse to believe that the Jewish minority has been singled out for suppression in a manner not far different from the methods practiced by Stalin. The charges against the unfortunate Jewish leaders of maintaining contact with foreign

agents are as reminiscent of Stalin's days as the secret trial and the harshness of their sentences.

Some further light on the whole shocking affair is thrown by a report that the trial took place in Leningrad at the beginning of October, and that the heavy sentences might have been influenced by a courageous public demonstration of thousands of Jews outside the Leningrad synagogue during the High Holy Days. These large gatherings of Jews during festive seasons have been an irritant in the Kremlin for the past few years. These demonstrations, like the vote of 500,000 Jews who, during the last census, declared Yiddish to be their mother tongue, made manifest the unyielding spirit of Russian Jewry and a growing determination on the part of a large section, including youth, to remain Jews irrespective of Russian propaganda and oppressive measures. The Jews who gathered around the Leningrad synagogue singing Jewish folksongs and dancing Jewish dances adopted a manner of protest that should convince even the most ruthless persecutors of the futility of trying to suppress a people's identity and spiritual aspirations.

Three Leningrad Jews have been made to pay the bitter price for their community's stubborn refusal to yield to repression, and their arrest and sentence must give fresh cause for disquiet and protest. For whatever the effect, it is the moral duty of us all everywhere to continue to protest against the policy of discrimination practiced against Jews, the weakest and most defenseless minority in the U.S.S.R. While Stalin's body has been banished from the Kremlin, for the millions of Jews in Russia his spirit lives on.

[From the *Jewish Forum*, November 1961]

THE JEWISH CONDITION IN RUSSIA

(By Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president, World Zionist Organization)

(On August 22 the first Yiddish language magazine in 13 years—*Sovietische Heimland*—made its debut, an event hailed as another retreat from Stalin's anti-Jewish policy. Atheistic, 130 pages long, and a bimonthly of 25,000 copies, it is supposedly addressed to the 2 million Jews living in the Soviet Union. Loyal Jews of course are still wondering why the Stalinist policy continues to apply to Hebrew and to Judaism particularly. The following article by one of Jewry's most eloquent statemen is therefore of special significance.—The Editor.)

A general antireligious campaign is being conducted in the Soviet Union, but where the Jewish religion is concerned its character is particularly unpleasant. At times, outrightly anti-Semitic. Rabbis and other officials of the Jewish faith are depicted as crooks and speculators and the mere publication of names of Jews attending services or serving as members of local synagogue committees intimidates believers.

In view of deeply rooted survivals of traditional anti-Semitism—the existence of which is acknowledged by Soviet officials themselves—it is no surprise that this leads to deplorable consequences, as happened in the notorious Dagestan case. Be it as it may, this is quite incompatible with an officially proclaimed line that atheist propaganda and education should be conducted with "cultured, tolerant, and scientific methods."

Visitors to the Soviet Union continue to report severe shortages of Jewish prayer-books, sacraments, and other objects of the faith. Though some facilities are granted to a few communities, the religious needs of Jewish believers in most parts of the Soviet Union are neglected. There is no Jewish religious central organ or body to concern itself with the requirements of isolated Jewish communities and synagogues

scattered over the U.S.S.R., nor is there any provision for religious exchange between Soviet rabbis and their colleagues elsewhere. Judaism consequently experiences greater discrimination there than other religious denominations.

No signs of improvement can, unfortunately, be traced in the field. On the contrary. There has been a wave of synagogue closures in the past year, more often than not preceded by an unbridled anti-Jewish religious press campaign mostly on the local level. Since September of last year, synagogues have been closed in Stalino, Kasaviurt, Kobuleti, Saratov, Rezina, Kremenchug, Poltava, Viliki-Luki, Soroka, Novgorod-Volynski, Kalinovits, Tukcum and Czernovits.

Nor has there been improvement relating to the Jewish national and cultural life. No national Jewish institution or organization in the whole U.S.S.R. Nor any relaxation of the taboo on Jewish schools, Jewish clubs, Jewish societies, and other Jewish institutions. In short, no organized or systematic Jewish activity, social or cultural.

The growing Jewish generation has no means whatever to learn the history of its people, or to become acquainted with the life of its Jewish brethren abroad. Though Soviet-Jewish writers still write in Yiddish—some even managing to publish their works in Communist Yiddish publications outside the U.S.S.R.—there are no such facilities in the Soviet Union itself. The several works of contemporary Yiddish writers that have seen the light of day in Russia have thus far been cleared for Russian translations only.

We need not, however, overlook occasional moments of relief in the Soviet blank of Jewish creative life. Evidence from Soviet publications and from observations made by foreign visitors, somehow indicate that thousands of Jews continue to crowd the scattered Yiddish folklore concerts. Theatrical performances occasionally given by Yiddish amateur troupes seem to play to packed houses. After an absence of Jewish publications for many years, three books in Yiddish were issued 2 years ago. The collected works of classical Yiddish writers like Sholem Aleichem, Mendele Mocher Sforim, and Peretz were, it is reported, sold out. A Birobidzhan Almanac in Yiddish and Russian was published last year. Two Yiddish books are promised—the selected works of David Bergelson, Yiddish writer executed with other Jewish men of letters in August of 1952, and a volume of poems and letters by Asher Shvartzman, Soviet Yiddish poet killed in the 1919 civil war.

And as you may have seen in the newspapers, the Yiddish bimonthly "Sovietische Heimland," has appeared in an edition of 25,000—and by its admission, atheistic. But these concessions only emphasize the void in Jewish national creative life. They become significant only because they point up—implicitly—that the Soviet authorities themselves admit a hunger for Jewish culture in their country. For if there are potential readers for literature by writers like Sholem Aleichem, Peretz, Mendele—even Bergelson and Shvartzman—there must be a potential readership for Jewish books of all kinds. Not the least by writers who share the experiences and preoccupations of the present generation. * * *

In the face of such evidence, Soviet authorities can no longer argue that they need not provide facilities for Jewish cultural life because the Jews do not need them. When the Soviet authorities further argue that Jews are granted facilities for a Jewish cultural life, their claim is unimpressive—especially when in the whole Soviet Union there is not one Jewish school. Not even in cities comprising hundreds of thousands of Jews. Nor is there a single public school where Jewish

language and history are on the curriculum. Jewish kids, in other words, have no opportunity there to learn something of their national heritage.

Still there seem to emerge new nuances in the Soviet attitude toward Hebrew. In the 1959 issue of the minor Soviet Encyclopedia, for example, Hebrew is no longer defined as a "dead" language which "reactionaries" are trying to revive, but as a "cult" language—as a literary medium in several European and American countries and as the State language of Israel. And the official catalog of dictionaries issued in Moscow this year makes mention of a forthcoming publication (100,000 copies) of a Hebrew-Russian dictionary. Compiled by Prof. F. L. Shapiro and edited by Professor Grande, it will contain 30,000 words. When we recall how Hebrew was altogether taboo in the Soviet for a long stretch, this is indeed a welcome development.

Moreover, for religious Jews, I need not add, Hebrew has the added significance of being the language in which our religious rituals are conducted. Without the knowledge of it, we cannot read our prayers.

But it is not clear at this point what such minor concessions signify. Are they symptoms of a genuine reconsideration of Jewish cultural rights? Or a mere gesture to world opinion?

After an appeal was made to Soviet authorities to enable Soviet Jews whose families had been separated by the war and the Nazi holocaust to reunite with their kin, Premier Khrushchev at a press conference in Vienna (July of last year) declared that the Soviet Government had, in principle, nothing against family reunification. But he doubted, he said, whether there were people who wanted to leave the Soviet Union to join their relatives abroad. This after applications covering tens of thousands of individuals had been submitted. (Only a negligible number received favorable attention, by the way.)

Now that the Eichmann trial has revived memories of the tragedy experienced by millions of Jews, our appeal to the Soviet Government to do something in that direction might find greater response and understanding than the Premier's reply indicates.

Until recently the Soviet line of argument was rigid. Adamant. Unyielding. "There is no Jewish problem in the Soviet Union," said the authorities. "Soviet Jews, like all other Soviet citizens enjoy full rights. They occupy outstanding positions in science, music, the arts. If the Jews do not have their own cultural life it is because they themselves do not have need for such. They are not territorially administratively concentrated and, consequently, cannot have any schools or cultural institutions. They have totally integrated themselves with the local population. They have as many synagogues as they want. They have no contacts with world Jewry because they neither belong to nor have anything in common with the Jewish people outside the U.S.S.R., etc."

Such specious arguments have been repeated on other occasions. Khrushchev declared to the French Socialist delegation in May 1957: "The Jews speak Russian, Ukrainian, and so on, in accordance with the part of the country they reside in. Even if Jewish schools were opened very few volunteers would be willing to attend them. The Jews are dispersed throughout the whole of the Soviet Union. It is impossible to open a university in the Jewish language. There would not be enough students. As to the Jewish or Hebrew languages, there exists no demand for such."

And in an interview on July 24, 1957, the Premier was quoted again: "Our position is that it depends on the will of the Jews. If they want to create a state within our borders like Birobidzhan nobody is against this

and it exists to this day. But the initiative must come from the Jews there. They could have their own language, schools, and traditions. The State language would be Jewish and they would have the benefits of anything they wanted. But to set up separate schools all over Russia would be too expensive."

And the Jewish-born Russian writer Ilya Ehrenburg, at another press conference, in Brussels a year later, declared: "There is no need for Yiddish culture in Soviet Russia. Jewish youth does not understand the language. There was a time when in Russia there was a big concentration of Jewish people who spoke Yiddish. After the Hitler persecutions those people did not exist any more and there was no necessity for the Yiddish language."

And an interview with Serge Groussard last year again quoted Khrushchev as saying: "A real Jewish cultural community is no more realizable than a political community. The Jews are interested in everything, probe deeply into everything, debate everything, and end by having profoundly different opinions."

And a declaration of Mikoyan, Khrushchev's deputy, at a press conference in New York, a year later, reiterated: "The Jewish population has merged with the Russian in Russian culture so fully that Jews participate in general culture and literature, on the Russian stage and in Russian literature. There is no Jewish problem in the Soviet Union at all. This problem is created by those who wish to impede good relations."

Continuing this line a year later, M. Kammar, Soviet academician and member of the CPSU CC, was quoted by the Jewish Observer and Middle East Review: "The Jews in the U.S.S.R. feel themselves completely free and equal with all other citizens without distinction as to nationality. They do not want to set themselves apart from the peoples among whom they live. They do not want to create their own special schools, theaters, etc."

Numerous cracks, however, began to appear last year in this wall of opposition.

The claim that Soviet Jews have no need for a Jewish culture seems to have disappeared from official Soviet and Communist communications. The Western Communist press, for example, official Soviet information bulletins issued abroad and such Soviet outlets as newspapers Trud and New Times spare no effort to inform the world of a flourishing Jewish cultural life in the Soviet Union. The success of Yiddish concerts and plays is described at length and in detail. The issuance of a Yiddish book or a translation of Yiddish poetry is given publicity.

To judge, for example, from a recent article entitled "The Assemblage of Bankrupts," Jews appear, after all to be a nationality. The author dwells on Jewish achievements in various fields, frankly boasts that "books and newspapers in the Jewish language are issued in the Soviet Union and a number of theatrical collectives perform there."

While in another article, entitled "Jews in the Soviet Union," editor Aaron Vergelis of the new Sovietische Heimland writes: "We make no fuss about our cultural achievements for we believe that our achievements speak for themselves. When stories are written in our country about the big Jewish choral groups—in Riga, for instance, one of them has 100 members—we speak of them simply as choirs. Our many Jewish dramatic societies—in Leningrad or Vilnius, for example, can with justice be called proper theaters. And consider the galaxy of Jewish professional singers or reciters who have appeared on the scene in the Soviet Union. Can anyone imagine so large a number of first-rate masters of Jewish art developing their talent in a country that sneers at Jewish culture? This applies also to Soviet

Jewish literature, which in recent years has found its way to the millions of Russian readers—not to mention Yiddish editions, which go to Jewish readers too."

And "Sovietische Heimland" is not a minor incident. Whereas there was "no need" for such a publication 2 years ago, the need for it has now been officially acknowledged. The very issuance of a Yiddish publication is a striking acknowledgment that there is a thirst for Jewish culture in the Soviet Union. These minimal "Jewish" concessions only point up the need for a genuine Jewish culture—in the form of Jewish schools, Jewish institutions, a truly Jewish press in Russian, Yiddish and Hebrew.

Such facilities are available to all other nationalities there. The Armenian Socialist Soviet Republic, for example, which celebrated its 40-year jubilee last May, found Premier Khrushchev proudly boasting: "The motherland has opened broad prospects of work and creative activity of service to the people for thousands of Armenians, who at one time, for various reasons and owing to circumstances, were deprived of their homeland. A hard fate has scattered the Armenian nation all over the world. Many people did not withstand the hard struggle for existence; many today are still forced to continue the hard drudgery of work in bondage. I have been told that Armenians living in exile wrote a song about a swallow which comes back to Armenia every year in the spring and brings greetings from the exiles in the various countries. On its return, this swallow tells the people a lot of good things about your Republic. That is why Armenians are keen to come back to their motherland. They return to socialist Armenia where they have every opportunity of comparing their homeland's past with its present and of comparing what socialism and capitalism offer to mankind. Returning to the homeland, especially when a man was born and grew up abroad and lived the greater part of his conscious life there, is a complex process. These people, after all, have been for a long time under the influence of bourgeois propaganda, bourgeois rules and standards of living. In a word, they have been forced to live by the laws of the jungle. Patience and determination are necessary to instill the new qualities of the Soviet man in these people. But one thing is certain: Soviet Socialist Armenia is now the center, the magnet which is attracting the best daughters and sons of the Armenian people. Republican organizations must continue to show solicitude about the work and life of people returning to the homeland."

To mark that "national" occasion, Rachia Kochar, celebrated Armenian author and member of the Armenian CPCC, wrote: "Those who do not know us say that the Armenian loves a wandering life, that this is a trait of his character. We know that such an opinion is unfair. The Armenian toiler loves his native country, his land, his water, his draft oxen, his sun and fruits, loves them with an ardent love and irresistible yearning. How numerous are the songs in which the Armenian farmer glorifies his soil and its fruit, calls his bullocks his brothers: 'Pull dear bullock of dear brother.' This love and longing calls home the Armenian toilers from all corners of the globe. They preserve their language and their culture. Far from the motherland, they open Armenian schools and libraries, issue Armenian newspapers and journals, speak to their children in their native tongue so that the latter, on coming to Armenia, should not be dumb citizens in their native land, where the most ancient and forever young Armenian language rings purely and freely."

To which we might add:

There is a great similarity between the circumstances of the two ancient nations—the Jews and the Armenians. Both experi-

enced the ruin of their State in ancient times. Both suffered centuries of persecution and exile. Both have been scattered all over the world.

We hope and pray, therefore, that the day will come when the Soviet leaders will no longer find it difficult to see the Jews in that light and speak of them in that tone. We, therefore, appeal to the Soviet Government to grant religious Jews the rights officially stipulated in the Soviet Constitution and conceded to all other religious denominations.

Let us break through the wall of silence. Let us begin open discussion and exchange of opinion. We say to the Soviet authorities—let us, by all means, encourage rethinking of the uniqueness of Jewish history—a reevaluation of the Jewish conditions in the Soviet Union.

[From the New York Herald Tribune,
Jan. 18, 1962]

AROUSING CONSCIENCE—RABBIS PLEA TO U.N.:
FREE RUSSIA'S JEWS

(By Jo-ann Price)

LAKEWOOD, N.J.—Leaders of this country's Orthodox Jewish rabbis, incensed and anxious over the jailings of Jews in the Soviet Union, yesterday asked the United Nations to seek their release.

A strongly worded statement, issued by the cochairmen of the midwinter conference of the Rabbinical Council of America, an influential organization of 900 rabbis, said that "the entire world can only be repelled by the fact that religious leaders of Russia's estimated 3 million Jews have been incarcerated for alleged treasonable activity."

It was released by Rabbi Samuel Landa, of Ozone Park, Queens, Jewish Center, and Rabbi Fabian Schonfeld, spiritual leader of Young Israel Synagogue, in Kew Gardens Hills, Queens, as the conference ended at the Brunswick Hotel.

The statement commended the New York Herald Tribune for exposing recent anti-Jewish incidents and arrests in the Soviet Union. The stories written last November by Rowland Evans, Jr., of the Herald Tribune Washington Bureau, and others that followed them, "aroused the conscience of the civilized world with regard to these grave and unjustified invasions of the basic principles of human justice," the rabbis said.

Reports that seeped through the Iron Curtain and were documented January 7 by Label A. Katz, of New Orleans, president of B'nai B'rith, have told of a steady assault on Jews in the Soviet Union since last June. Incidents included a quadrupled tax assessment on the clergy, dismissal of the director of the Moscow Yeshiva, and the disbanding of the Vaad Yeshiva, governing council of the Moscow Seminary.

Among the imprisoned Jewish leaders were Dr. Gedalia Rubinovitch Pechersky, of Leningrad, and other ranking lay leaders of synagogues in the capitals of five Soviet republics. Little has appeared in the Soviet press about the anti-Jewish drive.

Many Jewish organizations have strongly protested the anti-Semitic acts by Soviet authorities but the Rabbinical Council is one of the few that has directed its appeal to the United Nations. Others have been the Religious Zionists of America and the Jewish Labor Committee. The United Synagogue of America, representing 1.4 million Conservative Jews, has asked the United States to inquire into the arrests. Most Jewish groups have urged the Kremlin to stop them.

Rabbis of the Rabbinical Council have about 1.5 million people in their congregations, many of whom are just a generation or two away from Russia and some of whom bear painful memories of Nazi atrocities.

Mr. JAVITS. Now, Mr. President, I have a few general observations.

The time which I spent in the Soviet Union has helped to convince me that it is critically essential to get the maximum amount of information about the free world and its views through to the Russian people. They should be told now how we feel about the prosecution of Jewish leaders. They do not have the facts now, and what they get in their press and radio is heavily colored by Government propaganda.

In spite of this—and it is a revelation to anyone who goes there—the Russian people are very receptive to anything which comes from the United States in the way of a statement of our position. I was there when President Kennedy's interview with Alexei Adzhubei, editor of Izvestia, Khrushchev's son-in-law, was published.

It made a remarkable impression on the people themselves who had an opportunity to read it, in Moscow and in the Moscow area, and upon the foreign diplomatic corps. It was, generally, a very real contribution to our relations with the Soviet Union. It did not perform a miracle. It did not change the situation materially. However, it did have an effect, and indicated this is the right line of action to pursue.

Even leading officials in the Soviet Union were compelled to state that the tone of the interview, notwithstanding that they thoroughly disagreed with it, was the right tone and certainly not calculated to do anything other than to attempt to heal the breach between us, which is so serious for the world, rather than to exacerbate it.

Mr. President, I think it is critically important that we make a very great effort on getting through with authoritative information.

In this connection, I regard it as highly important to increase our cultural exchange activity with the Soviet Union. I ascertained, when I was there, that the Soviet authorities are willing to go further in exchange of radio, television, publications, motion pictures, artists, and athletes. At least they say they are ready to go further. Knowing of their negotiating habits, when we reach the point of actual negotiation perhaps we will find a lot of worms in with the fishhooks. Nonetheless, that is their expressed desire.

In that connection, I should like to inform my colleagues that a great deal was made during my visit of the desirability to provide for visits to the United States by members of the Supreme Soviet, which is in name, at least, their supreme legislative body.

In my view they certainly are not legislators in our sense, nor are they to be equated with Members of the Congress in the authority which inheres in their offices, but they are regarded as influential people in the Soviet Union and it is a fact that a good many of them do wish to come to the United States to see for themselves, to ask questions, and to be received. I think this interest can be beneficial and that we ought to take advantage of it. Some people fear that they would spread hostile propaganda, but nonetheless we must remember that we wish to go to Russia, also, to have a look for ourselves. On balance, this

kind of exposure, it seems to me, would be in our favor.

While the members of the Supreme Soviet can come here now, they claim that those who have come have not been able to see our legislators and our Government officials.

Exploration is now being made to see if congenial arrangements can be worked out by which members of the Supreme Soviet who are truly important in the life of their country may be received here in a way that will give them an opportunity to see some of our Members of the Congress and also officials in our executive department; provided reciprocal courtesies are extended to U.S. officials visiting the Soviet Union. Arrangements for this exchange could be included in the overall cultural exchange agreement now being negotiated with the Soviet Union and be covered therefore in its protective terms.

In this way, I think we can make our impact felt on the Russian people to a much greater degree than we do at present. On the one hand, we must make emphatic our protest against Soviet discrimination against Jews and any other religious minorities in the Soviet Union; on the other, we must make it possible for more influential Russians to be exposed to our society, the way in which we run our Government and to the men who help run it.

Mr. President, these are by no means two inconsistent positions, for what they represent is the effort to pry open this fiction but nonetheless grave reality, when one is actually there, of the Iron Curtain.

It is extremely important that by its silence the world should not repeat the mistakes it has so tragically made in the past with respect to the incidence of an anti-Jewish situation which exists now, I am convinced, in the Soviet Union. Rather the world should protest in the most distinct manner, especially bearing in mind the sensitivity of the leaders of the Soviet Union to any charge of anti-Semitism and the pride which they take in the fact that they live in an allegedly classless, unbogoted society.

The protest should be utilized on a large scale in the world to break through to them and to the Russian people the sense of indignation and outrage felt by the free world when it sees even some indications of an anti-Jewish policy. I am convinced that such indications are very real and present, and there is a situation of very serious peril.

Secondly, we should give every opportunity, consistent with the security and protectiveness which we have a right to expect from the administration on these agreements, for Soviet people of importance to come out and have a look at the world and the United States in particular. I am confident that we can do so without any material jeopardy to the issue of security.

A good many Senators have spoken to me about the remarks I have made today and have given me a great sympathetic feeling of identity about their own views with those I have expressed.

For the record, I should like to read a very brief note sent to me by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who had an opportunity to read the remarks which I prepared for today. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

JANUARY 24, 1962.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The report which you propose to make to the Senate on Thursday, January 25, is an excellent document and I believe you are rendering a distinct service to the Congress and to the country in making this report.

Sincerely,

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the question might be asked as to why the report I have made is being made at this time, in view of the fact that no particular proposed legislation is before the Senate, and that I do not recommend particular proposed legislation as an aspect of my report. I have made the report because the Senate is famous in the world for many things, but it is perhaps most famous as being a forum in which ideas of freedom, including protests against its deprivation, and a sense of denunciation of injustice have always found a great receptivity and a real home.

I should like to conclude what I have said, which has been necessarily somewhat detailed because one must always state one's evidence before coming to a conclusion, by saying that I believe there is real peril to the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. I believe that this peril pictures the great weakness of this monolithic state in that it is often completely ambivalent in terms of its protestations of principle and doctrine and the development of its actual practice.

Finally, there is no way in which this shell can be cracked. There is no way in which what happens can be exposed to the view of the people of the world except in another forum. There is no forum in the Soviet Union, except one which might be secured at the peril of one's liberty and life, in which such facts can be disclosed, conclusions drawn, and the protest called for.

I feel a great sense of honor in being a Senator of the United States and to have an opportunity on the floor of the Senate, in terms of the international policy of our Nation and the whole thrust of the free world, to lodge a protest, to present evidence, and to express the hope that, first, it may be taken up feelingly and with conviction by other peoples as well as our own and, second, that it will, because of the unanimous view of the free world and the sense of outrage which it feels, break through even the hard shell placed around the Soviet Union by those who hold its destinies.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I commend the Senator from New York for performing the service which he has rendered the Senate today. I think it is very important that we counteract some of the propaganda which comes out of the Soviet Union and is intended to work to our disadvantage. According to the Russian Government, people are persecuted in virtually every other part of the world, particularly that part of the world which we know as the Western World. We do not have access to the facts relating to the persecution which goes on within the Soviet Union itself. So I know I have learned things from the Senator's statement that I had not realized before, and I am sure that as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the news go out from this Chamber, a great many people in this country will get a better understanding of what is going on behind the Iron Curtain, as it is called, and perhaps feel a little more keenly about the problem than they they have done before.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is one of our most respected Members, for his very gracious words. I point out that it is very necessary to have such factual disclosures because of the way the Russians dress these things up in a secret trial. One might, if he merely read and ran, think that those accused people were some horrible criminals who were traitorously running away with the secrets of the Soviet Union. One might so conclude until he reads between the lines and begins to appreciate not only the fabrication but also the barbarism of the deceit which is being practiced on the world in order to make leaders of a religious community appear to be criminals. It is bad enough that they are being persecuted and kept in jail for years on end. We saw some who had spent as many as 10 years in jail, and other similar persecution. That is bad enough. But to make them out as traitors and immoral men because of secrecy and propaganda is really compounding the outrage.

As I said before, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Vermont; and I am grateful for the privilege of being able in this most august forum to register the protest I have and to disclose the facts which I have disclosed.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I wish to add my voice to that of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in commending the senior Senator from New York for the very excellent job that he has performed today on the floor of the Senate. I know the task required him to spend many hours, days, and weeks in documenting the evidence that he has brought before the Senate. He has rendered a service in my opinion not only to the Senate and the people of this country, but to all mankind.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I recall especially his long and eminent service as Assistant Secretary

of State, which, it seems to me, gives him a very special reason for speaking. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has also a special reason for speaking. I am very grateful to them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, the distinguished senior U.S. Senator from New York is not only a very able American legislator; he is a very competent lawyer. His powers of observation, I think, are quite beyond question, and are the result of long years in the practice of his profession. The visit which he made to the Soviet Union several months ago gave, therefore, to an extremely well equipped observer, adequate opportunity to see what takes place within the Soviet Union relative to discrimination against the Jewish people who live there.

The people and the Government of the United States are compassionate. They abhor discrimination against human beings, whether the discrimination exists—as, unhappily and all too often, it does exist—in our own country among our own fellow citizens, or wherever else it may take place throughout the globe.

Thus, when our able colleague tells the Senate there is clear evidence that the Jews and the Jewish religion suffer grievous limitations and restrictions in Soviet Russia, it gives us in this Chamber and in the country reason to pause and to ponder.

The Senator refers to a series of criminal trials within the Soviet Union, as a result of which punishments, sufficiently evil to be in the Stalin fashion, were meted out to some Jewish people and leaders now in Russia. Thus he points to one more brutal act inflicted upon human beings by an atheistic, communistic government.

The Senator points out how communication, in several new forms, might add some hope toward the elimination of some of the paths of violence and of indefensible discrimination by the Communist leadership against their fellow men. Thus he gives dubious food for thought.

I simply wish to have the RECORD show that, along with other Senators who stood here earlier to salute him for his labors and for his report, I express my sentiments of congratulations for a service well performed.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my colleague. I have already expressed my gratitude to my colleagues from Vermont and Kentucky who spoke in the same vein. It is but another reflection of the deep understanding of our international situation, as well as the sense of justice which pervades our Nation, that the Senator has given tongue to these sentiments at this time. I thank my colleague.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend.

MANAGEMENT OF THE ELK HERD IN THE NORTHERN PART OF YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, officials of at least two Department of the Interior agencies and three States continue to be concerned with the 27-year-old—and continuing—problem of managing a great natural resource, the elk herd in the northern part of Yellowstone National Park.

According to the National Park Service, the herd numbers 10,000, double the number biologists say the range will carry.

Although disagreement with the reduction program has been a matter of record in my office since 1953, it reached new heights this winter—and culminated in protests from the State administration of Montana and Wyoming, and offers to take all the elk which could be trapped.

There were charges that officials of the National Park Service and Yellowstone National Park were dishonest and incompetent with respect to management of the elk herd and preservation of the related soil, vegetation, and wildlife resources.

Last month, Supt. Lon Garrison of Yellowstone and other Park Service and Interior Department officials met with Acting Governor Gage and members of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission on this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that a background statement prepared by the National Park Service for that meeting be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

MANAGEMENT OF YELLOWSTONE'S NORTHERN ELK HERD INTRODUCTION

There seems to be a general belief in the minds of those who criticize the National Park Service's policies on control of the northern elk herd that our objectives as stated in November 1961 are unfounded and radical departures from previous thinking. There are also more than hints that our control program is not based on scientific data, that our control methods do not include all measures that are effective.

This statement is intended to show that the control program is based on many years accumulation of sound scientific data, that the 1961-62 program is no radical departure from previously stated objectives, and that definite progress is being made toward bringing the northern herd into balance with its range. This statement is made with full realization that its reader appeal is low and cannot be expected to still the cries of emotional critics whose knowledge of or interest in the facts is secondary or lacking. It is directed to those readers who do want to know the basis for Service policy and its history of development.

Fundamentally, there are four elements in the management of Yellowstone's wildlife—the land, the plants that grow upon it, the animals that utilize plants directly or indirectly, and the weather.

Weather is beyond our control as is the production of soil, but soil is our capital. Whatever management plan is adopted its foundation stone must be soil conservation for once soil cover is lost, discussion of herd

size or range management is completely futile. Centuries are required for replacement of topsoil.

Conservation of plant cover is next in importance. Plants stabilize soil and contribute to its formation. Mistakes in management of plant cover can be rectified in a man's lifespan if the soil remains unharmed, but it is better to err on the conservative side of plant and soil protection than risk loss of the soil.

These elements are too often neglected by those whose only interest is hunting elk, yet the elk and other animals constitute the one element of the pyramid whose manipulation can either save or destroy the plants and soil. Here again the conservative view is essential even if unpopular. For if the animal population exceeds the carrying capacity of its range, the plant cover is damaged or lost, erosion produces soil loss, the carrying capacity decreases, and so the spiral down accelerates until something breaks this chain of events. With an elk herd that something is usually heavy winter kill on a devastated winter range.

Numbers: Too large herds have roamed Yellowstone for more than 40 years and have produced range deterioration and erosion mainly in winter range. Early superintendents' reports discuss elk, and estimates of herd size are revealing:

In 1897: "I believe that more than 5,000 winter in the park and that at least 15,000 leave the park in autumn to winter in the lower country."

In 1909: "A conservative estimate would place the number of elk in the park at between 30,000 and 40,000."

In 1912: "27,801 animals were counted inside the park, and 2,300 were observed just outside and, therefore, belonging to the same herd, making a total of 30,101 that actually belonged to the winter herd of the park."

These 1912 figures refer to the northern herd only.

In 1914 the northern herd numbered 35,209 according to a census taken between April 11 and May 2. This figure is the peak recorded. In the winter of 1919-1920 the inevitable happened; an estimated 25,000 elk were reduced to 11,000 by winter kill, and never again did the northern elk herd reach 20,000.

Appendix A tabulates data concerning the elk control program since its beginning in 1934-1935, however, these figures require some explanation. Hunter kill figures are quite accurate through 1955-56 because most of them are based on checking station counts. Trapping and kills by rangers are based on daily reports of trapping and shooting teams. Winter kill figures are based upon counts of dead elk made by rangers in the field. The lack of figures beyond 1954-55 reflects insignificant winter kills in recent years.

Herd counts are not very accurate until the helicopter surveys of 1956 and 1961. Before then counts were made on foot or horseback and were subject to many errors such as:

1. Too loose definition of areas each counter was to cover.
2. Too large areas for counters.
3. Estimation of large bunches in forested areas.
4. Estimation of large bunches in motion.
5. Movement of elk from one area to another during the count.

RELATIONSHIPS TO OTHER SPECIES

Bison, moose, bighorn sheep, antelope, and mule deer are other grazing and browsing animals which must compete directly with elk to survive. Bison and moose have no difficulty because of comparable size. However the smaller species are currently in potential trouble. A complete ecological study

is needed to authenticate observations that bighorn sheep populations appear to be declining on this range; mule deer barely holding their own; and antelope in real difficulty because in late winter herds of elk compete for the already damaged sagebrush range.

Whitetail deer and beaver are no longer found in the Lamar Valley of the northern Yellowstone elk winter range and assumptions are reasonable that elk competition contributed to their disappearance. Other species may well go the same route.

The actual objective is healthy range with all animal species together available for public enjoyment and for such enjoyment in all future years.

SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

There is scant basis for the statement that the National Park Service elk control program is not based on scientific study. To the contrary, it is probably safe to say that no herd save the one in Jackson Hole has received such long and detailed study. From 1911 to the present there has been continuous observation and study of Yellowstone's northern elk herd with some recent progress in range restoration. These studies rather faithfully reflect a trend from wanting to produce large numbers of elk for preservation of the species to gradual realization that the herd was larger than its range could support.

The first outstanding scientific report on Yellowstone's elk problem resulted from the Graves-Nelson study in 1917.

1. Col. Henry S. Graves was Chief Forester of the Forest Service and Dr. E. W. Nelson was Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey. Even though these gentlemen were interested in building up elk herds instead of reducing them, they were quick to recommend that the elk population in all of the Yellowstone National Park region should remain at their present numbers estimated to be 40,000 to 45,000 elk. Among their other recommendations were two that bear mentioning here: that special studies of elk habits be undertaken, and that close cooperation exist between States and Federal Government in elk management.

The recommendation of special studies brought W. M. Rush to Yellowstone in December 1928. From his arrival until April 1932, Mr. Rush studied the elk and their range. Mr. Rush was a longtime employee of the Forest Service whose knowledge of biology and the Yellowstone herd made him the best man for the investigations. His findings were included in a 1932 report entitled "Northern Yellowstone Elk Study," published by the Montana Fish and Game Commission.

2. Several of his conclusions have been fundamental to our present management policies. He found that the winter range had deteriorated fully 50 percent since 1914 due to overgrazing and drought and that on more than half the range sheet erosion had taken place to a depth of 1 to 2 inches.

Cheat grass (*Bromus tectorum*) and rabbitbrush (*Crysothamnus*), indicators of overgrazing, were spreading over the lower range. All browse species were heavily overgrazed by elk, and even sagebrush was going fast.

Mr. Rush considered artificial feeding undesirable for several reasons that are valid today. He found that elk quickly became dependent on feeding and refused to rustle feed, thus becoming "paupers." Congestion on feeding grounds favored transmission of diseases. Furthermore, artificially fed animals were in poorer condition than ones who rustled all winter.

Rush, like Graves and Nelson before him, was trying to find a way to increase carrying capacity of the range, yet he, too, stated in his recommendations that "No means should be taken to increase the present size of the

elk herd until range conditions materially improve. Size of the herd at present between 12,000 and 14,000." He stressed continuing range studies and better census methods as vital to proper conservation of the elk and their range.

Scientific studies were continued by park rangers with range and wildlife management training along the lines indicated by Rush.

Study plots and transects were established; winter ranges were mapped at regular intervals, and finally it became clear that some positive control plan had to be adopted to manage the northern herd. And so it was in 1934 that the first real elk control program was devised.

This program called for a reduction of the northern elk herd by 3,000 animals. Principal reliance was placed on trapping within the park and hunter kill outside the park during a Montana season extended to permit hunting when elk were outside the park. Finally, if these methods failed to bring about the necessary reduction, elk would be killed by park rangers. The objective was achieved.

For a good summary of the range studies from 1934 to 1938, a report entitled "Northern Yellowstone Winter Range Studies, 1938," by District Ranger Rudolf L. Grimm is highly recommended. Having more data on hand than his predecessors, Grimm was able to make better estimates as to the carrying capacity of the park's winter range. He expressed forage requirements in elk units and, converting the requirements of deer, bighorn, and bison to these units, arrived at a carrying capacity of 7,000 elk for winter range during the average winter month.

Grimm recognized that the months of February and March were times when available range was below winter month averages and only about 5,000 elk could be supported. He thought that 6,300 was a good compromise figure for the elk carrying capacity of the northern herd's winter range within Yellowstone National Park. His figures were based on the winter of 1937-38 but similar calculations for 3 preceding years showed carrying capacities to be of similar magnitude.

Grimm's studies reinforced Rush's conclusions regarding overutilization of winter range. He, too, found far too many elk on a damaged range. On the positive side, he noted improved plant growth during both 1937 and 1938 seasons, but he attributed the improvement to favorable weather rather than a smaller elk herd.

Dr. W. B. McDougall, coauthor of the definitive book on Yellowstone plants and a recognized authority, made several general observations in 1943 about the winter range. These are simple and readily understandable.

3. He said the only way to bring about any large-scale aspen recovery would be to reduce the numbers of browsing animals to a very low minimum. He found abundant evidence of range deterioration but also noted that practically nowhere had deterioration gone so far as to prohibit reasonably rapid recovery under favorable conditions. Perhaps McDougall's most interesting observation is as follows: "It would be practically an impossibility to determine the carrying capacity of the Yellowstone winter range. There are too many variable factors. The climatic conditions vary greatly from year to year and with these varying climatic conditions not only the amount of forage produced but the total acreage of range utilized varies greatly. Indeed, climate seems to be a much more important factor in the fortunes of the range than numbers of elk, except that the numbers of elk is a controllable factor and the climate is not. Seemingly the most we can say is that when the range is found to be deteriorating there are too many animals and when it is not deteriorating there are not too many animals."

Such a statement clearly shows the need for studying trends in plant growths and

other factors of range productivity. In 1948 a Park Biologist position was established and Walter H. Kittams began a series of studies that are continuing today. These studies are aimed at determining the response of vegetation to easing grazing pressure as the elk-control program reduces numbers to 5,000 animals. In a report dated February 28, 1958, Kittams noted good forage production on low winter range of the northern herd and grass utilization much less than usual during the spring 1956-spring 1957 period.

4. A similar cautiously favorable report covered the following year.

SUMMARY OF SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

The most obvious result of the scientific studies to date has been a continuous decrease in the numbers of elk that observers thought the winter range of the northern herd could support, 12,000 to 14,000 in 1932, 6,300 in 1938, 5,000 in 1950. Also there has been increasing attention to other species which share the winter range of the northern elk herd. The emphasis has shifted from trying to increase winter range by land acquisition and cultivation of suitable land to manipulating the size of the elk herd and following the response of vegetation. From attempts to produce maximum elk herds we have moved toward developing a balanced ecology wherein each species plays an important part.

We know that sometimes since the early 1930's the general decline of Yellowstone Range conditions was checked and that considerable local recovery is evident in places where the elk control program has been most effective. True, aspen and other browse recovery is less than it should be, and much of the range is still overgrazed, but we know we are moving in the right direction in our management plan for range recovery.

CONTROL MEASURES

There are five ways man can control the size of the northern elk herd. These are by (1) public hunting outside the park; (2) public hunting inside the park; (3) trapping live elk inside the park; (4) direct reduction inside the park by rangers; (5) biological controls.

If man does not exercise these controls, nonselective controls such as disease epidemics and winter kill will come into play and do the job with resultant calamity.

PUBLIC HUNTING OUTSIDE THE PARK

When elk control began, the best reduction measure was considered to be public hunting along the north boundary of the park. This has proved true as is borne out by the figures; of a total reduction of 60,400, 40,745 elk were killed by hunters.

There are, however, two considerations beyond control of the National Park Service which may decrease the efficiency of this method.

First, in mild winters the elk may not leave the park in sufficient numbers to permit a large hunter kill.

Second, since large numbers of elk rarely leave the park until after the Montana hunting season has closed, the State must reopen the season if a kill it to be made. While the Montana Fish and Game Commission has cooperated fully in the past by reopening the season in the Gardiner area, there is growing reluctance to continue this procedure year after year. As of this writing, December 15, 1961, there are about 1,000 elk outside the park in the normal hunting area. The State has given no indication that the season will be reopened.

LIVE TRAPPING

Since 1934 the National Park Service has trapped 5,765 elk, most of which have been planted in surrounding States to establish or supplement resident herds. Through excellent management by State agencies, these herds have grown about as large as they can, and have reached elk carrying capacity of the

range they occupy. The Forest Service is most reluctant to have more Yellowstone elk planted on nearby national forests, and State agencies are encountering stiffening resistance from stockmen to plant on private lands. Animal diseases such as brucellosis, anaplasmosis, tularemia, leptospirosis, and red water may be factors which can affect future live plants.

There is also grave doubt that a trapping program would ever take the annual increment to a herd of 5,000 elk which would amount to 1,000 or more each year. Trapping success is dependent upon scarcity of natural forage and severe winters. Elk won't enter the traps unless they are very hungry. Mild winters or improving range conditions will tend to decrease trapping success which in the best trapping season (1955-56) accounted for only 645 elk. The evidence suggests that live trapping can only supplement other control measures.

SHOOTING BY RANGERS

This control method has much to recommend it. It can be increased or decreased at any time, can be concentrated at specific locations or on sex groups, avoids the losses of other wildlife. Ranger shooting teams are highly trained men who know how to operate in the park in the worst weather. They are equipped with specialized equipment for winter work, can utilize Service quarters as operating bases. In short, they are the most efficient control tools, but because of small numbers operating under difficult conditions they find it difficult to achieve the large kills produced by hunters outside the park. There is considerable public objection to this on sentimental grounds and furthermore, the Service, as a matter of policy, favors hunting outside the park over killing inside by ranger teams.

PUBLIC HUNTING WITHIN THE PARK

This method is prohibited by law in addition to being contrary to National Park Service policy. There are several good reasons for this. Hunting during the park visitor season is unthinkable and after November 1 the weather makes hunting hard and dangerous. Winter wilderness hunting has a romantic sound but it is not really much fun in bitter zero weather and deep snow. The record of dead moose, bears, coyotes and birds plus elk killed and not utilized resulting from elk hunts in Grand Teton National Park is indicative of what would happen in Yellowstone should hunting be allowed, and the picture is not encouraging.

It is also impossible to say what other uses of Yellowstone National Park might be advocated once elk hunting were permitted. If elk, why not bear, deer, moose, pronghorn, and bighorn? If hunting, why not mining and logging, or dams to raise the elevation

of Yellowstone Lake? These hard questions may make the National Park Service appear cynical, still Cassandra has been disregarded before.

But the heart of the matter is simply this: Most people in America do not want hunting in their national parks any more than they want mining or logging, and the parks belong to all America.

BIOLOGICAL CONTROLS

This is an almost unknown field yet one which is worth watching. If some method could be developed whereby the rate of elk reproduction could be controlled our problems would be solved. Whether such methods will be developed or when cannot be answered now but must wait on future scientific research.

SUMMARY

We see then that control of the Yellowstone northern elk herd has depended primarily upon hunter kill outside the park for the bulk of herd reduction, that live trapping and shipping can supplement this kill, and kill by ranger teams can be depended upon to make up any reduction deficit that appears. Only reduction by ranger teams is within control of the National Park Service. Hunter kills outside the park depend on weather and the State of Montana; trapping success depends on weather. Biological controls are not a sound possibility at the present time.

HELPFUL SUGGESTIONS

From time to time the National Park Service receives suggestions from sincere sportsmen. These usually concern methods of driving elk out of the park or into traps. Most of these methods have been tried and have failed, but it is tough sledding to convince the public that elk won't drive.

The Service put a line of men across the Gardiner Valley at Lava Creek and started a drive toward the north boundary. The elk moved north for a short time as a herd but, tiring of the game, they scattered around and through the drivers back to where they had been.

Again, a line of men, horsemen, and crews in weasels tried a drive on Deckard Flat. Firing guns and flares they began the drive. As before, the herd started to move out but soon panicked, milled wildly, then charged the drive line through flares and even shotgun blasts which were used in a vain effort to turn them.

Attempts with planes and helicopters have not been markedly more successful. If the elk are willing they can be driven; if not, they can't.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

There is every evidence that the National Park Service has been openly informative about its plans for elk control. Service rep-

resentatives have met with State and Federal agencies to discuss mutual problems and have gladly appeared before conservation and sportsmen's groups to present plans.

The reports of the Absaroka Conservation Committee contain full details of elk management plans from 1943 to 1954 and frank discussions of them. Press releases have been issued and public meetings held to keep the public informed.

POLICY, MANAGEMENT, AND ELK

It is National Park Service policy that Yellowstone National Park present to its visitors a vast wilderness area in as natural a state as possible. This requires that animal populations live in harmony with their environment and each other, that imbalances must be corrected by natural controls if possible, by man if not.

The elk control program is designed to reduce an overlarge herd of elk which has caused deterioration of its winter range. Based on experience and scientific study over 30 years, the program places primary reliance on hunter kill outside the park with trapping and ranger shooting teams operating inside the park. Except for changes in emphasis caused by weather, there has been no change in control methods since 1934. The reduction goal—a northern elk herd of 5,000—is solidly based on scientific studies. There is absolutely no evidence that the herd is too small; to the contrary all evidence indicates the herd is still too large.

The National Park Service cannot fly in the face of all evidence and halt the control program to appease a few critics. "Stop the slaughter of Yellowstone elk," is a fine, emotional battlecry, guaranteed to make headlines, and rally the boys. Another good one is, "Save the elk." In all honesty and humility the Service asks, "How?"

Should the National Park Service sacrifice its capital, the soil, in a vain effort to save a few hundred elk for a winter or two so they can die of starvation? No responsible authority questions the poor condition of the range or the fact that more elk will wreck it. Should the National Park Service confine its work inside the park only to live trapping when experience suggests strongly that this spells ruin of the range because enough elk simply can't be trapped?

If in the final judgment of the years of study and experience, the experts, and the administrators should prove utterly wrong, has any permanent damage been done? No. Natural reproduction on understocked range will restore any desired herd size in 5 years.

The major objective for the northern Yellowstone elk herd remains as it has for 50 years: To have a healthy herd of elk in balance with its range and with all other species which use the same range so that the natural ecological picture can be presented to park visitors.

APPENDIX A

Record of elk reductions, northern Yellowstone elk herd, Yellowstone Park, Wyo.

Period	Hunter kill	Direct field reduction	Live trapping	Winter kill	Total reduction	Actual spring count	Period	Hunter kill	Direct field reduction	Live trapping	Winter kill	Total reduction	Actual spring count
1934-35	2,598	223	444		3,265	10,647	1949-50	40	518	316	184	1,058	
1935-36	2,287	(1)	551	89	2,933	10,112	1950-51	1,265	500	312	217	2,294	
1936-37	257	394	180	15	846	10,281	1951-52	3,198	52	563	500	4,313	
1937-38	3,587	111	225	89	3,912	8,794	1952-53	110	17	165	50	332	
1938-39	2,971		307	533	3,811	10,976	1953-54	422	171	216	241	1,050	
1939-40	122		16	68	206		1954-55	763	113	593	289	1,658	
1940-41	275		12	10	297		1955-56	3,900	1,974	645	?	6,519	6,963
1941-42	2,071		145	108	2,324		1956-57	345	717	227	?	1,289	
1942-43	6,539	691		872	8,102		1957-58	50	536		?	586	
1943-44	125		10	100	235	8,235	1958-59	372	1,051	319	?	1,742	4,848
1944-45	403			300	703		1959-60	50	674	135		859	
1945-46	2,094		73	250	2,417		1960-61	25	1,287	147		1,459	8,150
1946-47	3,069		76	475	3,620	8,513							
1947-48	970		39	375	1,384								
1948-49	2,837		49	300	3,186	7,815							
							Total	40,745	8,825	5,765	5,065	60,400	

¹ Taken for museum specimens or biological studies.
² Helicopter.

³ Plane.

NORTHERN YELLOWSTONE ELK HERD ESTIMATED POPULATION, 1892-1961

The following estimates of the number of elk in the northern Yellowstone herd for the years shown are the most accurate available. It must be understood that these are estimates, and that over such a long period correspondence, news releases, etc., may have included figures somewhat varied:

Year:	Estimated number
1892.....	25,000
1893.....	25,000
1897.....	15,000
1907.....	25,000
1908.....	25,000
1909.....	30,000
1910.....	30,000
1912.....	30,100
1913.....	32,200
1914.....	35,300
1916 ¹	29,500
1923 ¹	14,500
1926.....	14,000
1927 ¹	13,000
1928 ¹	14,200
1929.....	13,300
1930.....	10,600
1931.....	10,600
1932.....	10,600
1933.....	12,500
1934 ¹	13,000
1935 ¹	11,000
1936 ¹	11,000
1937 ¹	9,700
1938 ¹	11,000
1939.....	10,800
1940.....	12,000
1941.....	12,500
1942.....	11,700
1943 ¹	9,100
1944.....	10,500
1945.....	11,500
1946 ¹	10,700
1947.....	9,600
1948.....	12,400
1949 ¹	11,000
1950.....	12,000
1951.....	12,000
1952.....	9,200
1953.....	10,600
1954.....	11,500
1955.....	11,800
1956 ¹	8,300
1957.....	8,200
1958.....	9,000
1959 ¹	7,200
1960.....	7,600
1961 ¹	10,000

¹ Years in which actual count was made; figure printed is estimate based on count.

Mr. METCALF. With support from many wildlife groups and sportsmen's clubs, the Park Service began a herd reduction program in 1949. In November 1960 Superintendent Garrison reported that this program was getting results. While "we still have too many elk, we can see the goal of a wildlife population in balance with the range and within itself becoming closer to reality," he said.

Seeking additional information on the problem and the proposals, I called upon Mr. John J. Craighead, of Missoula, Mont., leader of the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, a joint venture of Montana State University, the Montana Fish and Game Department, the Wildlife Management Institute, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of Mr. Craighead and seven other wildlife biologists be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT REGARDING THE MANAGEMENT OF THE NORTHERN YELLOWSTONE ELK HERD

As professional wildlife biologists, we are concerned with the current attempts by well-meaning but ill-informed citizens to prohibit the National Park Service from carrying out sound, long-range plans for managing the northern Yellowstone elk herd. The issue is too vital to sacrifice well-established principles of resource management for expediency, or the self-interest of minority groups.

The current controversy regarding the proposed reduction of the northern elk herd in Yellowstone National Park involves two basic considerations: Should elk numbers be reduced? If so, how should this be accomplished? Over the years sufficient data concerning range conditions and elk numbers have been gathered to indicate that the elk must be drastically reduced to get and to keep them in balance with the available winter forage. This necessitates an annual reduction program. Long-range cooperative plans to accomplish this have been in effect with some success since 1954.

The basic responsibility for the conservation, welfare, and management of wildlife and its habitat within our national parks rests with the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. National parks are seldom complete natural units; the larger hoofed animals migrate in and out, thereby creating problems requiring coordination of control and management with adjacent State and Federal land management agencies. In the case of the northern Yellowstone elk herd, responsibility for the game animals does not pass to other agencies until the elk leave Yellowstone Park.

The elk range damage problem was first made a matter of public record in 1911, although severe winter elk losses had occurred throughout the 1890's. The relationship between range condition and elk welfare was not fully understood at that time. As range use patterns rapidly changed with the settlement of the lower Yellowstone Valley in Montana, elk were forced to remain in the park on unsuitable range for longer periods during the winter and migrations occurred only during the most severe winters. Eventually the combination of overuse of winter ranges outside the park and hunter harvests at the boundary served to disrupt the migrations until at present very few elk leave the park in winter. Range damage within Yellowstone has become intensified until many other resource values within the park are being jeopardized.

Elk reduction has been achieved by three methods—trapping and transplanting, hunter harvest along the north Yellowstone boundary in Montana, and direct reduction by rangers within the park. The Park Service has cooperated with adjacent States in trapping elk but it has become increasingly difficult to dispose of the animals to States that lack suitable winter range for elk. At best trapping and transplanting is a slow, costly, inefficient method and too often merely shifts the problems elsewhere. The dangers of creating additional game range problems, and depredation on private lands are serious. Compounding the problem is the high cost of such programs with no possibility of a satisfactory solution. All the elk trapped and moved in the past 40 years represent less than the 5,000 proposed as the reduction goal for this one winter.

The hunter harvest in Montana to date has accounted for approximately 75 percent of all the animals taken from the herd over the years. This removal by hunting as well as by all other means has not been enough to take care of the annual increase each year. Elk have not left the park in sizable

numbers for 5 years. When they do migrate, considerable pressures are exerted in Montana to close the seasons to stop the fringing-type of slaughter and this can be expected in the future. The hunt, when allowed to continue, is at best a low quality hunt unattractive to many sportsmen.

There is no assurance that public hunting within the park can effect the necessary reduction and it would invariably create some other extremely knotty problems in park management and administration. A high quality hunt in the fall would require many outfitters and wardens as well as large numbers of packhorses to set up hunting camps and to transport meat. Such livestock could be fed hay but would also utilize the already heavily grazed mountain parks and meadows. A winter hunt would require oversnow vehicles, a high degree of supervision and in all probability road hunting and firing-line situations would develop.

The hunting public would in a sense obtain vested rights—the right to say each year how the elk and perhaps other game should be harvested—whether the rare grizzly and other game species needing protection would become the target of the rifle originally intended only for elk. Is it reasonable to assume that hunters would support sound management within Yellowstone when for decades small vocal minorities have successfully opposed vitally necessary management of the Jackson Hole herds in Wyoming and the Gallatin and Sun River herds in Montana? Is it safe to assume that other self-interest groups will not see in this a precedent for actively seeking special privileges in this and other national parks?

Direct reduction is the most efficient and only reliable method for achieving the necessary harvest. In 1953 at a joint meeting of the Federal and State management agencies along with interested sportsmen (Absoraka conservation committee), the Park Service agreed to face up to this responsibility and local support for achieving the desired reduction was promised. In 1955 the Montana Wildlife Federation studied the area and the proposal, and offered full support. For the past several years this plan has been followed with some success and with greater promise for the future. Suddenly this fall the support seems to have vanished. States that didn't want elk for transplanting last year or the year before suddenly offered to take all they can get; this, despite poor growing seasons, livestock competition, and local elk range problems of their own that remain unsolved.

The Park Service has stated that with minor financial assistance their personnel can conduct an effective direct reduction program designed to go into operation each year after trapping, and hunting outside the park have been tried. It appears that the Yellowstone Park administration needs financial support to properly implement this plan. Necessary funds and facilities should be provided and the Park Service encouraged to do the job. More importantly, the Park Service should be receiving the full support of the adjacent State and other Federal agencies. Every year action is postponed merely serves to allow further damage to the range and to the elk. Such delays also increase public opposition and misunderstanding.

The elk, their habitat, other wildlife, the soil, and the values these create for all visitors to Yellowstone National Park are endangered. The solution is not to open a national park to public hunting; but to diligently pursue the management objectives set up for this herd after years of study and planning. This and similar problems of wildlife and resource management in our national parks must be successfully handled by the National Park Service in cooperation with adjacent resource manage-

ment agencies. The northern Yellowstone elk problem is extremely complex; it can be solved only when the American public, land administrators, and policymakers recognize that it requires continuous research, continuous management, continuous public education, and annual appropriations of public funds in proportion to the magnitude of the task.

W. Leslie Pengelly, Montana State University; Clyde M. Senger, Montana State University; Richard D. Taber, Montana State University; Wesley R. Woodgerd, Wildlife Research Unit; John J. Craighead, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; P. L. Wright, Montana State University; Robert Hoffmann, Montana State University; George F. Weisel, Montana State University.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, subsequently, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall accepted the offer from Montana and Wyoming to take all available live-trapped elk. His telegram to the Governor of Montana is dated December 13, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that his telegram may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., December 13, 1961.

HON. DONALD G. NUTTER,
Governor of Montana,
State Capitol, Helena, Mont.:

I welcome the news that Montana will accept all available live-trapped elk from the northern Yellowstone herd. This decision will ease our management problems. As you know, last summer the Park Service was advised by your game officials that Montana elk stocks were then near their maximum efficient limits. Because we had similar word from Wyoming, we did not give as much emphasis to a transplant program as now appears indicated by your assurances and similar assurances from Wyoming that each State can now take all the elk we can live trap.

We appreciate the cooperation we have had from your wildlife experts, who agreed with us that a drastic reduction of the northern herd was necessary, so that there would be forage available for the remainder of the elk, and bison, deer, and other species. We regret that we could not come to agreement on sportsmen participation in the program. In addition to the basic policy consideration which has always deterred public hunting in national parks, there are also the management problems, involving vehicle access, controlling numbers of participants, and the like.

We know that reduction by shooting is distasteful, even with the elaborate measures we have taken to assure the resultant meat supply goes to charitable institutions, Indian reservations, orphanages, and other welfare agencies. Your cooperating with the live-trapped transplant program will keep the less desirable shooting control to a minimum.

It is true that there has been insufficient public information on the reduction program. I would be indebted to you if you would designate an experienced wildlife management official of your State to represent you on an advisory board which I am creating to advise me and the Yellowstone National Park superintendent on wildlife management and related problems. I am making the same request of the Governors of Idaho and Wyoming.

Previously, officials of your State expressed concern about transplants as a possible source of brucellosis elk infection on cattle

ranges both inside and outside the park; and

Whereas the present resident elk herds in southwestern Montana are already large enough to be causing material damage to private lands and feed supplies in the area; and

Whereas the State Fish and Game Commission has agreed to take trapped elk for planting in areas of the State that can support them through cooperative agreements with public land agencies and private land owners: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fish and Game Commission, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management be commended for their stand in planting elk only where the range will support them; and be it further

Resolved, That until range conditions improve no further elk plants be made in this area.

BILL GARRISON,
President.

JANUARY 3, 1962.

An eloquent spokesman for those who oppose reduction of the elk herd is Mr. Clair Malvaney, of Gardiner, Mont., who wrote a poem which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

OUR HERITAGE

(By Clair Malvaney, Gardiner, Mont.)

Along the upper Yellowstone
Lies a vast and wild domain,
Where wildlife unmolested
Bred a herd of national fame.
For among those lofty mountains
And down each grassy slope,
Ranged the great north elk herd
And a few fleet antelope.

This great northern herd of elk,
It ranged both far and wide,
From the upper Maiden Basin
Right up for the Great Divide.
With the first fleeting snowflakes
That came with the early fall,
One could hear the echoing bugle
Of the bull elk's mating call.

Echoing through the mountains
As the moon waxes full,
Bugle after echoing bugle,
Challenging, each bugling bull.
The world stops, awed, enchanted,
Through the night and early morn,
A feeling like being awakened,
Or of a great new day being born.

By the middle of September
You hear the report of a gun,
Which interrupts the serenading,
And now the hunting has begun.
The old head hunter pauses,
And he listens, if he's wise,
For the bark of the cow elk
Or the bugling of his prize.

With the coming of the hunter
The elk move slowly down
Into Yellowstone National Park
So as to be on safer ground.
As the snow drifts surely deepen,
And the weather begins to change,
The leaders of each gathering herd
"Ridè point" toward their winter range.

Down from old Bull Mountain
Or the high Horse Creek Plateau;
Out from the Granite Mountains
As the herds continually grow,
Around from Castle Lake they come
When they hear the hunter's blast,
The hunters think, "They disappeared,"
Yes, safe in the park, at last.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, with acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior of the offer of Montana and Wyoming to take all available live-trapped elk, stockmen and another Interior Department agency—the Bureau of Land Management—came into the picture. As the Park Service has pointed out, elk are a dominant species, able to exist even after they have destroyed the natural habitat of other animals. Some ranchers object to having elk share the range with livestock. Elk are big and tough. They carry knives—and brucellosis.

Under date of December 21, 1961, I received a letter from Mr. E. A. Moore of Dillon, Mont., district manager, Bureau of Land Management.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Dillon, Mont., December 21, 1961.

HON. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: For your consideration, this office has been asked to submit the recommendation and resolution adopted by the district advisory board, concerning the elk problem in and near the Yellowstone National Park. The recommendation and resolution adopted at the meeting held in Dillon, Mont., December 11 and 12, 1961, is as follows:

"That the elk herds in overstocked areas be reduced by the quickest and most feasible method, to the grazing capacity of the available forage, as determined by those agencies responsible for the resources involved and such herds be maintained within the proper grazing capacity: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Advisory Board of Montana 5, Bureau of Land Management, That the National Park Service and the Fish and Game Department be requested to plant elk in this district only upon written consent of the landowners and land management agencies in the area logically affected by subsequent redistribution and drift of said planted elk or in lieu of the above, adequate fence be constructed to confine elk to the plant site of deeded land."

Sincerely yours,

E. A. MOORE,
District Manager.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, typical of the response of stockmen is the following resolution, received January 1, 1962, from the Southwestern Montana Stockmen Association:

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHWESTERN MONTANA STOCKMANS ASSOCIATION

Whereas there has been considerable publicity and needless controversy over the disposal of surplus elk in the Yellowstone Park herd; and

Whereas an unusual weather cycle for several years has contributed both to the build-up of said herd and to the deterioration of

The migration of the northern herd
 Became a legend far and wide
 Before the coming of the railroad,
 Yankee Jim, or Jim McBride.
 Before the billowing snowfall
 Became too crusted or deep,
 Down the tumbling Yellowstone
 They started their annual trek.

From up around Little Pebble Creek,
 Soda Butte, and Muddy Lamar,
 Out of Slough and Crevasse Basins
 They drift in from afar.
 Through the Oregon or Buffalo Pass
 They come, then spreading around,
 They feed, drift, then feed again,
 Ever heading for lower ground.

Some, they cross the Yellowstone
 And out on Deckard's Flat,
 Grass is good, but they understand
 The Thirty-Thirty's rat-a-tat-tat.
 Some take up Baldy Mountain,
 Others headed for Pine Creek slopes,
 Some were caught on Eagle Creek
 And were shot by hunters, like dopes.

Some are killed on Travertine Flats,
 Still others more ably led
 Break a trail up Phelps Creek
 And through over the Nigger Head.
 They'll meet at the forks of Trail,
 If the hunter would but hasten,
 Some they'll kill, but the others
 Will head toward the Maiden Basin.

Some come through the Turkey Pen,
 Others will choose Snow Pass,
 Then drift down north of Sepulcher
 To steal Tony Stermitz's grass.
 Some will pass around Electric Peak
 On out by Sports Man Lake,
 Maybe along the Specimen
 Or the other routes they take.

Some elk come through Beady Gulch,
 Some over Slip and Slide,
 Past Rigler's and the O.T.O.
 Thus over the next divide.
 The hunters kill their quota
 As the herds come drifting through,
 But in some of the milder winters
 The kill might be very few.

We raised a herd of buffalo
 And turned them loose to roam,
 Their hay from the Buffalo Ranch,
 Which was their mountain home.
 The herds grazed unmolested.
 There were moose and deer galore
 Who never heard of a ranger,
 And there was always room for more.

This famous northern elk herd
 Full 20,000 strong,
 Was the pride of you and I
 Until the ranger came along.
 For with the going of the swaddle
 And the retiring of Jim McBride,
 With the loss of men like "Harry the Tresh"
 All horsensense in the park has died.

And now we have this bookworm,
 Mother Nature's first Boy Scout,
 Who quickly counts the blades of grass,
 And this, he figures out;
 He comes up with a deficit,
 No ranger is wrong, alas!
 So now the dwindling northern herd
 Grows fat on minus grass.

They drive off all the settlers
 From their hard earned, watered lands.
 To turn the forage into weeds
 To feed their phantom bands.
 They love the mangy coyote,
 The rangers' one true friend,
 They turn him loose to range and kill
 After they marked his little end.

The Buffalo Ranch has horses,
 The stalls and the ranges full,
 A cross between old Sea Biscuit
 And the wily Sitting Bull.
 Sea Biscuit, so to stalk the elk.
 He is so fast and fleet;
 Sitting Bull, so he can squat
 Until the ranger takes his seat.

To make room for horses
 The coyote and his ilk,
 The wise old would-be ranger
 He decides to kill our elk.
 They are now too few to migrate
 And far too wise to be run,
 So into their protected rangeland
 There's a ranger with a gun.

A ranger whom they trusted,
 As they lie, contented, serene,
 Deep in their winter refuge
 It's shameful, disgustingly mean;
 The ranger who betrayed a trust
 Who has lost his self-respect,
 Out to slaughter the very herds
 We had paid him to protect.

So listen, all you tourists!
 Maybe you hear that shriek of pain,
 This is just your precious ranger
 Killing your trusting, protected game.
 No longer safe, no refuge near,
 Our herd is doomed to roam,
 No longer can they lie serene
 For they no longer have a home.

Today our rights stand challenged,
 By a few sore bigoted men,
 No longer may I hold them
 With this fast but bleeding pen.
 Speak up! Or forever hold the tongue
 For with your candid remark,
 Lives or dies your great north herd,
 Who migrate via Yellowstone Park.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, first let me reaffirm my longstanding belief that the United Nations with all of its imperfections is the best mechanism so far devised to keep the peace. Despite its shortcomings, it has successfully dealt with many complexities and conflicts arising in today's world.

Since 1945 there has been an almost explosive growth of new nations. The United Nations of 1945 was a banding together of 51 nations to combine their power and influence and place it at the service of the charter's aims—peaceful settlement of disputes, the independence and security of nations, including the small and the weak; cooperation for economic and social progress and for the advancement of human rights; self-government and self-determination for dependent peoples; justice and respect for international law. The authors of this charter could hardly have anticipated the speed of the vast independence movement, or the turbulence that would sometimes attend it. Today the U.N. body is formed of 104 members, many of which are Soviet influenced. Of the original 51 members only 11 were from Africa or Asia; today, of the 104 members 50 are from Africa and Asia.

I quote two paragraphs of a letter from the Secretary of State dated January 19, 1962:

For 16 years the United Nations has served the national interest of the United

States as well as the interests of most of its other members, through its many regular functions and its peace-keeping functions. There are, of course, strict limits to United Nations action, limits set by the willingness of its members to support extensions of the United Nations' executive role.

But the United Nations' growing capacity to act goes well beyond its much publicized military operations. It provides various kinds of advice and self-starting aid for all of its less developed members. It also provides a wide range of peaceful settlement procedures, ranging from single representatives of the Secretary General to peace observation teams, mediators, conciliation commissions, and the general supervision of progress toward self-government. The peacemaking role of the United Nations serves our interest because many of the disputes contain the seeds of war. While some of the crises taken to the United Nations continue to be dangerous, in many instances the trend has been reversed.

In spite of my continuing support of the United Nations, I have grave apprehension concerning the proposal of the United Nations to offer \$200 million in long term bonds to meet its present financial crisis. I also have misgivings about the wisdom of committing the United States to the purchase of one-half of the total bond issue. It is too easy to follow the primrose path of deficit financing. I believe there is an alternative method which might well be employed by the United Nations in solving its fiscal dilemma.

Article 19 of the United Nations Charter denies to any member nation the right to vote if it is more than 2 full years in arrears in its payments. This has been construed as meaning its payments to the regular annual budget, and not special assessments for such operations as the Emergency Force or the Congo undertaking.

I may say that there is a caveat in article 19 of the United Nations, allowing a member to vote if the question of arrears is beyond the control of the nation. If a small country has an exceedingly difficult economic situation to contend with, or is faced with a great national catastrophe, it could be allowed to vote even though it was more than 2 years in arrears in its general assessment.

An examination of a list of countries in arrears on November 30, 1961, is quite interesting. We find that Hungary, for example, was in arrears on its annual assessment \$476,000. Its regular budget assessment per annum is \$288,500. It is apparent that the total owed by Hungary is just under the 2-year assessment; therefore, Hungary continues to vote. Of course Hungary along with other satellite countries in the Communist bloc has refused to pay anything toward the support of the Emergency Force in the Middle East or the Congo operation.

Of all the 104 members of the United Nations, only the following were paid up in all three accounts—Annual Budget, Emergency Force and Operation Con-

go—on November 30, 1961: Australia, Canada, Ceylon, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, and the United States.

Thirteen nations of 104 were paid up. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing amounts owed by various coun-

tries as of November 30, 1961, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U. N. PAYMENTS AND DEBTS

The following table lists the 99 of the U.N.'s 104 members who were responsible

for the payments to the regular U.N. budget, the U.N. Emergency Force in the Middle East and the U.N. operation in the Congo when the assessment list was tallied by the U.N. last November 30. U.N. statistics did not then include figures for the 5 newest members admitted last fall: Sierra Leone, Mongolia, Mauritania, Syria, and Tanganyika.

	Annual budget assessment	Arrears	U.N. Emergency Force arrears	Congo arrears		Annual budget assessment	Arrears	U.N. Emergency Force arrears	Congo arrears
Afghanistan	\$41,217		\$38,415	\$26,416	Italy	\$1,545,642		\$421,001	\$3,318,544
Albania	27,478	\$14,535	23,373	27,298	Ivory Coast	41,217	\$367		
Argentina	762,517	736,049	873,930	488,708	Japan	1,504,425			1,084,695
Australia	1,229,644				Jordan	27,478	24,746	33,373	27,298
Austria	295,389	62,036	80,458	694,210	Laos	27,478	24,746	3,722	17,611
Belgium	893,038	57,212	43,245	1,495,973	Lebanon	34,348	30,934	24,498	34,121
Bolivia	27,478	55,050	37,324	27,298	Liberia	27,478		3,931	
Brazil	700,691		449,082	109,190	Libya	27,478	24,746	33,373	27,298
Bulgaria	109,912	24,986	125,586	15,899	Luxembourg	41,217			
Burma	54,956		15,899	693,207	Madagascar	41,217	27,824	3,154	12,698
Byelorussia	322,867	290,782	393,591	235,555	Mali	27,478			7,925
Cambodia	27,478	24,746		2,131	Mexico	487,736		513,399	484,530
Cameroun	27,478	27,098	15,452	7,925	Morocco	96,173	158,728	26,879	95,541
Canada	2,136,421			8,990	Nepal	27,478	24,746	25,611	17,611
Central African Republic	27,478			118,875	Netherlands	663,822			
Ceylon	68,695		15,452	3,927,969	New Zealand	288,520			
Chad	27,478	31,098	15,452	136,486	Nicaragua	27,478	40,349	5,754	17,611
Chile	185,477	160,056	87,037	10,056	Niger	27,478	31,098	4,206	8,990
China	3,441,630	6,274,453	4,022,703	8,990	Nigeria	144,261	52,500	22,084	41,605
Colombia	212,955	192,212	106,392	17,611	Norway	336,607			
Congo (Brazzaville)	27,478	31,098	7,968	17,611	Pakistan	274,781	140,000		73,247
Congo (Leopoldville)	27,478	31,098	4,206	8,990	Panama	27,478	23,366	27,506	17,611
Costa Rica	27,478	30,867	21,560	17,611	Paraguay	27,478	60,797	29,611	17,611
Cuba	171,738	148,757	136,922	170,609	Peru	75,365		92,582	48,436
Cyprus	27,478	31,098	4,206	8,990	Philippines	295,389	133,013	82,518	189,319
Czechoslovakia	597,648	112,665	709,019	1,283,171	Poland	941,124	818,569	1,208,150	1,342,070
Dahomey	27,478	31,098	382	935	Portugal	137,390			136,308
Denmark	412,171			80,129	Romania	233,564	70,347	344,414	501,468
Dominican Republic	34,348		9,356	26,416	Saudi Arabia	41,217		54,012	40,946
Ecuador	41,217	26,918		22,013	Senegal	41,217	39,504	6,309	13,509
El Salvador	34,348		17,150	26,416	Somalia	27,478	31,098	7,968	10,056
Ethiopia	41,217	37,120	64,177	33,680	Spain	638,865		801,444	639,667
Federation of Malaya	116,782			356,612	Sudan	41,217		69,811	26,416
Finland	247,303			7,216,191	Sweden	954,863			
France	4,396,493			7,925	Thailand	109,912			
Gabon	27,478			30,918	Togo	27,478		4,206	8,990
Ghana	48,087	43,307	6,514	101,263	Tunisia	34,348			9,905
Greece	157,999	21,419	155,891	17,134	Turkey	405,302			
Guatemala	34,348	207,638	17,134	27,298	Ukraine	1,236,514	1,113,581	1,479,085	2,654,535
Guinea	27,478	3,000	7,484	17,611	Union of South Africa	384,663			825,949
Haiti	27,478	63,916	13,735	17,611	Union of Soviet Republics	9,356,287	8,408,843	12,774,084	20,088,253
Honduras	27,478	45,179	7,673	17,611	United Arab Republic	219,825	152,738	311,920	218,390
Hungary	288,520	476,283	345,802	286,624	United Kingdom	5,344,487			1,926,697
Iceland	27,478		3,722	7,925	United States	22,332,810			
India	1,689,902	139,999	1,749,138	206,930	Upper Volta	27,478		7,968	10,056
Indonesia	322,867			67,458	Uruguay	82,434	69,327	22,973	52,833
Iran	144,261		74,944	61,420	Venezuela	343,476	305,896	46,528	220,138
Iraq	61,826				Yemen	27,478	45,346	33,373	27,298
Ireland	109,912			61,638	Yugoslavia	240,433			233,853
Israel	96,173	86,614	26,196						

¹ Services of Indian contingents in the United Nations Emergency Fund will be credited toward unpaid contribution.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the United Nations at the same time it authorized a bond issue, asked the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion on the question of whether special assessments are mandatory obligations of member governments as are the annual budget assessments. It is my understanding that the legal authorities in our own State Department believe that a favorable decision will be rendered. The decision is expected in May.

In anticipation of such a decision would it not be wiser to meet the financial crisis in the United Nations by means of short-term borrowings? If the Court says a nation has to pay its special assessments within 2 years or lose its vote, many nations will pay up.

Among the nations most enthusiastically supporting the United Nations policy in the Congo about which I have many misgivings, there are many who have contributed little or nothing to the military operation there. Surely many

of them can and would pay up under the pressure of being disenfranchised.

I know the argument is made that Russia and the satellites will not pay up, and if they lose their vote, that they will pull out of the United Nations and lead to its disintegration. I cannot follow the logic of this argument. Russia and its satellites can pull out whenever they please. Russia has remained in the United Nations because continued membership best serves its national purpose.

I think the United States should at least take the lead in the United Nations to find some short-term method of meeting its current debts. I would certainly rather see the United States purchase \$100 million worth of 2-year, 2-percent notes from the United Nations than the long-term bonds now contemplated. If at the end of 2 years the member nations had not made good on their assessments, the bonding method could then be considered. If the International Court decides as I think it will in May, the United Nations fiscal dilemma may be resolved by the spring of 1964.

The Congress is being asked to increase our own debt ceiling to \$308 billion. I hate to see the United Nations resort to the dangerous policy of financing its operation through long-term funded debt. Special problems will continue to arise and special costly programs will be needed. In 1957 it was the Gaza strip; in 1961 it was the Congo. What it will be in 1965, none of us knows, but there will be trouble somewhere, and funds will be needed to implement a program. In supporting the long term bond issue, the State Department points out that annual repayments to cover the costs of servicing and retiring the bonds will amount to about \$10 million. It is said that this amount would be raised by a modest increase in the regular assessment budget. In that way all nations would contribute to the Congo costs.

I think the Russians are too clever to fall for that. The Russians could easily withhold 3 or 4 percent of their annual assessment, explaining that none of their payments should be applied to

the liquidation of the bonded indebtedness. If Russia or any other nation followed such a policy, they would have 20 or 30 years of grace before their annual budget assessment account was in arrears by 2 years. Russia's annual assessment is \$9.3 million. On November 30 Russia owed \$8.4 million. This was, of course, for the regular administrative assessment. If Russia withheld 3 or 4 percent of its new annual assessment, it could run along for many years before its account was \$18.6 million, twice its annual quota, in the red.

I would hope, Mr. President, if the hour is not too late, that serious consideration be given to a short term method of getting the United Nations fiscal house in order. I am convinced that the people in many of the countries now behind in their payments to various United Nations accounts are unaware of this situation. Surely, many of the smaller countries that vigorously support the United Nations Congo policy can meet the modest payment assessed against them.

Most private clubs follow a fairly standard procedure in collecting dues and accounts from members. If a member is in arrears, his name is posted, and the unfavorable publicity of such posting generally results in the payment of the indebtedness. If this fails, the member is suspended; and if arrears continue, ultimately expelled. The U.S. Information Agency might well bring to the attention of the people of the defaulting nations the fact that they are in default.

Long-term deficit financing for current costs, emergency or regular, would establish a dangerous precedent in the United Nations. Could not this same method be used for public works projects by the U.N. in underdeveloped countries? Could not a huge U.N. technical assistance program be financed by bonds? If we buy half of the Congo bonds, how can we ever explain our refusal to buy half of any future bond issue?

I wish to elaborate on this point. Spokesmen for the administration say that this is a one-shot or a one-time operation, that it will never happen again. We do not know what will happen. We do not know what the costs of the United Nations will be. But once we establish a precedent of buying one-half of the bonds, the same spokesman will come to us the next time and say, "Well, we will have to do it again." The next time it may be a billion dollars, not \$200 million, and we will be expected to take one-half the bonds because we took one-half in the first place. No one will understand our motive if we do not. The prestige of the United States will drop if we do not again take half the bonds.

Mr. President, I call on Senators who are members of the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Foreign Relations, to study seriously the full impact of long term deficit financing for the United Nations. Surely there must be a better way.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. MORTON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I compliment the Senator from Kentucky for suggesting at least one alternative to suicide for the United Nations. The fact is that in December the United Nations owed \$108 million. By June 1962, that debt will have increased to \$170 million. With the Congo costs running from \$8 million to \$10 million a month, it is perfectly obvious that a \$200 million bond issue would carry the Congo operation through only until November, when more money would be required. In the meantime, the issuance of bonds would establish a precedent not only for financing the police actions of the United Nations, but also a precedent for financing the regular operations of the United Nations.

As the bond method becomes popular, more and more countries will become slack in paying their assessments, so perhaps the assessments would be cut, and the U.N. would simply revert to selling bonds, of which the United States would be expected to buy one-half, as we are asked to do now. If we buy any bonds at all, other countries may expect us to buy more than half. I had some experience in that field a year and a half ago, when I was a member of the Appropriations Committee at the United Nations.

The Senator from Kentucky is exactly correct in saying that we might expect the United Nations to vote appropriations running as high as billions of dollars and ask the United States to purchase bonds to pay the cost. I cannot think of any clearer road to suicide than to start on such a course.

There are other alternatives, of course, but before we consider alternatives, I should think it would be advisable to get the facts. Apparently the United Nations does not have the best bookkeeping system in the world. Up to this point it has been impossible to find out whom the United Nations owes and what it owes for. Some representatives of our Government and of the United Nations are working on that question at the present time. They hope to have an answer for us some time in the near future. I certainly hope they will, because that is a very important question.

The Senator from Kentucky is also correct in saying that we should await the opinion from the World Court of International Justice before we take action. I believe the World Court will find that the assessments for the costs of the Congo operation and the Gaza Strip police action are as binding as are assessments for the regular costs of the United Nations. If they are not, then the United Nations is really in immediate trouble and probably could not stand up very long.

As the Senator from Kentucky has said, it is true that article XIX of the charter provides that members who become in arrears in their dues to the amount of the last 2 full years will lose their votes. The catch in that is that although Russia would be likely to lose her vote under article XIX some time within the next 15 or 18 months—and other members of the Soviet or Communist bloc would probably lose theirs also—Russia would still retain her membership, particularly her member-

ship in the Security Council, as well as her permanent membership with full veto power. There is no provision in the charter, that I know of, which would deprive Russia of her veto power over any action the other members of the U.N. might wish to take.

However, I feel that if an earnest endeavor is made to collect the assessments from all the members of the United Nations, most of them will pay them. In fact, some of the countries which are now in arrears simply have not made their last payment. For instance, in December, Great Britain was in arrears more than \$2 million. There is no doubt that Great Britain will pay that amount and not run any danger of losing her vote. Great Britain, Canada, the United States, and the other countries which the Senator from Kentucky named are staunch supporters of the United Nations. We have kept the United Nations going by advance payments of our assessments and by other support which we have given. Nevertheless, it is essential that the assessments be collected from those members who believe in the United Nations, who realize that they have responsibilities in the United Nations.

Then some means must be found to deal with the few recalcitrants who remain. Personally, I would rather have them out of the United Nations completely than to have them remain in the organization, refusing to pay their assessments, but still making as much trouble as possible for the members who do take their assessments seriously and conscientiously.

I agree that Russia would be very loath, indeed, to leave the United Nations or to lose her voice or her vote in the U.N. It is worth too much to her.

I sincerely appreciate what the Senator from Kentucky has said on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his cogent comments. I know that he as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations will give this proposal careful study. I think long-range deficit financing is really a primrose path to tread, whether we buy bonds in a proportion of 40 or 60 percent, or whatever the proportion may be. It seems to me that for us to do so would establish a precedent which would go on and on and on.

As the Senator from Vermont knows from his experience as a delegate to the General Assembly, there is much support for the transferring of our technical assistance program to what is called UNTA—the United Nations Technical Assistance program—and, of course, at the same time for Uncle Sam to pick up the tab.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MORTON. I think there are many advantages to having technical assistance handled through the United Nations; but, on the other hand, it would be all too easy to say that this is a matter which can be handled through the sale of bonds. After all, Mr. President, how would such bonds be sold? Directly or indirectly, the credit of the United States would be involved, because we would purchase a large share of

them; and, in addition, as the principal supporter of the United Nations, we would have an obligation to support the bonds which others might purchase.

Today we have hundreds of billions of dollars of contingent liability which we do not think of when we talk about our national debt. The proposed United Nations bonds would be another vast contingent liability on the credit and the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not want to see the United Nations go down the drain because of its fiscal dilemma, whatever it may be. I agree with the Senator that we must ascertain to whom the money is owed and for what it is owed. But I agree that the issuance and sale of such bonds would not be a solution of the problem of handling either the current expenses or the unusual expenses of the United Nations. After all, there will be other unusual expenses in the future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

CHANGE OF NAME OF THE PLAYA DEL REY INLET AND HARBOR, VENICE, CALIF.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 157) to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the "Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 157.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the Senate committee report on the pending business be printed at this point in the RECORD. I have marked the appropriate paragraphs.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to change the name of the small-boat harbor at Los Angeles, Calif., now known as Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., and also known locally by other names, to Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., is located on Santa Monica Bay, Los Angeles County, on the coast of California, 20 miles northwest of Los Angeles Harbor, and 410 miles southeast of San Francisco Bay. The project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1252), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document 389, 83d Congress. The project is nearing completion.

The Federal plan of improvement provides for establishment of a harbor for light-draft vessels, consisting of an entrance channel

and basin which will provide protected berthing facilities for about 7,000 small craft and for parking 2,500 trailer-mounted craft. The portion of the project in which the Federal Government participates is the main entrance channel, main harbor, revetments, and protective jetties. The side channels, bulkheads, relocations, smaller sheltered berthing areas, tide gates, access roads, parking areas, and necessary land required are to be provided at local cost. The Federal participation is limited to \$2,350,000, or about 10 percent of the cost of the entire project.

The name "Playa del Rey—The King's Beach" has come down from the days of the early Spanish settlement and is not considered descriptive of the harbor, which is a marina for small craft. In addition, other names have been used locally which has caused confusion.

Local interests, particularly the Department of Small Craft Harbors and the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif., have requested that the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor be changed to Marina del Rey.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee is in accord with the desires of local interests and recommends enactment of H.R. 157, which would change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif., since this project is a harbor exclusively for the use of small craft. The committee is not aware of any opposition to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 157) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 889, H.R. 3879, and that it be made the pending business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3879) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to withhold action on this measure pending the return of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business and at the request of the administration. I make this announcement only to indicate to the Senate that there will be no action taken on this proposal until the arrival of the Senator from Oregon.

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

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

TRAFFIC DISASTER AT GREELEY, COLO., DECEMBER 14, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on December 14, 1961—less than 2 weeks before Christmas—the worst traffic disaster in the history of Colorado occurred near the city of Greeley. On that cold bright morning, a schoolbus was struck and sliced in two by a streamliner, overdue on its way to Denver.

Twenty schoolchildren were killed. An additional 14 children were seriously injured. This accident has shocked and horrified the people of Colorado who, I believe, are determined to see that all within human power is done to insure that such a disaster shall not happen again.

It is perhaps ironic that, at the very time of the crash, the Interstate Commerce Commission was engaged in a thorough investigation into the prevention of rail-highway grade-crossing accidents involving trains and motor vehicles. This study, still in progress, is of a very great importance. The regulations and legislative recommendations which will result from the ICC study should go a long way toward insuring that all possible safety precautions are taken at grade crossings.

In both 1959 and in 1960, I called upon the Commission to initiate such a study as this. I was therefore most pleased by the action of the ICC, on February 6, 1961, in initiating the investigation. It has long been needed.

This need was never more tragically demonstrated than it was by the school bus disaster at Greeley.

Gov. Steve McNichols, the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, and other State officials have carefully investigated the causes of this accident. There is much to be learned from their study, much which will be of value to the ICC in its investigation of grade-crossing safety standards. For this reason, I addressed a letter on January 16, 1962, to the Honorable Rupert L. Murphy, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I request unanimous consent that this letter be made part of the RECORD at this point:

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

JANUARY 16, 1962.

HON. RUPERT L. MURPHY,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: As you know, over past years, I have called upon the ICC to launch a complete investigation into the prevention of rail-highway grade-crossing accidents involving trains and motor vehicles. I have long felt the need for a full review of our safety standards in this regard is imperative.

I was therefore most pleased when the Commission on February 6, 1961, saw fit to begin such a study. It has long been needed. This study is currently in process.

The importance of this subject was tragically and forcefully brought home to

all Coloradans on Thursday, December 14. On that day in Greeley, Colo., a schoolbus was sliced in two at a grade crossing by the streamliner City of Denver.

Twenty children were killed, 13 more hospitalized.

This is the worst traffic accident in the history of our State.

It is an accident that could have been prevented.

The Colorado Public Utilities Commission, the Governor, and State officials have carefully investigated the causes of this accident. I deem it of the highest importance that the results of this study be heard by the Commission as part of its investigation No. 33440. I request, therefore, that a hearing be held by the ICC in Denver, Colo., so that the lessons learned from this appalling disaster will be made a part of the Commission study.

It is my understanding that the commissioners engaged in this study will be holding hearings in California in the near future. I suggest, therefore, that the Denver hearing be held as part of the commissioners' western trip, as they return from the west coast.

Kind regards,
Sincerely,

JOHN A. CARROLL.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I was most pleased to receive a reply from the Chairman on January 17, and I ask unanimous consent to make this reply part of the RECORD.

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

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF SAFETY AND SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1962.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: This has reference to your letter of January 16, 1962, requesting that an investigation be made of the Greeley, Colo., train-schoolbus accident which occurred on December 14, 1961, and that it be made a part of the investigation into the prevention of rail-highway grade-crossing accidents involving trains and motor vehicles covered by docket No. 33440 currently in progress.

A recommendation has been made to the appropriate division of the Commission for the holding of a hearing in the Greeley, Colo., accident and if approval is obtained, such a hearing will probably be held at Greeley on February 8, 1962. Every effort will be made to have all pertinent information received at such hearing made a part of the proceeding in docket No. 33440. In this respect it should be pointed out that a hearing in the investigation instituted by docket No. 33440 is to be resumed on January 23, 1962, in Washington, D.C., while the recommended hearing in the Greeley accident will not be held until February 8, 1962, that being the earliest available date for the Commission.

Regarding the holding of future hearings in California in docket No. 33440 I wish to advise that while this matter was discussed at a prehearing conference and at past hearings in that docket no definite conclusions have been reached in this respect; although some of the parties to the proceeding expressed a desire to have continued hearings in California. This question will be opened for discussion at the January 23 hearing and undoubtedly a definite answer will be forthcoming at that time or shortly thereafter.

If I can be of any further assistance, do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

RUPERT L. MURPHY,
Chairman.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I was informed on Wednesday that this hearing will now definitely take place on February 8, at 10 a.m. in the Greeley City Hall. I am confident that hearing will be of great value to the Commission.

As an example, Mr. President, of the great concern felt by the people of my State and of their desire to see that shortcomings are eliminated from present safety standards, I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD at this point, three editorials from Colorado papers, from the Denver Post, the Rocky Mountain News, and Arapahoe Herald.

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

[From the Denver Post, Dec. 17, 1961]

SCHOOLBUS SAFETY CAN BE IMPROVED

A manslaughter charge has been filed against Duane Harms, 23, driver of the Greeley schoolbus which was struck by a train, killing 20.

This is the obvious thing to do. Harms was the person whose actions appear to be most directly responsible for what happened.

But we say this, also: Harms was not alone.

He was not alone because there were plenty of other people—and plenty of public jobholders—who had a hand on that steering wheel almost as firmly as did Harms, if only symbolically.

It is easy to blame people and conditions in retrospect. And yet there are a few observations about the unsafe condition of that crossing that invite the suggestion that somebody's safety standards were out of joint.

The road crosses the tracks at an extreme diagonal. Looking to the right, as Harms did, obviously was difficult. He told authorities that he looked in the rear view mirror as part of his check of track conditions.

With testimony indicating that Harms possibly did not come to a complete stop, this is no excuse. And yet the conclusion is inevitable that this angle crossing may have added to the dangerous condition which exploded at 8:01 a.m. Thursday.

In correcting this situation and others like it, wherever they exist, Coloradans ought to ask these questions:

Should not school officials be required by law to report any unsafe bus route conditions to the county commissioners? One former school official contacted said he, as a superintendent, made annual studies of road safety. He says he received good cooperation from the commissioners in correcting bad conditions, including unsafe crossings.

One Weld County commissioner told the Denver Post all he remembers discussing with school officials last fall was the district's complaints about "rough roads and the need for gravel."

And are all county commissioners, themselves, sufficiently awake to the problem?

What, also, about the Colorado Public Utilities Commission? Its authority seems fairly broad in regulation of a utility as the operation of that utility affects public safety.

Actually, the PUC has ordered some flasher signals installed north of Denver.

Apparently more are needed, although the cost of installing them at all crossings (at \$20,000 per mainline flasher) would be prohibitive.

Straightening out diagonal intersections might also be worth investigating. The State highway department, for example, discourages angle crossings on State highways.

One possibility seems to have merit: requiring flashers at crossings where two critical factors are involved; schoolbus routes and high-speed trains.

This would cut down the area of expense considerably. Not many rail lines are really high-speed affairs, and not all the crossings involve schoolbuses.

There are many things that need to be done. Many agencies need to get together and find out how such tragedies can be averted.

The atmosphere should not be—and we know it will not be—to fix blame. It will be correction. And we suspect that Duane Harms, himself, would go happily to jail if he could feel assured that the public was taking a hand to try to make sure nothing like this happens again.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Dec. 17, 1961]

TO PREVENT ANOTHER TRAGEDY

The tragic schoolbus accident near Greeley last week has focused attention on another frightening statistic.

In the first 10 months of 1961—January through October—there were 63 accidents involving schoolbuses in Colorado. And on just 1 day last week, the State patrol recorded three schoolbus accidents in the Denver area, all fortunately without injuries.

It is true that in these accidents on the record through October, there were only 21 injuries and 1 fatality.

But that is a near thing. It would have been so easy—just a few seconds either way for the bus or for the train—to have missed the shocking tragedy which claimed 20 lives.

As long as there can be near-misses, the danger of such tragedies exists. So long as these are possible, the boys and girls on their way to and from classes are not completely safe.

It would be difficult to put too much stress on the need for full and complete training for all drivers of schoolbuses. What may be adequate for other drivers, including those holding chauffeur licenses, can still be inadequate for the drivers in whose care the lives of children are placed.

Driving a schoolbus is a tremendous responsibility. Not only must the driver handle the vehicle safely, but he must watch over and control his young charges and, at the same time, be on the lookout for outside hazards. This is certainly expecting a great deal of any individual.

That means the utmost care must be taken in selecting drivers. And they must be given the most complete instruction—including full training in all aspects of safety.

Even that, however, will not always be adequate.

It seems to us worth the trouble—and expense—to make certain that schoolbuses cross railroad tracks only where they have protection, mechanical or human.

A full stop at crossings is a minimum. Even a stop with the driver walking out in front of the bus for an unobstructed view of the tracks is not fully protective.

In most cases there certainly should be flashing lights or even mechanical arms to protect crossings which are being used by children and by buses.

Most city schools organize safety patrols—utilizing children themselves—to help protect the boys and girls at street crossings.

Perhaps some form of this safety patrol idea can be devised to add safety at otherwise unprotected rail crossings.

It is no use blaming the driver, or anyone else, for the tragedy at Greeley. Rather let us look to the shortcomings in the present methods and precautions and see that this tragedy is not likely to be repeated ever again.

[From the Arapahoe Herald, Dec. 19, 1961]

TWENTY PUPILS DIE

After a tragedy like the one at La Salle, Colo., last week, everyone starts asking what can be done to prevent railroad crossing deaths.

Several suggestions have been made.

Mature bus drivers should be hired when possible. Men and women in their thirties or forties have developed a sense of caution and they still have good reflexes.

The rule about stopping at crossings is good, and it is generally observed. What is not strictly followed is the requirement to open a door on the bus so that the driver may hear a train's whistle. We have recently observed three different Greyhound bus-drivers, and all consistently opened the door after the bus was a full yard on the tracks.

Motorists in private cars should turn off the radio and open the window before crossing the rails. A woman called us this week and complained that the bell at the Main Street crossing sometimes doesn't ring even though the red lights flash. She admitted that she never rolled down a window to let the sound in.

The most dangerous type of crossing is the diagonal one, such as at La Salle or at the South Prince Street tracks in Littleton. Motorists see trains better if they approach at a 90° angle.

Some crossings are more dangerous than others. In 90 years, no one in a vehicle has been killed at Main Street despite the traffic volume. But on West Tufts Avenue, the death toll has been high. Since 1948, 12 persons have died there. Eastbound traffic cannot readily see northbound trains owing to a building. One newcomer recently had a train zip behind him just as he cleared the Tufts Avenue tracks. He sold his nearby house the next week.

Grade separations, like that at Hampden Avenue, are the ideal answer. But they cannot be built on all roads. Even automatic lights have been too expensive thus far. But some day the armament race will slow down and the Government will need to look around for peacetime projects. It can spend a few billion on underpasses, interchanges, and warning signals in order to provide jobs for defense workers.

Meanwhile the average citizen must realize that he has a serious responsibility for looking after the safety of his own family.

Mr. CARROLL. Lastly, Mr. President, I would say a word about the driver of this tragic schoolbus. Twenty-three-year-old Duane Harms almost miraculously escaped serious injury. He is now charged with involuntary manslaughter.

Young Mr. Harms has written me a letter—a letter which I feel all Senators will want to read. This letter speaks for itself. It speaks of the urgency of insuring that such an accident shall not happen again. Mr. Harms rightly says:

This tragedy will never be forgotten, but I feel something should be done.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be made a part of the RECORD at this point:

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

GREELEY, COLO., December 29, 1961.

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: As you recall on December 14, 1961, I was the driver of the schoolbus at Greeley, Colo., where 20 children lost their lives. This tragedy will never be forgotten, but I feel something should be done.

I have received over 100 letters from all parts of the U.S.A. and the general opinion is: There are hazards on every bus route and especially at railroad crossings, which have been ignored. Surely something can be done and I am asking you to support or introduce some law that might correct such a situation. No one knows but the driver the responsibility that is involved in handling a bus load of children when windows are frosted. We cannot erase the tragedy, but we can certainly profit by this so that a tragedy like this may never happen again.

I will appreciate anything that can be done and I will be glad to help in any way I can.

Thanking you for the above favor I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DUANE HARMS,
JUDY HARMS.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as everyone familiar with Federal elections knows, many qualified Americans are systematically denied the right to vote—a century after the enactment of the 15th amendment.

Those responsible for this unconstitutional practice employ various means for denying the vote to men and women whose color, race, or origins they consider objectionable. Intimidation is one means; and in an attempt to protect Americans from such intimidation, whether physical or economic, the Congress enacted the civil rights laws of 1957 and 1960.

Another means by which the vote is unlawfully denied to qualified persons is the so-called literacy test. In many localities, these tests—often fair and nondiscriminatory on the surface—are used to prevent certain of our citizens from voting. The President of the United States, in his state of the Union address, spoke of the "insidious" use of these tests—and insidious it is. It saps at the strength of our democracy, and cannot be defended by anyone concerned with the fundamental rights of all Americans.

I do not think the requirement of literacy for voter qualification should be abandoned altogether. It is vitally important that those who select the men and women responsible for the operation of the Government be able to understand the questions on which they make their decisions.

But what must be prevented is the unfair and discriminatory use of these tests which results, not in determining whether a person can read, but in perpetuating the denial of the right to vote solely on the grounds of race, color, or national origin.

Therefore, I am, today, introducing a bill to prohibit the arbitrary use of literacy tests to deny the right to vote to citizens of the United States, including the natural-born, Spanish-speaking citizens both of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The bill does not attempt to eliminate literacy as a proper and reasonable qualification for voting. It prohibits arbitrary or unreasonable tests which do not simply test literacy, but instead contain vague and indefinite standards. Our experience is that such tests can be and

have frequently been used to deprive citizens of their right to vote without distinction because of race or color.

The bill would require States which use literacy tests to use an objective test. The test is whether a citizen has completed six grades of an accredited school in any State, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico. This is a recognized standard of literacy which has long been used in the maintenance of our national statistics.

The bill is limited to the imposition by the States of qualifications to vote in Federal elections. This is clearly a matter of national and congressional concern, and not solely of interest to the various States.

The purpose of the bill has had the endorsement and support of the Republican as well as the Democratic Party, and the unanimous recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission.

The need for congressional action in this field is apparent from the finding incorporated in the bill that literacy tests have in fact been misused to deprive citizens of this country of their right to vote because of their race. There can be no disagreement that it is proper and appropriate for Congress to take all necessary action to eliminate such practices in the United States.

If enacted, the bill would also prevent the denial of the right to vote to Spanish-speaking citizens who may be literate, well educated and informed, but who are not permitted in some areas to participate in the democratic processes of the country because they were born and educated in a part of the United States and its related territories where Spanish is the historic and chosen language of the people. The vast majority of these Spanish-speaking citizens of the United States have available to them all the information necessary for an informed citizen in Spanish-language radio and press. There is no reason why they cannot vote intelligently on issues and candidates. The legislation is necessary to make it possible for them to do so.

I express the hope that the committee to which the measure is referred will hold hearings shortly so that the Attorney General and others interested in the question can be heard, and so that witnesses both for and against the measure can be given the consideration which the proposal calls for. In my opinion it is only fair that a proposal of this kind receive quick and serious consideration in the committee which will have jurisdiction over it.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the bill to which I have referred in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the bill will be received.

The bill (S. 2750) to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators), was received, and read twice by its title.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I wish to express my appreciation to the majority leader, who with his customary courtesy gave me notice of the fact that he would do precisely what he has done upon the floor of the Senate today, having in mind, as I know he did, the fact that at the end of the previous session I substantially stated to the Senate that I would submit an amendment to a bill upon another subject in order to make it, as it were, the first sign that we had to have such legislation in the present Congress. I did not see the President asking for such a measure.

So first I express my appreciation to the majority leader for having in mind my deep interest in the subject.

Second, I ask the Senator if he will be kind enough to inform me whether or not the bill is an administration bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The bill is an administration bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think the action of the majority leader will be of very great satisfaction in many quarters. We have had a little problem in New York concerning our Spanish-speaking citizens, but our courts have thoroughly taken care of that question.

I think the distinguished Senator from Montana knows me well enough to know that what I am about to say is not said in any sense of presumption or trying to read into a situation any condemnation, but in view of the experience that we have had with measures of this kind before committees of the Senate. We know we have had to proceed in civil rights matters pretty much by taking off the calendar bills which come over from the other body. Can the Senator give us any assurances upon the subject of hearing, consideration, report, and an opportunity for action in the Senate upon the measure? I repeat that I know the Senator from Montana knows me well enough to know that I am serious. I know the Senator's good faith is complete, and that he would have action on the bill tomorrow if he could. But I wonder what assurance he can give the Senate on those subjects.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At the moment I can give the distinguished Senator from New York no assurance, because I have not discussed the subject with any member of the Judiciary Committee, to which I assume the proposal will be sent. But the Senator has heard me make a plea on the floor of the Senate for early hearings so that administration representatives and other witnesses on both sides of the question may be heard. It would be my intention, if the request were not given consideration after an appropriate time, to offer the proposal as an amendment to a measure pending before the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Then the Senator in practical effect is saying to me—and again I speak in comradeship, because our objective is the same and I do not ask the Senator to agree—that he would propose to do exactly what I had in mind to do, with all the authority which he has as majority leader and in pretty much the same way I had in mind to do it, if we do not get satisfaction through the committee process within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The statement of the Senator is, generally speaking, correct. I would not want to be held too specifically to this general idea.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to ask the Senator another question, if he will indulge me again, again stating my deep interest in the subject, and in view of the fact that I have always been a foremost advocate of making the subject one of bipartisan consideration, and have, as the Senator knows, worked closely with Senators on his side of the aisle on civil rights matters, and hope always to do so. Are we to assume from the bill the Senator has introduced that this represents a change in what seems to be the policy of the President, not to send civil rights legislation to Congress, either in the last session or in this session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would not say that this signified a change in any degree in the attitude of the President. He made it quite plain last year that he would like to use the authority vested in the Executive, together with the two civil rights bills which were passed by Congress in previous years. He has exercised that authority with vigor and discretion. I believe also that he has made an extremely good record in the field of civil rights during his first year in office.

The Senator from New York may recall that in the President's state of the Union address this year the President referred to the matter of literacy as a qualification, and in that connection I believe he used the word "iniquitous."

He also referred to the question of the abolition of the poll tax, I believe he said through a constitutional amendment, although I am not certain in that regard.

So I would say that this represents a steady advance in the administration's position, and that the President now intends to continue to use his Executive power; but that, in the light of events, based in part on the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, he has become extremely interested—on the basis of his state of the Union address—in seeing to it that such matters as the poll tax and literacy tests ought to be given early consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will indulge me further, I believe the Senator's bill is not in the form of a proposal following the constitutional amendment process. It is, as I understand, a proposal for a piece of straight legislation, a proposal to change statutory law. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. With respect to literacy, this is a proposal which I welcome, because I deeply feel that this is the route to take, rather than to follow the constitutional amendment process.

It will be remembered that on the question of the poll tax I received a very substantial number of votes a few years ago, decisively showing that that matter could be dealt with by law.

I am delighted that the Senator has introduced his bill. I compliment him upon his action. I do so regardless of whether it cuts the ground out from

under me. That is quite another matter. I do not say that unkindly. The important thing is that this is being done. If the President of the United States is behind it, it makes it even more important than if I were for it. I am delighted that the Senator has introduced the bill. I have one other question to ask the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before the Senator proceeds, I should like to say that the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has for many years been trying to get a measure passed by both Houses of Congress seeking to take the constitutional amendment route to correct the poll tax situation.

I honor him for the courage he has shown in this respect. I personally have held to his belief that that is the best way to handle the poll tax matter, namely, through a constitutional amendment. I do not believe it would take the States very long to muster the required three-fourths vote to make that amendment a part of the Constitution.

Mr. JAVITS. I would say to the Senator that now I am arguing as a lawyer when I say that the adoption of the statutory route for the measure which the Senator from Montana has presented to the Senate this afternoon is a very clear precedent as to what ought to be done in the matter of the poll tax; and I say this without asking the Senator's agreement, because he has expressed his view.

With respect to that point I should like to ask the Senator one further question. I have the right to assume, therefore, that this measure, as an administration measure, will stand by itself, and that it is not necessarily an indication of the President's intention to submit other civil rights measures to Congress, or that we will have any other messages on this subject—and of course the Senator has a right to state his position, and is not bound to reply with a yes or no answer—but the fact is that the Senator is telling us that this introduction of an administration measure means that the measure stands by itself in respect of civil rights legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, I am not in the habit of having words put in my mouth. Any 1 of the 100 Members of the Senate has a right to assume what he wants to assume, and is not limited in that respect.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Finally, I should like to say—and I can do this independently in my own time, although I am sure the Senator will indulge me further at this time—that I do not believe that this measure represents the totality of what must be done in terms of legislation if we are to redeem the pledge which the President made to the country in his campaign so far as civil rights are concerned, and if we are to do what must be done in terms of civil rights for our Nation's people, from the standpoint of either domestic policy or foreign policy.

Nonetheless, whatever may be its effect on what I had in mind to do, which I expressed very clearly, I am delighted that this step has been taken. I believe it represents recognition that this can be done by law, and that legislation is

necessary in this field, rather than to take the constitutional amendment route—and that Congress must get into the act, as it were, if civil rights are to be assured; further, that Executive action is not enough.

I pledge myself, first, without in any way inhibiting my intended action, to cooperate in making certain that this gets done, as outlined by the Senator from Montana in complete good faith; second, that I shall continue to do everything I can to bring about the enactment of other legislation which is also essential in the civil rights field.

I thank the Senator for his graciousness in yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from New York. I say once again, as I have said many times, that he is consistent in his views. I hope this matter may be considered on a nonpartisan or bipartisan basis, because there is nothing much to be gained by either party making a political issue out of this subject, and that there is much to be gained by the people if we work together in trying to bring the issue to a head.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to address a parliamentary question to the Chair. Has it been decided to which committee the bill will be referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has not been referred as yet. It will have to be studied, and conclusion will have to be reached as to where it will be referred.

Mr. CARROLL. Reference has been made to the possibility that it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know. I assumed that.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to commend the President of the United States, the administration, and the majority leader for bringing the issue before Congress now. The forthright statement of the majority leader is to be commended. After ample time has been given to a study of the bill and after hearings have been conducted, if the committee does not take action on the matter within a reasonable length of time, the majority leader has in a sense given notice that he intends to pursue the matter in other ways. I understood him to say he hoped it would be handled through regular procedures. If it is not, it will be presented, perhaps, in the form of an amendment later. I hope that will not happen. Is that the position of the majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. I have heard the colloquy between the majority leader and the able Senator from New York with respect to whether this bill represents a change on the part of the executive branch of the Government.

Obviously it represents a change, because the President has used his Executive powers very effectively in the past year, but now, as appears from the statement of the able Senator from New York, there is proposed a basic change

in statutory law, which can only be accomplished through the legislative branch.

I therefore commend the President of the United States and the majority leader. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, if the majority leader desires cosponsors on the bill, I would be happy to have my name added as a cosponsor of it.

It is a significant step forward. It is a step which is taken at the proper time. As to whether there will be other legislation on this important issue—and I have supported such proposals as have other Senators—we shall cross that bridge when we come to it. I think it is important that this step has been taken today. If the majority leader is looking for cosponsors, I shall be happy to place my name on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should be delighted to have any Senator who desires to do so join in the introduction of this measure. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk until 12 o'clock tonight for that purpose.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, that being the case, I should like to have my name entered at this time in support of the bill.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall read the bill with the deepest interest. If it meets the test of the recommendation of the Federal Civil Rights Commission, and if it is agreeable to the majority leader, I, too, should be pleased to add my name, if the majority leader would find that congenial to him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be very congenial.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Following the splendid lead of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I simply wish to get the facts very clearly. My parliamentary inquiry is this: I gather that the bill which has just been introduced has been received by tacit unanimous consent, this not being the hour when bills are normally introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That is quite all right with me and, I know, with every other Senator here. However, at what point in the legislative business will the determination be made by the Presiding Officer as to the committee to which the bill will be referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will have to be by the unanimous consent procedure, because the Senate is not in the morning hour, and any business transacted outside the morning hour must be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in the morning hour, I should like to

have the bill presented and a judgment made by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the indulgence of the Senate for some time in which to examine the bill, so that it may be appropriately referred. Would the Senator from Montana care to ask for unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in compliance with the suggestion of the Presiding Officer, I ask unanimous consent that the bill recently introduced remain at the desk until Monday. In the course of the regular proceedings, the Chair would be prepared, I assume, to make known its findings as to the committee to which the bill will be referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. I have no objection, but I wish to propound another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Montana is granted.

The Senator from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JAVITS. At what time on Monday—not as to hour, but at what point of the proceedings—will the Chair make its determination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. During the morning hour the Chair will announce the reference.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the rules permit any Senator who felt aggrieved by the decision of the Chair to take an appeal from the ruling of the Chair at that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator may appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just listened to the interesting remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New York. I hope he is not considering ways and means to delay the measure, because the sending of the bill to committee is the regular procedure to get action, so that the Senate can face up to the proposal as soon as possible. If action is not forthcoming, other means will have to be found by which the proposal can be brought to the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The last thing in my mind is to delay this measure. I am so desirous of having it enacted that I myself had intended to propose it to another bill under the very liberal procedure we have in this body on that subject. I think the majority leader understands my concern. I do not blame him at all for making the statement he has made, so that his views may be clear in the Record.

My desire is not to see the bill buried in a committee from which it is very unlikely to emerge. It is for that reason that I have had the practice made very clear, not only for myself, but also for the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], who opened

the subject, and for other Senators who are not here today. We have a rather slim attendance today, and we are coming to the end of the day. My desire is to afford all Senators an opportunity to contribute their wisdom as to how best we can redeem the feeling of assurance that the majority leader has given us that he wishes to have the bill acted on at the earliest time and with real expedition.

I thank the Senator from Montana for allowing me the time to make this statement.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wish to compliment the distinguished majority leader for presenting this timely bill. I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the proceedings which have just taken place, I ask that the bill lie at the desk for additional cosponsors until and including Monday next.

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

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

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly about the budget of the Kennedy administration, as submitted earlier this month to the Congress.

To my way of thinking, this budget is eminently sound, and I shall support it. In speech after speech on the floor of the Senate since I first became a Member of this body, I have supported the principles of fiscal responsibility. I believe that in times of high and rising national income, such as the present, the budget should be balanced.

When I speak of the budget, I refer to the rather mythical instrument which has always been presented to the country as the fiscal program of the administration. I use advisedly the word "mythical," because the budget about which we read in the newspapers and hear on the television and the radio is only one of four budgets, and in many ways is the least important one. Yet, as a result of the conventional wisdom over the years, this budget—which violates practically all the sound principles of accounting—is the one on which we in the Senate and our colleagues in the House of Representatives take our stand and make our appeals to the country.

Actually, Mr. President, what is needed here in the Congress and at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is a capital budget—the kind of capital budget under which every well-run city in the Nation now operates.

When I was mayor of Philadelphia, a distinction was made—as it had been made for many, many years—between the operating budget and the capital budget. The concept is a simple one. The operating budget deals with expenditures for current services. The capital budget includes expenditures for capital improvements and for debt charges, other than interest, to retire loans for capital improvements, which must be paid off on an annual basis over a period of years.

Since I first came to the Senate, I have supported the efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to persuade our colleagues to establish some kind of intelligent and understandable budgetary procedure similar to—as I have said—that now in effect in most well-governed cities in the United States. To date, our efforts have met with no success. We will persevere; and we hope that before both of us leave the Senate—and I trust that will not occur in the coming fall—it will be possible to reorganize our fiscal procedures in such a way that there can be presented to the country, in reasonably simple form, the true anticipated fiscal operations of the Government of the United States.

Actually, Mr. President, the conventional budget, which has received so much attention during the last week or so, is not the one which is important. The important budget is the one known as the national income accounts budget; and the figures on which this budget is based are readily available in the President's budget message. But, unfortunately, they are never stressed; and, therefore, the average citizen, the average voter, and the average newspaper or television or radio reporter is so accustomed to presenting the budget in conventional terms that this national income accounts budget is almost always ignored. The latter budget really throws the most light on the influence of the Government's fiscal policy on the condition of business and the condition of the economy. I commend a study of it to both my colleagues in the Senate and our constituents. One who examines it will see that the President estimates that for the fiscal year 1963—the year for which he has submitted his budgetary figures—the Federal Government will take out of the economy \$116 billion, and will put back into the economy \$112 billion. These are really the basic figures on which we determine the extent of our fiscal responsibility.

As I have already stated, the conventional budget is largely a myth, because it treats an appropriation for a loan or a self-liquidating project in exactly the same way in which it treats an appropriation for a grant or for the payment of personal services. No sane man would do that in making up his individual budget, nor would any sane corporation do it, inasmuch as such a procedure is clearly misleading.

To return to the national income accounts budget, we see from the figures I have already referred to that the surplus anticipated is, not \$500 million, but \$4 billion. These figures show that the

budget is not inflationary, and that it will not become inflationary even if the \$500 million surplus were to be eliminated by congressional and executive action. We would have to provide, by action taken at this session of Congress, for an increased payout of more than \$4 billion above what the President has recommended, before we would find that the real budget—the national income accounts budget—was out of balance.

There are those who criticize the President's budget, among them able Members of this body, and they say that, in conventional terms, it will not be balanced, and they have predicted a deficit which they suggest may be as high as \$5 billion. They may be right, but if so it will be because the present business recovery does not progress as rapidly as the President expects it to. If that business recovery falls off and we find profits declining and unemployment increasing, that is just the time when we would not want a balanced budget. So, if they are right, our fiscal position will still properly meet the needs of the time.

I for one do not think the President has underestimated the strength of the recovery which started within a few months of his taking office, but I find it reassuring, on reading the budget message, to note that he is aware that the economy can always turn down and that he is prepared to take measures, accordingly, to deal with that situation if it should arise.

Among those measures would be the standby public works bill, which is similar in principle to bills which I introduced in the last Congress and again last year, and the discretionary power which he asks, and which I will support, to reduce taxes at a time when we find ourselves clearly in a recessionary period.

Mr. President, I would not be candid with my colleagues if I pretended that these views were original with me. They are set forth more eloquently than I could do in an article written earlier this week by that distinguished and much respected columnist, Walter Lippmann, in his column "Today and Tomorrow," entitled "Philosophy of the Budget."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's article may appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

PHILOSOPHY OF THE BUDGET

(By Walter Lippmann)

The 1963 budget, which the President has just delivered to Congress, is likely to be remembered as a considerable landmark. That is not because of its size, which in spite of our special responsibilities for defense is, as compared with the other budgets of the Western World, about normal in relation to our population and our wealth.

This 1963 budget is noteworthy because for the first time in our history it states that the balancing of the budget—whether with a surplus, a deficit, or with neither—is a question of economic policy and of deliberate decision. It is not, as so many regard it, a question of right and wrong.

It happens that the estimates for 1963 show a trifling surplus in what is known as

the administrative budget. But what is much more significant is the President's statement that "under present economic circumstances a moderate surplus is the best national policy."

It follows that if present circumstances were different, if there were not a recovery from the 1960-61 recession, a moderate surplus would not be the best national policy. On the contrary, the best national policy would be, as it has been in the past year, to choose to have a deficit sufficiently large to overcome the recession.

I am well aware that the economic philosophy of the budget is unfamiliar to many and that they look on it as dangerous and wicked. But the fact is that while Mr. Kennedy is the first President to make it the avowed official American fiscal policy, it has been the unavowed working philosophy of every administration, Democratic and Republican, since the great depression some 30 years ago.

It used to be a heresy to ask whether a budget should or should not be balanced with a surplus or a deficit. In this generation to ask the question has become the new orthodoxy.

Its central theme is that in the business cycles of recession and recovery, the budget can be and should be used to make the downswing short and shallow and the recoveries long and noninflationary. How can this be done? By using as a balance weight what the Government takes away from the taxpayers and what it pays out in salaries and contracts. The general rule is that in a recession there should be a deficit and in a recovery there should be a surplus. In the modern fiscal philosophy the budget should be used to balance not so much itself as the economy.

How this works is not made altogether clear by the budget we are all talking about, the budget that is called by the experts the administrative budget.

There are two main reasons why this kind of budget does not tell the real story. For one thing, it states the receipts from taxes when they are collected and not when they are incurred. Yet corporations and larger taxpayers are saving for taxes and therefore withholding money from the economy during the whole fiscal year.

And second, the administrative budget excludes the trust fund transactions because they do not require appropriations from Congress. Yet these transactions for highway grants-in-aid, for unemployment compensation and for social security payments, amount to almost \$25 billion a year. They have a large impact on the ups and downs of the business cycle.

There are in use, as a matter of fact, two other budgets—the consolidated cash budget and the national income accounts budget. It is this latter budget that throws the most light on the influence of the Government's fiscal policy on the condition of business.

What does the national income accounts budget show? It shows that for the year ending July 1, 1960, the Federal Government took from the public a little over \$94 billion and paid out to the public about \$92 billion. For the year we are now in, which ends in July 1962, the Government is estimated to be taking away \$105.6 billion and paying out \$106.1 billion. For the fiscal year 1963 (which begins on July 1, 1962) the estimates are that the Government will take in \$116 billion and pay out about \$112 billion.

These are the significant figures about the budget and what they show is that—as regards Government spending—the present fiscal policy position is not inflationary, in fact it is mildly deflationary.

The budget is being severely criticized by such men as Senator BYRD and Senator KEATING. They are predicting that the budget will not, as the President predicts, be

balanced, and that there will be a deficit that may run as large as \$5 billion.

They may be right. But if they are right, they will be right primarily because the President is overestimating the strength of the present business recovery. If he is doing that, then the decision to balance the budget will have come too soon.

He will have made the same kind of mistake that President Eisenhower made in 1959 when he imposed deflationary measures on the economy, which was recovering but had not recovered fully from the recession of 1957-58. President Eisenhower's mistake, it will be remembered, deepened the recession and thus brought about the famous \$12.5 billion deficit in 1960.

I am not intending to suggest that the President has made this mistake. There is impressive expert support for his decision. But it is reassuring to read in the budget message that he is aware that he may have made a too optimistic prediction and is prepared to take measures accordingly.

RELATIONS WITH CASTRO

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we are presently concerned about the progress of the Punta del Este Conference, dealing with what action, if any, the Organization of American States should take with respect to Fidel Castro and the Cuban Government.

I rise to commend the President and the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, for the position they have taken at that conference. It now seems clear that we will not get everything we want. I do not think either the President or Secretary Rusk ever did feel we would get what we really want; but it now appears—and I hope my prognosis is not unduly optimistic—that, in all likelihood, Secretary Rusk will come back with a resolution of the Organization of American States which will expel Fidel Castro's Communist government from that Organization and, at the very least, rebuke it for having become the declared agent of a foreign power dedicated to the overthrow of free, non-Communist governments everywhere.

If that is to occur, it will be a substantial accomplishment, for which I hope the President and his very able Secretary of State will receive appropriate credit.

I have become somewhat impatient with the primitive approach of many of our conservative friends, who seem to believe that all the problems of the world are simple indeed, and if we are only prepared to fight and move with Marines and troops and airplanes to assert the American position around the world, and in Cuba in particular, all will be well. They seem to view, not only foreign affairs but frequently American affairs, as if this were a college football game in which cheerleaders labeled "Administration Supporters" and "Administration Opponents" lead the teeming stands in encomiums and "boo's" when particular moves are made on the chessboard of the world and its foreign affairs, much as moves are made by the opposing quarterbacks on football teams.

Mr. President, this is an endearing view of the world, and it must make an appeal to all of us who like to think of preserving a little bit of what things

were not so many years ago, before we came into public life and entered the Senate; but I suggest that this primitive approach to international problems is not only unrealistic, but quite disconcerting to the country, and I would plead for the intelligent support of the President of the United States and his Secretary of State in the way they are handling our Latin American affairs at the Punta del Este Conference.

Let us never forget that it was in the Declaration of Independence, one of the two foundation documents of our country, that the first reference was made to the necessity for a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

I should very much dislike to see the day when American policy at home or abroad was conducted by these cynics who have no regard for world opinion and who believe we can bludgeon our way into peace and security by doing what seems to be in the hard-boiled, short-range interest of the United States of America.

Let us think what would happen if we were to take that fatal step, which I am so happy the President of the United States has refused to take, sending troops and the Navy and the Air Force into Cuba. The uproar of world opinion would be tremendous and adverse. We might well find the Soviet Union moving the next day into Iran. I have no doubt the present efforts, which I trust will be successful, to bring peace to the war-torn nation of Laos, would immediately collapse. The inter-American system would be irretrievably damaged. What happened to Castro himself and Cuba would be a relatively minor result compared to the wave of anti-Yankeeism which would sweep Latin America and much of the rest of the world. The reaction would probably be similar to the wave of anti-Indianism expressed here and elsewhere when that country, which, with us, had professed for so long such high ideals and such an interest in the opinion of mankind, entered into Goa and conquered that small dependency of Portugal by force.

We would be entangled in a guerrilla war nourished from outside of Cuba. In my opinion, it would be very like the long, drawn-out guerrilla warfare in Malaya, which took the British many years to overcome. I submit there is no reasonable ground for thinking that an intervention in Cuba could be a short, swift, clean-cut operation. It would be an entanglement which would cost us seriously in lives and wealth of the country.

I commend the President and the Secretary of State for the actions they are taking and the policies they have laid down with respect to Cuba before the Organization of American States. We can all hope it will be successful.

Again, candor requires the comment that these views are not entirely my own.

Again, I support them wholeheartedly. Again, I tip my hat to Walter Lippmann, whose column on dealing with Castro, published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point.

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

ON DEALING WITH CASTRO
(By Walter Lippmann)

The conference of American foreign ministers in Uruguay has not concluded its work as this article is written. Moreover, it is being reported meagerly in this country and it may therefore be some time before we can come to an informal conclusion about it.

But it is not too soon to say that there is being created here an artificial and misleading standard by which to judge what is going on. Much too often the issues at Punta del Este are treated in terms of the United States winning or losing—if the condemnation of Castro is very severe and is accompanied by an all-around rupture of diplomatic relations and of trade relations, we win; anything less than this is something of a defeat.

This is, I believe, much too simple a view of a great and extremely difficult, of a quite unprecedented, problem in the history of the American states. The problem is how to contain and isolate Castro's revolutionary interventions, how to turn the Cuban Government from its attempt to become a full satellite of Moscow, how to convert it into a good and reliable member of the hemispheric system.

This will not be done by strong words in a resolution. Strong words never stop any revolution. Almost certainly it cannot be done by breaking off diplomatic relations in this hemisphere. The more Cuba becomes a part of the Soviet and Chinese system, the more it will use their channels to other states. It cannot be done by a general trade embargo. For 80 percent of Cuba's trade is now with the Communist bloc and the rest is with Mexico, Canada, and Western Europe. Cuba's trade with the other American states is negligible. Castro, we must remember, is not nearly so dependent on the Western Hemisphere as was Trujillo.

There is no good reason for crying out that we have been defeated because the biggest countries in South America will not vote for sanctions that would make big headlines in the United States but could have no substantial and decisive effect on Castro's regime. What, then, can be done that is worth doing?

The first thing to do is, as Brazil has been arguing, to lay a sound juridical basis for the containment of Castro. Existing hemispheric law was drafted by men who were thinking of the Second World War. They were thinking of the threat which had been posed of a Nazi or Fascist conquest of South America. If that were the present danger, if there were real danger of a Soviet military establishment in Cuba, those old treaties would still be quite useful. But the existing law is not directed accurately against the methods of the cold war, and it takes a lot of stretching to make the existing law fit Cuba's economic relations with the Soviet Union, or Cuba's agents and infiltrators in South America.

There is every reason to think that we can work out with the active assistance of the big countries of South America a statement of hemispheric law which fits the problem of Castro.

With a law amplified and clarified, we can move with general consent to organize inter-American machinery, in which we would take an active part, to expose and counter Castro's agents in this hemisphere. Moreover, while we cannot blockade Cuba, we can establish surveillance by sea and air and, without violating Cuban airspace, we can keep close watch on the military situation for signs of active Soviet intervention. For this it will probably be better that some diplomatic relations are maintained.

This is a general policy of containment, patiently, persistently and actively administered. There is one alternative to it. That would be for the United States to occupy Cuba, overthrow Castro, and set up a Cuban government that we like. There are many among us who favor doing this. If it were done, there would at first be very considerable rejoicing and enthusiasm among those who do not look beyond the excitement of the moment.

Once when the church bells were ringing in London to celebrate the beginning of a war, a statesman who had opposed the war said "today they are ringing the bells. Tomorrow they will be wringing their hands."

A United States occupation of Cuba would have enormous and far-reaching consequences. Although there are people who affect to think that there is no such thing as the opinion of mankind, or that a decent respect for it is unmanly, the uproar around the world would be tremendous. The inter-American system would be smashed. Whatever happened to Castro himself in Cuba, Castroism, fused with anti-Yankeelism, would rage throughout the hemisphere.

And we, in the meantime, would have entangled ourselves in a guerrilla war nourished from outside Cuba. It would be like the British war in Malaya, like the French wars in Indochina and in Algeria. There is no reasonable ground for thinking that intervention in Cuba could be a short, swift, and clean-cut operation. It could not be. It would be a lasting entanglement.

Believing this, believing that intervention would be a calamity, I can see no alternative to a policy of vigorous and alert containment.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL AT LUNCHEONS AND DINNERS OF VARIOUS CALIFORNIA BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCILS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the first week of January, I was honored to be invited to speak before five regional luncheon and dinner meetings held in various parts of California under the auspices of the Building and Construction Trades Councils of our State.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a partial text of my comments, used in my address at these several functions.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR KUCHEL

I am far more honored than I can tell you in being invited to speak before an audience such as this on this wonderful occasion. Over the years I have come to know many of you very well, and to have for you and your fellow members of the building and construction crafts a great and growing respect and, if I may say so, a growing friendship as well. Since Earl Warren honored me by making me a U.S. Senator almost a decade ago I have attended most of your annual conferences in Washington since they commenced some 8 years ago. Each of those occasions has given me an opportunity to talk to your representatives, to compare views, to become acquainted with your problems, and to be acquainted, too, with the highly important, unique, and complex character of the construction industry in America and the splendid role that it has played over the years in building our beloved country. And I look forward to meeting with you once again this spring in our Nation's Capital. Meanwhile, I repeat my gratitude for your invitation to meet with you this week in California. The reasons

for my gratitude are many and I am sure you understand them.

Mr. President, we love our country, we respect its institutions and we pray that we, the people, and our Government, and our friends around the world, together may work for an honorable peace and for the freedom of mankind. As Americans we are dedicated to the preservation of our Republic. We are grateful for our own freedom. We are ready to make any sacrifice to preserve it. And in the unique system of free competitive enterprise which has built our country into the strongest, greatest nation on the globe, you and the free labor movement in America have played, and continue to play, your own proud and honorable part. Management and labor, in good and growing comradeship, have forged ahead, in time of peace, and have built new homes and buildings, new highways and reservoirs all across the land. And in time of war and emergency, American labor and management have together fashioned the strong sinews of defense which, throughout our history, have permitted our soldiers and sailors and airmen to vindicate our faith in our system and to emerge victorious over evil.

Thus, not alone in the building of America, but also in its preservation, the labor movement has represented a powerful partner in the protection of our freedom. And in the perilous days through which this present lifespan passes, trade unions in America continue as staunch defenders of our American way of life.

To the Communists, the labor movement in any country constitutes an inviting target. Labor in America early saw the evil of communism and the stealth and subversion by which it has ever tried to subjugate and to destroy the liberties of man. The American people are grateful for the vigorous Americanism and for the vigorous anticommunism which you successfully practice.

Mr. Chairman, all of us in this room, all of us in America, stand together in our unflinching determination to keep the freedom which the Constitution guarantees to each of us. We live at a time in history, accurately described as "a balance of terror." There is no place on this globe either safe or immune from the hazard of nuclear extermination. Nuclear tipped missiles, now in existence, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, are able, with varying accuracy, to zero in to any part of the world. The nuclear arsenal of the United States is far stronger than that of Communist Russia. That is the judgment of the military and civilian leaders in our Government best qualified to say. We intend to keep it that way. We seek peace with justice. We seek to deter aggression by maintaining an unwavering superiority of our nuclear weapons, our capacity to deliver them and, indeed, of our entire military establishment.

As I talk to you we are bringing into operational status new nuclear weapons and new bases from which to launch them in strategic areas all across America and beyond. We are speeding up the process, and one of the reasons for this is the laudable and patriotic decision which the leaders of your crafts took in announcing that, no matter what the cause, or legal provocation, your unions would not exercise their right to strike at any of the missile or space sites at which they labor. We are engaged in the most deadly serious business our country has ever known. With your faithful and constant adherence to your voluntary no-strike pledge on missile bases, my fellow Americans, we shall demonstrate that an aggression against America would swiftly and surely turn the land of the aggressor nation into a sea of fire.

You are interested, of course, in my views respecting legislation affecting organized labor. I try to call them as I see them. If

you will let me say so, I try to represent the interest of the people. I am glad that on many issues in which you and your fellow members have a deep concern that we were able to share a common view. Let me recall some of them.

We were united in our opposition to the misnamed right-to-work proposal which would have meant no rights and little work.

We were united in believing there was a need for a balanced, equitable law requiring public disclosure for certain practices engaged in by both management and labor.

We were united in believing that prehire agreements in the construction industry should be entitled to the same recognition as collective bargaining agreements entered into in other industries. And the Congress, and the President, in 1959, agreed with us. After all, your agreements had been regarded for a hundred years as legal, binding obligations in your industry, until a rule, evolved with industrial plants in mind, placed them in jeopardy. Prehire agreements are universally regarded as indispensable in this industry. Why should they not be entitled to the same protection as agreements in other industries?

We expressly approved union-operated hiring halls. They have always been regarded as fulfilling the needs of both employees and craftsmen in the construction field. They have performed, in addition, a desirable social purpose. We gave effect to the principle of seniority in your industry. Seven day union security provisions were approved. Unions and employers were permitted to enter into agreements, in their own self-interest, to protect and preserve wages and working conditions established by local collective bargaining agreements at the site of construction. Finally, we specifically legalized vacation, apprenticeship and other training programs.

In the fashioning, gentlemen, of this record of progress, I have been pleased to participate from the outset, both as a sponsor and as an active advocate.

We were united in believing that national labor policy should operate in precisely the same fashion on all organized labor, and that it is indefensible and wrong to provide industrial unions with one set of rights but to subject craft unions to a different standard. Thus, we believe that President Eisenhower and President Kennedy were both correct in urging, in simple justice and fairness, that building tradesmen be treated equally with other workers in this land. There ought to be one labor policy, not two. Eisenhower recommended the so-called on-site amendment. I supported it. Indeed, the then Senator, now President Kennedy, and I were the co-sponsors of Eisenhower's oft-repeated legislative proposal.

We have been united in demanding revision and extension of the Davis-Bacon Act so that community wage standards cannot be undercut by fly-by-night operators using cheap labor, often imported from another State.

We were united in demanding that the prevailing wage law apply to the 41,000-mile interstate and defense highway construction program—the largest construction project in the history of man. May I recall, with considerable pride, that your speaker led the fight on this, supplied the swing vote in committee, and stood on the Senate floor, a little lonely at first, but with sufficient help as the months went by, until finally this fight was won.

In the United States with over 70 million Americans in the labor force, and in California with almost 6½ million people in our own labor establishment, the issues I have enumerated are neither narrow nor parochial. I frankly believe the position I took on them is the position that men of goodwill ought to take. I believe they are in the public interest. If I did not believe so, I would

oppose them. And I apologize to no one for the record I have made. I believe it is a good record.

Last year I supported wages and coverage legislation by which over a 3-year period, workers covered under the law, will receive a minimum of \$1.25 an hour. As of today, under the new law, they receive a minimum of \$1.15 an hour. That means the minimum wage is \$46 a week today. I have been denounced for voting for this law, under which in September 1963 covered workers will receive a minimum salary of \$50 a week. I wonder how many of those who wrote denunciatory letters to me receive \$50 a week or less?

Last year I supported legislation providing for Federal aid to education. You and I cannot justify the fact more than 1 million American children are being shortchanged by half-day school sessions. Neither do the national platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties. I devoutly believe in local control of education. I also believe that the education of our youth constitutes a vital part—perhaps the most vital part—of the future of our country. I recall the words of Jefferson: "If you expect a country to be ignorant and free, you expect what never was and never will be."

You will remember the controversy which raged in the country in 1959. Investigation had established that some in labor had violated their trust. The facts demonstrated that there were evil instances of illegal agreements between some in labor and some in management who together conspired against the people. New legislation was introduced to deal with the problem. New legislation was needed. There were some who wanted no law at all. There were others who under the banner of reform sought to wipe out not only the abuses but also the rights of labor as well. I remember the Senate debate on the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act in 1959. I remember when with very little discussion the Senate adopted an amendment sponsored by Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, ostensibly providing a bill of rights for labor. As I read and re-read what we had approved, it appeared to me that a mistake had been made, so great a mistake, indeed, that there was an honest question under the McClellan amendment whether a union might have the right to expel pro-Communists or felons from its memberships. At any rate, on behalf of a number of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, I offered a substitute bill of rights the next day.

I endeavored to correct the inequities of the McClellan amendment. After a vigorous and searching debate, the Senate adopted my substitute by a vote of 77 to 14, with every member of the Republican leadership and every member of the Democratic leadership present and voting supporting me. Indeed, Senator McClellan himself supported my substitute. I was seeking fairness in labor legislation. I was endeavoring to represent the public interest, and that, I believe I did.

At any rate, the Senate thought so. The amendment I offered provided for equal rights within a labor organization, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom from arbitrary financial exactions, protection of the right to sue, and safeguards against improper disciplinary action. My cosponsors and I sought to deal with the subject realistically. We sought to write this legislation in terms of common sense rather than of uncommon abuse. We sought reasonable Federal recognition. We recognized that the greatest protection of a union member against potential abuse should not be simply by enumerated statutory rights, but also by a recognition of "reasonable" rulemaking power in the union itself. We wanted to fashion a bill of rights for labor which would permit the thousands of local unions in the

country, most of whose officers are unsalaried, to discharge their responsibilities, to respect the rights of members, and to do it all without having a lawyer at their side constantly.

I am a lawyer. I like my profession. But I did not want to support labor legislation which might accurately be termed as the "lawyer's relief act of 1959."

Several questions which arose last year in the Congress will be before us again this year. You gentlemen will be interested in them as citizens, as Californians, and as trade unionists. They have to do with the defense of the Nation and they also have to do with jobs.

I have no doubt that the President acting on the recommendations of Secretary of Defense McNamara will urge the Congress to appropriate more money for the Defense Department than he urged last year; and last year's defense appropriation represented the largest peacetime military budget in our history. I have no doubt that the American people will completely approve whatever level of spending may be necessary to defend our country and to deter aggression. Part of the law of the defense budget provides that the Defense Department shall award defense contracts on the single basis of what bidder can give to the military the best, most efficient, and most economical military hardware or weapons systems. Under the law, firms in California have been awarded defense contracts of approximately 24 percent of the total. Some of my colleagues in the Senate from other parts of the country don't like that. They want to take California's defense business away from us for the benefit of their own constituents. The other day my friend from New York, Senator JACK JAVITS, and other New Yorkers, cried out against Secretary of Defense McNamara awarding contracts to California firms and not to New York firms. In the last session other Senators joined Senator JAVITS in sponsoring legislation, the effect of which would be to treat our fellow Californians unfairly. Not very many weeks ago the Governors of Missouri and Oklahoma joined in the shrill cry to deprive California defense firms of equal treatment under law in defense business. I regret to prophesy that others from varied parts of the country will join the attack.

I have said many times I have a duty to demand equal treatment for my Californians, no more and no less. And, of course, the Senators from any State have the same duty, no more and no less. But I shall continue to object with vigor any attempt to push or prod, or bully, the Defense Department into treating Californians unfairly under the law.

Shortly after President Kennedy took the oath of office he directed the Defense Department to channel contracts to firms located in labor surplus areas. I denounced that directive as illegal. In March the Comptroller General of the United States confirmed my position. Subsequently I arranged an appointment with the President. He assured me that our people in California would receive fair treatment. And I feel assured they will. I think the problem for you and me in this field is essentially one to be disposed of on the floor of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

Another vexing problem will recur, I am afraid, this year. In the last session some of my eastern colleagues attempted to repeal the 25-year-old 6-percent differential statute for Pacific coast shipbuilding. They almost succeeded. We prevented them from doing it by one vote on a rollcall. Without this statute, ship construction on the west coast would deteriorate to nothing. There is no other way to equalize cost differentials between East and West by reason of transportation expense. I anticipate my eastern colleagues once again will try to slap us

down. And, once again, I shall fight to protect the legitimate interests of the people of my State.

Perhaps the greatest area of controversy, and perhaps the most important, in this year's Congress, will occur in our deliberations on trade policy and aid policy. In the coming months, I want to discuss these in detail with the people of our State. Suffice to say, on this occasion, that I believe in an expanding foreign trade, that I do not believe our country can live in isolation, economic or otherwise, but that in the trade debates, I shall never forget that I am an American Senator representing the American people, and dutybound to promoting their welfare.

On aid policy, I firmly believe our mutual security program, as adopted over the years by Congress, has been in the interests of our own American security. I supported it under Eisenhower. I shall continue to support it under Kennedy.

The policy of mutual security is written into the law: "To strengthen friendly foreign countries" and "to continue to make available to other free countries and peoples, upon request, assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable and as may be effectively used by free countries and peoples to help them maintain their freedom."

But some of the Presidential recommendations and executive branch administrative decisions, I reject with finality.

I opposed the administration's proposal of last year that Congress authorize assistance to the governments of Communist European satellites. I still do.

I oppose the sale of military equipment, whether obsolete or not, to any Communist nation, in the Soviet orbit or not, and that specifically includes the regrettable Yugoslavian plane contract.

I object to the recently announced decision to loan \$133 million to Ghana for a reservoir and an aluminum smelter. In my view, Ghana is not a friendly foreign country in the terms of the mutual security law.

Ghana is a totalitarian country. It has a one-party parliament. President Nkrumah's political opponents are in jail. Its trade unions are government controlled with a vengeance. Upwards of 300 Soviet bloc technicians are now stationed in Ghana, and more are shortly expected. And today, as we sit here, Moscow is training young Ghana military personnel on Soviet military reservations.

Nkrumah calls Khrushchev a champion of the African cause and a true friend of the oppressed peoples of the world. At Belgrade, he announced support of the Soviet Union position on issues ranging from Berlin to nuclear testing.

We do not strengthen the free world by strengthening the Communist world. I want our country along with our allies to extend a friendly, helping hand to governments and to peoples who value freedom and who decline to fawn or grovel before Khrushchev.

We seek a just peace. We seek to help those who share our prayers for it. We seek freedom for mankind. And together, we, our allies, and those distraught but courageous states who join with us will move forward to attain these cherished goals.

I recall Churchill's words: "Humanity will not be cast down. We are going on—swinging bravely forward along the grand high road—and already behind the distant mountains is the promise of the sun."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if I may exercise the responsibility of the minority—a rather rare situation these days—I move that the Senate stand in

adjournment, pursuant to the order entered on Tuesday, until Monday next.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the responsibility rests lightly on the ample shoulders of my friend from California, and I join in that motion.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order entered Tuesday, January 23, 1962, adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, January 25, 1962:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan, vice Henry A. Byroade.

C. Allan Stewart, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY
Vice Adm. Edward Nelson Parker, U.S. Navy, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1968. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Harold C. Woodward, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1962, vice Jerome K. Kuykendall.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1965. (Reappointment.)

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Andrew M. Bacon, of Louisiana, to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Craig Pottinger, of Arizona, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz.

U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT*

To be senior surgeon

* William Y. Chen

To be surgeons

Harry Allen * John D. Egan
James E. Banta William D. Hawley

To be senior assistant surgeons

Joan M. Altekruze Robert G. Godersky
William L. Ashburn Ernest Hamburger
Gerald D. Aurbach Joseph S. Handler
Roger Berry William R. Hardy
Maurice B. Burg Sol Herman
Alan J. Cooper Mark M. Kartchner
Paul C. Cronce Joel V. Levy
John L. Cutler Lloyd A. LeZotte, Jr.
Alexander W. DeMasi Lawrence L. Marvin
Roger A. Feldman Michael W. Mosesson

*Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Robin R. Nichols
William E. O'Malley
Bernard W. Palmer
Jack E. Pickering
William C. Roberts
Lewis M. Roch, II

Walter P. Savage
Jack Shapiro
Joseph T. Sobota
Evert M. Vander Stoep
George S. Walter

To be dental surgeon

Milton E. Schaefer

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

John G. Battles Albert J. Munk
Eugene R. Berg Regis M. Nairn
Robert W. Bolton Dale W. Podshadley
James W. Brown Sydney T. Pollard, Jr.
Karl J. Hettwer Donald L. Popkes
James B. Hoaglin Thomas W. Ragland
Herschel S. Horowitz Charles R. Robinson
Merlyn B. Johnson Norman A. Roswick
Thomas L. Loudon John W. Vitamvas
Robert C. McAlexander John O. Wilson
Jr. Ralph A. Frew
James A. McTaggart

To be senior sanitary engineers

Robert W. Jones III
William Q. Kehr
William A. McQuary

To be sanitary engineer

Martin A. Bauer, Jr.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Richard E. Reavis
Paul W. Weiser

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Albert W. Bromberg Lee R. Lunsford
Sandler H. Dickson William T. Sayers
Donald G. Fox William L. Wagner
Richard W. Gerstle Carlton S. Wilder
Richard D. Grundy Walter R. Wilson
Richard E. Jaquish

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

William L. Brinck Elwyn Holtrop
Dale S. Bryson Donald T. Oakley
James R. Buchtel Maris Pubulis
Ronald F. Coene Barrett N. Sinowitz
Joseph R. Franzmathes Charles E. Tharp
Roger C. Grimm Charles H. Wentworth
III

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Edgar N. Duncan
Harry A. Hicks
Edward S. Thompson

To be assistant pharmacists

Linton F. Angle Ronald D. Gilbert
Fred Angres Thomas B. Poux
Max D. Dooley James L. Snowden
Robert L. Duvall Clair G. Wetmore
Curtis G. T. Ewing Gary J. Wold
Clarence L. Fortner Larry A. Wood

To be junior assistant pharmacists

Gordon R. Aird Robert E. Miller
Nancy B. Finch Andrew J. Passeri, Jr.
John T. Gimon James A. Resko
Jules M. Meisler Robert J. Schollard

To be senior scientist

Frederick F. Ferguson

To be scientist

Robert J. Ellis

To be senior assistant scientists

Carlton M. Clifford, Allan Hirsch
Jr. Eskin Huff
Arthur D. Flynn Julius A. Kasel
William J. Goodwin, James G. Kelly
Jr. Micah I. Krichevsky
Alfred R. Grzenda

To be assistant scientist

Mars Y. Longley

To be sanitarian

Edison E. Newman

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Norman A. Geiger George E. Prime
Maurice Georgevich Thomas C. Sell
James E. Martin Robert A. Stevens
Roger O. Olmsted Robert W. Wilson

To be assistant sanitarians

Bobby F. Craft
Dale J. Johnson
David B. Moses

To be senior assistant veterinary officer

Jerry F. Stara

To be nurse officers

Dolores R. Basco
Helen Grosskopf
Germaine S. Krysan

To be dietitians

*Merme Bonnell Jeanne M. Reid
Lois M. Gamble Alice M. Stang

To be senior assistant dietitians

Phyllis M. Charest Vilma C. Grassi
Maureen A. Doherty Esther C. Namian
Mary E. Ferrell

To be assistant dietitians

Betty L. Beach
Elizabeth K. Witter

To be senior assistant therapist

Walter S. Sekiya

To be assistant therapists

Frank H. Troske, Jr.
Carol A. Wendell

To be health services officers

Rebecca C. Chavez
Joel J. Vernick

To be senior assistant health services officers

Charles P. Froom
Carol A. Lewis

To be assistant health services officers

Virginia C. Davis
Richard A. Mackey

II. FOR CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Walter C. Clowers Leon Sokoloff
Charles M. Grace Patrick J. Sullivan
Charles E. Horner George N. Wagnon
Alan L. Klein

To be surgeons

Henry M. Gelfand Ray H. Hayes
F. Gentry Harris Lyman C. Wyne

To be senior dental surgeons

Albert C. Adams Oscar B. Tate
Paul N. Baer Gerson Wasserman

To be dental surgeons

William O. Engler
Colie H. Millsap, Jr.

To be senior sanitary engineers

Israel Bernstein
Norman E. Tucker
Charles L. Weaver

To be sanitary engineer

Clarence E. Cuyler

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

James G. Gardner

To be assistant sanitary engineer

Thurman B. Sauls

To be senior scientist

Joseph H. Schubert

To be scientist

Norman A. Clarke

To be sanitarian

John H. Fritz

To be veterinary officer

Winston M. Decker

To be nurse officers

Margaret F. Carroll
Bernadette T. Mesli

To be health services officers

Delbert L. Nye
Rachel S. Simmet

III. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be assistant sanitary engineer

John E. Hagan III

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Alley, Frank M., Jr., O85828.
Andrews, John De M., O87993.
Appleton, Forrest W., O92153.
Arwood, Thomas B., O90217.
Barnard, Robert H., O85852.
Barnes, William R., O85853.
Barrett, William M., O85859.
Bellaver, Richard F., O85881.
Borgmann, Wayne A., O85910.
Borstorff, Allan R., O85911.
Boysen, John H., O85919.
Brenner, Donald R., O94739.
Brown, Richard L., O85940.
Buckner, James L., O85950.
Butts, William T., O92170.
Byrd, James E., O85963.
Calhoun, George H., O85964.
Campbell, Donald W., O91784.
Caplick, William J., O85970.
Clark, Vernon L., O94280.
Clary, William T., O88629.
Coffman, Joe P., O85999.
Covington, Dwight H., O94281.
Curtis, George R., O86034.
Dahill, John B., O86039.
Daniel, Howard, Jr., O86042.
Dennis, John A., O86057.
Domal, Stanley J., O86072.
Donaldson, Orlow B., 3d, O86073.
Downey, Hal W., O86083.
Downing, William R., O86084.
Durham, Thomas F., 3d, O86101.
Eklund, Robert G., O91816.
Evans, Jaye H., O87510.
Finnerty, Ronald E., O92188.
Fluke, Eugene C., O86148.
Fox, Morton, O88379.
Frazier, Larry D., O86158.
Freeman, Monroe E., Jr., O93408.
Fudge, Eugene E., O86166.
Geiger, Arthur H., O89060.
Gracey, Lloyd F., Jr., O85755.
Graham, Charles McM., O91846.
Grassi, Robert H., O86197.
Gray, Harlen E., O88708.
Greene, Therman R., O86200.
Gregg, William G., O86202.
Groves, Charles D., O86207.
Groves, Michael D., O85551.
Harrington, George S., Jr., O89660.
Hayes, Richard E., O86238.
Hillen, John F., Jr., O85569.
Hobar, Basil J., O86266.
Horton, Franklin N., O86280.
Horton, Lowrey P., O89376.
Huggins, Bobby R., O86287.
Hunt, James W., Jr., O89224.
Jackson, George B., Jr., O94473.
James, Theodore K., O86313.
Jayne, Robert K., Jr., O86316.
Johnson, Harold D., O86329.
Johnson, Richard G., O94090.
Johnson, Stanley R., O86331.
Jones, Julius E., O86338.
Jordan, George W., Jr., O86341.
Kane, John S., O92206.
Karegeannes, Harry G., O92207.
Kelly, Edward J., O89523.
Keyes, Billy G., O86360.
Kimball, William D., O92079.
Kincaid, William L., O85429.
Kline, Gary L., O86377.
Krizan, William A., O86390.
Krupa, Stephen A., Jr., O91804.
Kuehl, James L., O86392.
Kuhn, William K., Jr., O94479.
Lawson, Owen D., O85602.
Ledbetter, Homer M., Jr., O86408.
Lindberg, Robert J., O87838.
Lovell, Don E., O86430.
Luzietti, John E., O94316.
Lyles, Billy A., O94484.
Markofski, Donald K., O86456.
Matchette, Claude R., O86473.
McGranahan, Kenneth L., O94320.
McInerney, Bernard M., O89253.
McNabb, Jerry W., O86503.
McNutt, Joel W., O86505.
McPeck, Donald F., Jr., O86506.
Megehee, Daniel B., O86509.
Mellon, James T., O85437.
Miles, Elwyn C., Jr., O93469.
Mitchell, Thomas P., O94492.
Moe, Donald W., O85623.
Morris, George A., O86549.
Morrow, Douglas C., O93061.
Neal, Samuel L., Jr., O86569.
Nee, John R., O91807.
Niven, Charles P., O86577.
Ondecker, Lawrence W., O94327.
Oliver, Robert T., O86593.
Parker, Purvis L., O89600.
Parks, James D., Jr., O87873.
Patrick, Horace B., O92111.
Phelps, Keith A., O94633.
Phifer, Thomas K., O86630.
Phillips, Harold E., O94635.
Pierre, Russell, Jr., O86636.
Provenzano, Robert J., O85642.
Pruett, Billy R., O85072.
Rath, Peter F., O89579.
Rawlings, Charles S., O93073.
Reddin, Thomas E., O86672.
Richardson, Joseph B., O89135.
Robinson, Robert R., O86695.
Rosamond, John B., O88905.
Rugenstein, Edgar H., O86708.
Salley, Robert W., O86715.
Sanders, Clarence B., Jr., O86717.
Sauvageot, Jean A., O91378.
Schultz, Kenneth R., O90469.
Schumann, Reinhard H., O89597.
Schwartz, Paul R., O94340.
Secret, Bobby P., O92248.
Sherrell, Wilson J., O86757.
Singer, Lawrence A., O91383.
Sisterman, Lawrence E., O86768.
Snow, Quentin E., O88497.
Sparling, Darryl E., O86796.
Swain, Richard C., O92129.
Taylor, Paul W., O88970.
Taylor, Ralph W., O86846.
Taylor, William D., O86847.
Tew, Clyde A., O86851.
Thompson, John T., Jr., O94503.
Urclucio, George R., O93094.
Vinett, Peter A., O86896.
Vitale, Michael L., O92267.
Vogl, Raymond E., O94354.
Wakelin, John D., O94507.
Waldrop, John C., O86902.
Wales, Wayne F., Jr., O85459.
Walker, Clifford M., Jr., O89307.
Wall, Kenneth L., O86903.
Watts, Thurman, O85279.
Welker, John J., O86921.
Wheeler, Albin G., O93100.
White, William L., Jr., O86929.
Wigner, Larry R., O94509.
Williams, Stuart H., O92273.
Wilson, Carroll R., O86941.
Wilson, Gifford D., O94802.
Wilson, Henry W., O86943.
Windham, William J., O86946.
Woods, Roy S., Jr., O86956.
Wright, Randolph M., O85708.
Wright, Willie F., O86960.
Young, Carl L., O86970.
Zahn, Kenneth C., O86973.
Zierak, Robert A., O86976.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Ashwood, Carl R., O88555.
Brady, Patrick H., O88015.
Crow, Kenneth E., O86025.
Harling, John T., O94303.
Harris, Leonard G., O94087.

*Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Hatfield, Earl P., O94463.
 Heller, Kyle M., O88730.
 Helsler, Carl W., O88905.
 Hopkins, Richard L., O88743.
 Johnson, Harry D., O94766.
 Laird, Stewart W., O86399.
 Lampe, Christian F., O88415.
 Lander, Robert J., O88779.
 Loring, Douglas M., A88797.
 Schiefer, Donald D., O94642.
 Short, Edward A., O88204.
 Summary, Robert J., O93085.
 Tuten, William R., 3d., O94656.
 Walker, Marvin E., O93096.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps
 Hart, Suzanne D., N3054.
 Tresselt, Elizabeth E., N3063.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps
 Nelson, Nancy L., L585.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General Corps

Rarick, David (AGC), O83617.

To be first lieutenant

Schulze, Howard D. (MSC), O84266.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287 and 3288.

To be captains

Connell, Thomas E., O1883672.
 Dillard, Douglas C., O948755.
 Jackson, Wallace L., O991180.
 Johnson, William D., Jr., O4009950.
 Langston, Gary E., O4009822.
 Palenchar, Andrew E., O4005340.
 Semerling, Ronald F., O1931808.
 Shelby, Frank F., O2014622.
 Smith, George K., O1702302.
 Walker, William A., O1881717.
 Wilson, Virgil H., O2021123.

To be first lieutenants

Buswell, Arthur T., O4064472.
 Finch, Kenneth W., O4074806.
 Jones, Luther E., O4035817.
 Lotz, Thomas M., Jr., O4067038.
 Lynch, Eugene S., O2298339.
 Rlovo, Jose A., Jr., O4063757.
 Willis, Carlton, O5304286.

To be second lieutenants

Berriman, Edward T., Jr., O5207281.
 Berthiaume, Paul D., O5006746.
 Chamberlain, Craig R., O5307189.
 Dalton, Clarence E., II, O5311773.
 Farley, Joseph I., Jr., O2302244.
 Frost, Dean R., O5213347.
 Gray, Ronald E., O5307217.
 Greenwood, Henry V., O5508876.
 Hall, William N., O5307343.
 Hicks, John A., O5504352.
 Hughes, Patrick R., O5211811.
 Hunter, Andrew H., O5704916.
 Kerr, James E., O5403296.
 Kershaw, Theodore G., Jr., O5405757.
 Kleffer, George W., O5207739.
 Lazdowski, Walter P., O5209217.
 Markham, William E., O5310637.
 Meisel, John L., O5211701.
 Moore, Charles L., O5308997.
 Mullenix, Ronald O., O5404960.
 Piccolo, John A., O5005920.
 Reiber, Carl F., Jr., O5005416.
 Smith, David K., O5310459.
 Soderstrom, Robert C., O5405699.
 Szabo, Richard M., O5006132.
 Walton, David J., O5010820.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States

Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3294, and 3311:

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Hankins, Cecile J., N797164.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Brown, John S., O5408318.
 Janiga, Richard G., O5518111.
 Lewis, Jack A., O5500379.
 Lord, Raymond Y., Jr., O5012525.
 Lowery, Rodney K., O1942268.
 Swanson, Charles N., Sr., O4043843.
 Thomas, Philip C., Jr., O5306781.
 Willford, John W., O5301210.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Rodriguez, Simon Y., O2293278.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Carson, John W., Jr., O4044620.
 Marlowe, Julius F., Jr., O2284031.
 Scheetz, Walter L., O2290161.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Johancen, Mary G., L2300933.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps
 Hauptert, Irene T., N2302409.

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Stegall, Robert G.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Johnson, Jeremy R., O5001878.
 Lockwood, Gary E., O2304292.
 Poore, Roger S., O5304573.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Cohen, Harvey M., O4085307.
 Deadrick, Lonnie E., Jr.
 Sauer, Gerald F., O2305198.
 Thuss, Charles J., Jr., O2300790.

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps

Brathauar, Robert E., O2300661.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps
 Mathews, Charlotte L., L2291662.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Corbett, Mary J., N5407248.
 Kerry, Hazel, N5411300.
 Norton, Frances L., N5407465.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Jones, Ronald C., O5703982.
 Kearns, William J., O2298414.
 Mereness, Fenton R., Jr., O5006059.
 Sandifer, Calvin P., VI, O5309980.

To be second lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Carroll, Sallie L. E., L2302305.
 Watson, Donna, L2302225.
 Weber, Donna M., L2302371.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288 and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Baker, John W., II
 Barbour, Michael C.
 Brennan, Richard E.
 Conway, Brian J.
 Curtis, James H.
 Ernst, Barry L.
 Gary, Dennis T.
 Gee, Langston
 Gerukos, John
 Gordon, Thomas J.
 Hallisey, John
 Harvey, Edward A., Jr.
 Howland, Elvin B.
 Kendall, John L.
 Kerner, George
 Kovach, Frank
 Kullbom, Merrill C., Jr.
 Laible, James P.
 Leone, Richard J.
 Malt, Sherwin H.
 Mance, William W., Jr.
 Martin, Robert E., Jr.
 McDermott, Arthur A.
 McGowan, John J.
 Miller, Dennis D.
 Moody, Michael A.
 Powell, Frederick C.
 Radcliffe, John H.
 Ramirez, Oscar, Jr.
 Reinert, John F.
 Roedel, Paul E., Jr.
 Rowlette, Lemuel A.
 Simpkins, Charles M.
 Snyder, Charles W., Jr.
 Streeter, Charles L.

Thompson, Jerry L.

Truscott, James J.

Walette, Alonzo V.

Weigand, Denis M.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Acuff, Alfred M., Jr.
 Affourtit, Rene
 Albertella, Raymond C.
 Alexander, Franklin D.
 Allison, William C.
 Amick, Robert L., Jr.
 Applebaum, Lawrence
 Armstrong, Marvin C., Jr.
 Arnold, Preston T.
 Asherman, Richard E.
 Austin, Ralph E., Jr.
 Baggett, Fred K.
 Baker, Richard H.
 Banks, Stephen J.
 Barber, Don W.
 Barnes, John W.
 Barquin, Brian L.
 Batchelor, David K., Jr.
 Battaglioli, Victor J.
 Bax, Maurice F.
 Bayer, James W.
 Beck, Joseph W.
 Belanich, Joseph F., Jr.
 Bell, Eldered N., Jr.
 Bellinger, Robert A.
 Beltz, Charley L.
 Bender, Charles D.
 Benedict, Michael J.
 Bence, William J.
 Bickert, Dale J.
 Biggs, Danny J.
 Biggs, Henry D.
 Bitler, William D.
 Blackwell, David E.
 Bonabologna, Julius J.
 Bonneau, William R., Jr.
 Bonner, Harold S.
 Boose, Donald W., Jr.
 Bowen, Paul J.
 Bowers, George W.
 Bowman, William R.
 Brennan, William A.
 Brewer, Charles R.
 Brick, William B.
 Briggs, David S.
 Bristol, Donald F.
 Brown, Keith I.
 Brown, Kenneth M.
 Brown, Tony R.
 Bruce, Gene D.
 Brumfield, Wetzel D.
 Buckley, James M., O5706523
 Bulger, Dennis B.
 Bungay, David J.
 Bunton, Terry R.
 Burchill, Howard R.
 Burkholder, Warren S., Jr.
 Burns, Gary M.
 Byrne, William F.
 Caggiano, Patsy G.
 Call, William A., Jr.
 Cambareri, Ross A.
 Camp, Joseph W., Jr.
 Campbell, David B.
 Campbell, James A. B.
 Canelos, William A.
 Carley, John H.
 Carlow, Richard D.
 Carmolli, Nicki H.
 Charbonneau, Ronald J.
 Chase, Benjamin O., Jr.
 Chatham, Ronald L.
 Colan, Albert R., Jr.
 Coleman, Alan B.
 Coleman, Bennie L.
 Colson, David A.
 Cone, Edward E., Jr.
 Conklin, William H.
 Connors, David C.
 Corliss, William K., Jr.
 Couture, John F.
 Coy, Dale E.
 Croce, Paul A.
 Cummings, Edward J.
 Cummings, John W.
 Cunha, Herbert
 Curry, John L., Jr.
 Curtis, Anthony M.
 Curtis, Richard M.
 d'Ambrogio, William J.
 D'Andrade, Walter C.
 Davis, Ryland P., Jr.
 Deaton, Sterling W.
 DeFanti, David J.
 Deigert, Richard
 DeLuca, Donald P.
 DeMarco, Francis H., Jr.
 Deveaux, William P.
 DiEduardo, Joseph
 Dittamo, Hector T.
 Dodson, Billie R.
 Dolan, David
 Donovan, Timothy H., Jr.
 Dopp, George G. B.
 Dow, Peter T.
 Drummond, Donn C.
 Ducatte, Maynard R.
 Dunn, David R.
 Dunnington, Joseph C.
 Duntton, James G.
 Edwards, Floyd W., Jr.
 Eger, John M.
 Eller, James M.
 Elliott, Thomas N., Jr.
 Erway, Douglas K.
 Erwin, Bobby D.
 Evans, Richard A.
 Even, Donald G.
 Fardal, John E.
 Farmer, Michael B.
 Farris, James L.
 Faxon, Robert M.
 Fearick, Martin S., Jr.
 Felter, Joseph H., Jr.
 Fernandes, Alfredo J., Jr.
 Ficalora, Paul B.
 Firestone, Terry J.
 Fischer, John G., IV
 Fisher, Lawrence D.
 Forcier, David N.
 Fournier, Maurille J. P.
 Freitag, Merle
 Frick, Thomas N.
 Gagnon, Richard J. E.
 Garde, Daniel F.
 Garvin, Richard F.
 Gauthier, John A.
 Gerard, Jacques B.
 Giese, George H., Jr.
 Gilbert, John R.
 Gilmore, Gary B.
 Glaser, Donald S.
 Goetz, Arthur D.
 Gorbea-Frontera, Roberto
 Gorceys, Gregory N.
 Greason, Earl S., 3d
 Green, Joe C.
 Greer, Peter R.
 Grilli, Michael R.
 Guinn, Jack L.
 Hahn, Wade E.

- Hale, William R.
Hall, Peter G.
Hall, Thomas F., Jr.
Hamilton, Robert E.
Hanley, Bruce M.
Hanson, John R.
Hardy, Rodolph D., Jr.
Hargen, Joseph
Hargus, Herschell H.
Harrison, Phillip T.
Hassett, Paul M., Jr.
Hatch, George S.
Healey, Dermot T.
Heer, Bernard C., Jr.
Heller, Lee A.
Heinschel, Robert F.
Hellmuth, Robert W.
Hendrix, Paul V.
Henriksen, Thomas H.
Henry, Noah W., III
Hertel, Guy S.
Hickok, Phillip J.
Hicks, Billy W.
Highfill, Gary W.
Hinds, Paul T.
Hines, Charles A.
Hitch, James K.
Hobbs, Gary L.
Hodder, Clinton A.
Holland, James R.
Horan, David C.
Howard, John W.
Huser, Herbert C.
Infantino, Robert L.
Ingersoll, John T.
Ivey, Oliver T., Jr.
Jackson, Larry L.
Janssens, Gerald R. J.
Johnson, Edward C., Jr.
Johnson, Kenneth M.
Johnson, Robert P.
Jones, Alan B.
Jorgensen, John F.
Kapelka, Stephen R.
Kay, John R.
Kehoe, John C., III
Kelly, David G.
Kennedy, John P.
Keup, Robert A.
Klizer, Carl S.
Krueger, Don E.
Krumanoeker, Lawrence B.
Kueny, Joseph J.
Landrum, Benson F.
Lang, Walter P., Jr.
Larson, Kermit E., Jr.
Lasecki, Ronald P.
Laubenheimer, Russell J.
Lavole, Wilfred G.
Lawless, William J., Jr.
Lawrence, William D.
Lawton, Allen E.
Lefelar, Robert A.
Leitao, Clifford D.
Lemon, David L.
Leonard, William E.
Leonhardt, Thomas C.
Lewis, Alan D.
Lewis, Peter C.
Liepils, William J.
Liphard, Arthur F.
Long, Hugh W., III
Longwell, Dennis C.
Lundy, James I.
Lyle, James M.
Lynds, Robert E.
Lyons, William T.
MacDonald, John M., Jr.
Maceyka, Edward A.
MacNamara, Gervase
Madish, Daniel T.
Mahoney, Hugh D.
Maier, Nelson H., Jr.
Majewski, Francis E.
Mallion, Richard J.
Mancuso, Frank N.
- Mange, Richard C.
Manley, John R.
Mannix, Timothy
Manzi, Joseph F., Jr.
Marangola, Joseph C.
Marble, Kenneth A.
Masington, Nicholas, Jr.
Mason, Keith L.
Mason, Robert W.
Mason, Tommy R.
Matje, Robert W.
Maurer, George H.
Mayoras, Donald E.
McAndrew, James M.
McDade, Joseph E., Jr.
McFarland, Lewis G.
McFerron, Darrell A.
McGill, Brian J.
McGough, Joseph T., Jr.
McGrade, Harold J., Jr.
McIntosh, Robert D.
McKenna, Gerard M.
McQuade, Walter J., Jr.
Melander, Harold W.
Meler, Thomas R.
Mennenrich, Dennis N.
Meshinsky, Edward
Mayer, Ronald J.
Miers, Kenneth L.
Miller, Eugene J.
Mingus, Thomas M., O5706306
Mitchell, Geoffrey S.
Moore, Earnest R.
Morgan, Paul B.
Mortensen, Ernest J.
Mott, William H., 4th
Mottola, Louis F.
Mullen, Edward F., Jr.
Murphree, John D.
Murray, Henry K., Jr.
Myers, Larry R.
Mylod, James P.
Najjar, Alfonso L.
Neale, James F.
Newman, Ralph E.
Newman, William F.
Niederfringer, Stephen C.
Nivica, Gjon N.
Noel, Albert E.
Northrop, Edward D., Jr.
Norton, James B.
Oberholzer, John A.
O'Connor, Dennis M.
O'Hagan, Patrick J.
O'Neill, Malcolm R.
Orenstein, Stanley A.
O'Rourke, Thomas C.
Orr, David H.
Oswald, Robert W.
Oualline, Charles E.
Pappalardo, Salvatore, Jr.
Parise, Joseph F., Jr.
Parker, John C.
Parlow, Robert J.
Parowski, Paul R.
Partyka, Gerald S.
Paulson, Robert P.
Payne, Robert K.
Peay, James H. B., III
Pepl, Jerome S.
Perrine, Charles H.
Peterson, William C.
Peterson, Leon L.
Pezzullo, Joseph A.
Pike, Charles R.
Popkoski, Edward S.
Popp, Douglas M.
Porter, Jeffrey B.
Porter, Michael D.
Portmann, Joslyn V.
Posk, Joseph P., Jr.
Powell, Paul E.
Prezioso, Anthony A.
- Pritchard, Arthur H., Jr.
Queen, Charles E.
Raines, Austin M.
Raquet, Charles A.
Read, Donald B.
Redmond, Lawrence A.
Redmond, Robert C.
Reed, James L.
Reed, Theodore R.
Reed, Walter B.
Reidy, Robert D.
Remenicky, James P.
Remling, Arthur A., II
Rencurrel, Ronald B.
Renigar, Frederick H.
Rethore, Bernard G.
Richardson, Hugh B.
Richardson, William
loughby F., III
Riggs, Harold E.
Rippepe, Eldon T.
Rising, Stephen P.
Risor, Robert L.
Robinson, George L.
Roche, John H.
Rogers, Douglas H.
Rosson, Samuel I., Jr.
Rubery, Daniel J.
Rush, Terry J.
Salerno, Jerry A.
Salmon, Bardwell C.
Salvitti, Joseph M.
Samuels, Seymour, III
Saulnier, Phillip J.
Savas, Andrew
Sawin, Frederick G.
Schmeelk, John
Schmiederer, John M.
Schroder, John K.
Senus, Leon J.
Shadrick, Kirk W.
Shaw, Edward F., Jr.
Shaw, Stanley L.
Shein, Jeffries
Sheridan, John T.
Shestople, Nicholas
Short, Albert V.
Silvey, Bedford J.
Simpson, William N., III
Sims, Thomas L.
Sinclair, Roger L.
Smith, David B.
Smith, John C.
Smith, Samuel W.
Sneed, Thomas A.
Sobieski, Henry F.
Sobke, John F.
Sproul, Robert H.
Stanley, Arthur T.
Steinle, Peter E.
Stevens, Dale M.
Story, Jonathan, III
Streeter, Raymond C.
Strohbehn, Edward L., Jr.
Sutton, George E.
Szydo, Robert B.
Tambling, David F.
- Tanski, Chester J., Jr.
Tate, Raymond A.
Tate, Robert A.
Templeton, Geoffrey B.
Thees, John D.
Thompson, Lawrence E.
Thompson, Richard C.
Tragakis, Christopher J.
Trainor, Francis E.
Troup, Emile W. J.
Turcotte, Gerald V.
Turner, Robert E.
Tyson, Harvey D.
Uimer, Jerry W.
Underwood, Harry W.
Vance, George W.
Van der Kleef, Michael L.
Vannes, Clayton L.
VanStone, John S.
Vaughan, Arvin M.
Veselka, Reynold
Vest, James A.
Vogel, William M.
Voss, James G.
Vozka, David
Wagner, William J., Jr.
Walker, Harvey C., Jr.
Walsh, William E.
Walton, Elmer D., Jr.
Ward, Francis E., Jr.
Ward, John D.
Warder, Francis P., Jr.
Washington, Billy J.
Webster, Lynn C.
Weigand, Gerald L.
Weigand, Robert W.
Weiss, Robert M.
Wellman, Allen C.
Wells, Douglas E., Jr.
Werner, Walter J.
Wheeler, Dale D.
Wheeler, Robert A.
Whitaker, Chester J.
Whitaker, Donald W.
Whitehead, Charley L.
Wilbur, Paul A.
Wilcox, Keith B.
Williams, Dock H.
Willis, Deral E.
Wilson, Charles S.
Wilson, Joe J.
Winn, Robert B.
Wintermantel, James C.
Winters, Kenneth T.
Wise, Eric W.
Wolf, Robert L.
Wood, Calvin S., Jr.
Wood, William W.
Woolever, Ronald J.
Word, Larry E.
Wroblecki, Dennis A.
Wuchler, Walter H.
Yardas, Douglas A.
Young, William G.
Zeletz, Gordon N.
Ziegler, William F.
Zima, Ernest I., Jr.
Zwicker, Gary L.
- Charles G. Elliott
Gerald C. Saladin
Raymond L. Speer
Clifford W. Randall
Renworth R. Floyd
Joe P. Pennington
Robert L. Sandquist
- James S. Midgley
John M. Doherty
Billy M. Keltner
Charles H. Nixon
Melvin J. Umbach
Meinrade H. Schilly
- U.S. COAST GUARD
- The following-named persons to the rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:
- To be Lieutenants*
- Richard F. Elden
William P. Penney
Rudolph T. Sommer
Roger F. Frawley
Richard M. Connor
- Lee I. Levy
Charles H. Jehle
Costa J. Alton
John C. Hanson
Karl F. Welty, Jr.
- To be Lieutenants (junior grade)*
- Robert A. Janeczek
Oliver W. Barber, Jr.
Alan C. Peck
Kenneth F. Franke
Ernest Bizzozero
Bobby G. Kingery
- Richard C. Walton
Hugh J. Milloy
David H. Freeborn
Marvin N. Bromen
Bruce G. Lauther
Lawrence Graham
- To be chief warrant officers, W-4*
- Clavis W. Baum
Frank J. Recele
John T. Dailey
Raymond L. Barnett
Eugene Linnemann
Robert P. Stalcup
Elton W. Grafton
Homer E. S. Williams
Jack K. Ridley
Marion G. Rubado
Fletcher R. Peele
Manuel L. Bent
Leon A. Anderson
George B. Schack
Albert DeCosta
Albert J. Bates
Malcolm Versaw
William H. A. Herbst
John W. Colby
Irving T. Bloxom
Ernest L. Killian
Robert H. Burn
Leonest L. Tillett
Leroy H. Hermon
Gilbert W. Coughlan
Joseph J. Dobrow, Jr.
Henry A. Cook
Alfred M. Livingston
John Chartuck
John P. Ryan
William E. White, Jr.
Suell R. Grimm
Roland R. Davis
James W. Freeman
Edward E. Lewis
Oliver F. Rossin
Louis M. Piermattel
James W. Lockhart
Russell M. Young
Ellis M. Moore
Kenneth E. Payson
Martin J. Connolly, Jr.
Harvey J. Hardy
Gene D. Vecchione
- Harry V. Hardy
Robert E. Sadler
Robert H. Kollmeyer
Henry L. Cotton
Roy L. Singleton
Andrew Kirkpatrick
Alexander M. Grant
Oliver T. Henry, Jr.
Folster E. Blair
William Keokosky
Nevette A. Gardebled
John E. Giles
George A. J. Michaud
Edward Petroski
Meredith D. Hazzard
Earlie W. Shelton
Frank Jakelsky
Robert H. Wiggins
Lawrence E. Wagner
Henry E. Ask, Jr.
Roy V. Sogaard
Norris D. Hickman
James T. Mead
Robert P. Ellard
Phillip E. Barnard
Harold H. Rohr
Kenneth G. Sherwood
Elwood S. Hudson
Harold Eveld
Clinton A. Gregory
Walter R. Terry
Lloyd L. Franklin
Francis C. McCracken
Howard A. Carande
Charles U. Staska
Edgar W. Thomas
Stanley J. Salabor
David D. McCormick
Sterling Fulcher
Byron A. Barr
John A. Packard
Robert F. Anderson
Melvin H. Eaton
- To be chief warrant officer, W-3*
- Kenneth L. Heinzen
George A. Knapp
Mark Fitton, Jr.
William H. Bellow
Frank H. Steinheiser
William H. Fraser
Leslie M. Furst
John H. Olsen
John H. Coppens
Eugene E. Moore
Raymond W. Gifford
Jay E. Law
Richard "M" Burdick
Frank A. Coleman
Eugene B. Cox
Robert E. Mooring
Donald O. Nelson
Charles W. Wicks
Eugene D. H. W. Willett
- William F. Miller
Joseph J. Zagiba
Richard G. Thompson
Fred Permenter
George E. Rongner
John T. Renfroe
Albert DeBrase
Andrew Pietrkowski
Hugh B. Houston
George E. Carribeau
Donald E. Phillips
Karl M. Ashby
Elmer E. Johnson
John H. Bettis, Jr.
Maurice T. Hedgecock
James F. McLaughlin
Bob Nelson
Edward B. Eaton
Paul R. Cornell
- CONFIRMATIONS
- Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 25, 1962:
- COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY
- Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:
- To be lieutenant commanders*
- Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.
- To be lieutenants*
- Donald W. Moncevicz
Donald R. Tibbit
- Dale E. Westbrook
K. William Jeffers
Harold E. McCall

Howard R. Tarr, Jr.
Eugene K. Kindschl
Robert E. Gardner
Clayton W. Collins, Jr.
Ralph G. Isacson
Joseph J. Bookout
John Rekuc
Harold R. Margrave
Francis W. Sullivan
Horace F. Hey
Leo Frey
Gordon W. Ault
Eric G. Bragg
Leonard L. Boulter
Robert L. Wilson
James B. Gill
Clifton Cuthrell
Cleo Hach, Jr.
Albert V. Carver
Mack E. McGuffin
Hubert F. Midgett
Hull O. L. Tanner
John E. Simpson
Wilson F. Jones
Boyd E. Bonnicksen
Oscar A. Erickson
Claude A. Broadus
James D. Toler
Donald C. Davey
William A. Shaffer, Jr.

To be chief warrant officers, W-2

James F. Coen
Louis R. McDowell, Jr.
Kenneth G. Allen
Lawrence R. Fillinger
Charles A. Carroll
William P. Goldwire
Jerry H. Hedgecock
Thomas B. Laln
William H. Goetz
Loyal Walley
Eugene D. Freeman
Warren K. Wordsworth
Louis J. Lussan
Hugh J. Milloy
Robert A. Roy
Roland E. Huggins
Emanuel Schnelder
Alex Z. Walker, Jr.
Karl K. Drum
Russell A. Cahill
Seaborn W. Jones
Earl D. Johnson
Robert D. Askew
William B. Sobek
Archie Brookshire
William J. Irrig
Austin C. Mee, Jr.
Edward P. Lewy
Robert V. Ricard
James R. Ingram
Edwin M. Custer, Jr.
Jimmie J. Davis
Jack A. Massey
Harry D. Smith
Fred V. Reed
Paul J. Bouchard
Daniel C. Mania
Richard H. Hicks
Marvin N. Broman
Bruce G. Lauther
Robert E. Potts
Robert E. Diller
Harold E. Stanley
Billy R. Mull
John A. Donnelly
Charles R. McFarland
Leroy W. Peterson
Carl W. Snyder, Jr.
Philip M. Lebet
Edward A. Walsh
Samuel T. Buckman,
Jr.
Ronald H. Youngman
Dean L. Webster
Hubert T. Blomquist
John D. Drewer
Robert L. Barr
Jackie R. Gore
James E. Mitts
Peter D. Van Horsen

Roy M. Schwaneckamp
Kirven L. Dunn
Robert L. Walters
Darrell "B" Siniff
Joseph F. Baranowski
Edmund A. Novak
Lester H. H. O'Neill
Jerome R. Morton
Richard R. Anthony
Jack W. McDonald
Charles F. Potter, Jr.
William W. Muessel
George R. Brower
Robert L. Hatfield
Euclid L. Wade
Clark A. Johnson
Eugene W. Darcy
Dorris L. Steele
Eugene R. Lockhart
Ivan J. Anderson
Richard A. Krueger
Ernest N. Yaroch
Duane A. Force
Wallace N. Anderson
Joseph C. Waldrop
Daniel L. Knauss
Floyd J. Mulheren
Jack G. Smith
Charles W. Oldham
Mortimer Jeffords

Russell F. Mills
Ronald E. Wille
William F. Hunter
Harvey R. Little
John D. Ransom
Francis J. Honke
Robert M. Terkelsen
Peter F. Sterbling, Jr.
Richard H. Hill
Cecil L. McManus
Raymond H. Spottman
Richard C. Tims
James F. Tutwiler
Elbert W. McKinney
Kenneth E. Wadman
Ernest R. Gronlund
Robert G. Carnilla
Willis A. Roderfeld
Paul W. Bicking
Alfred K. Rausch
Edward L. York
Francis W. Kelly
Edward B. Midgett
Douglas H. Derr
Robert L. Thompson
James E. Smith, Jr.
Ellsworth N. Slater
Richard J. Kilroy
Jack W. Dugan
Warren B. Barrett
Frederick W. Cress-
man, Jr.
Marvin J. Portwood,
Jr.
James O'Connell
Arthur L. Jayroe
Elwood T. Elder
Patrick J. Flynn, Jr.
James N. Hodges
Dewey E. Sutton
Parker J. Pennington
Edward W. Kostbade
Charles D. Mills
James K. Beebe
Carl F. Baker
Charles L. Francis
John T. McGilly
Coit Rodgers
Cluene Russell
Robert E. DeMichillie
Charles R. Wilson
James H. Tyner
Charles R. Finn
Edward Schertzer
Harry F. Sanborn
John R. Alford
Albert R. Bennett
Paul R. Harp
Raymond J. Gorman
Glendon Grantham

Earl A. Erickson
Robert A. Jones
Richard R. Terhune,
Jr.
Charles F. Coolidge
Donald E. Grant
Robert C. Hilker
Cordus C. Bough
Eugene E. Doyle
Earl L. Dickson
Glenn E. Basham
John A. Marino
Robert A. Murrell
Arthur M. McIver
Omer L. Foster
Kenneth C. Garrison
Franklin L. Fountaine
Donald E. Dean
Dale T. Butler
Lyman R. Oliver, Jr.
Frederick R. Cooper,
Jr.
Donald L. Conlon
Charles D. Pearson
Richard D. Bundy
Robert Casale
Harry V. Walker
Thomas E. Hilton
James F. Kaneaster
Gerald E. Palmer
Stephen Pecklonis
William T. Vanderberg
Richard A. Gill
Lennox A. Johnson

John H. Wiechert
Ivan B. Alken, Jr.
Donald D. Luedke
Robert V. Bouck
John T. Watson
John W. Gates
George P. Spaniol
Blanchard M. Pierce
Truxton W. Payne
Robert D. Goodenough
Dalton L. Burrus
Elwyn C. Evans
Richard E. Eastman
John D. Kakalla
Edwin L. Mapp, Jr.
Robert D. Bowen
Richard J. Harding
Stanley W. Mead
William W. Southern,
Jr.
William L. Broadwell
Francis V. McMahon
Charles W. Brandon
Fred E. Grombacher
Sewell G. Loggins
Jesse E. Sparks
Forrest W. Ringsage
Paul L. Cargile
Earl R. Schattenberg
George E. Prather
William H. Bacon
Franklin H. Doughten
Kenneth W. Bates

quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 6]

Abbitt	Forrester	Multer
Alger	Garland	Nedzi
Ashmore	Garmatz	Nelsen
Auchincloss	Gaimo	Nix
Avery	Gilbert	Norrell
Baring	Griffiths	O'Brien, N.Y.
Barrett	Hagan, Ga.	O'Neill
Bass, N.H.	Harsha	Patman
Becker	Hays	Pilcher
Belcher	Healey	Powell
Blatnik	Hébert	Reuss
Blitch	Hemphill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boggs	Hoffman, Mich.	Rutherford
Bow	Hosmer	Scherer
Breeding	Ichord, Mo.	Schwengel
Bronwell	Inouye	Scott
Broomfield	Jarman	Seely-Brown
Buckley	Jennings	Seiden
Burke, Mass.	Joelson	Shelley
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Sheppard
Carey	Judd	Shriver
Celler	Kee	Sisk
Chiperfield	Keith	Slack
Clark	Kilburn	Spence
Coad	Kirwan	Staggers
Conte	Kunkel	Steed
Cook	Landrum	Stephens
Cooley	Lankford	Thompson, La.
Curtis, Mo.	McCulloch	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	Tupper
Dawson	McSween	Ullman
Derwinski	McVey	Vanik
Dole	MacGregor	Van Pelt
Dooley	Mailliard	Waggoner
Edmondson	Martin, Mass.	Watts
Ellsworth	Meador	Weis
Fallon	Merrow	Whalley
Farbstain	Miller, N.Y.	Widnall
Felghan	Moorhead, Pa.	Yates
Finnegan	Morrison	Zablocki
Flynt	Moulder	Zelenko

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 43: 10: *Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servants whom I have chosen.*

Almighty God, grant that in the achievements of each day we may bear clear and unmistakable witness that we are Thy servants and have Thy spirit of generosity and good will toward all mankind.

Inspire us with a deep and sincere concern for the desperate needs of our generation and the confident assurance that Thy grace is abundantly able to sustain us in our longings and labors to meet them.

May it be the goal of all our desires to give humanity the opportunity to bring to fulfillment and fruition those capacities and capabilities with which Thou, their Creator, hast endowed them. Thine be the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 306 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 314)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Twenty-eight years ago our Nation embarked upon a new experiment in international relationships—the reciprocal trade agreements program. Faced with the chaos in world trade that had resulted from the great depression, disillusioned by the failure of the promises that high protective tariffs would generate recovery, and impelled by a desperate need to restore our economy, President Roosevelt asked for authority to negotiate reciprocal tariff reductions with other nations of the world in order to spur our exports and aid our economic recovery and growth.

That landmark measure, guided through Congress by Cordell Hull, has been extended 11 times. It has served our country and the free world well over two decades. The application of this

program brought growth and order to the free world trading system. Our total exports, averaging less than \$2 billion a year in the 3 years preceding enactment of the law, have now increased to over \$20 billion.

On June 30, 1962, the negotiating authority under the last extension of the Trade Agreements Act expires. It must be replaced by a wholly new instrument. A new American trade initiative is needed to meet the challenges and opportunities of a rapidly changing world economy.

In the brief period since this act was last extended, five fundamentally new and sweeping developments have made obsolete our traditional trade policy:

The growth of the European Common Market: An economy which may soon nearly equal our own, protected by a single external tariff similar to our own—has progressed with such success and momentum that it has surpassed its original timetable, convinced those initially skeptical that there is now no turning back and laid the groundwork for a radical alteration of the economics of the Atlantic Alliance. Almost 90 percent of the free world's industrial production (if the United Kingdom and others successfully complete their negotiations for membership) may soon be concentrated in two great markets—the United States of America and the expanded European Economic Community. A trade policy adequate to negotiate item by item tariff reductions with a large number of small independent states will no longer be adequate to assure ready access for ourselves—and for our traditional trading partners in Canada, Japan, Latin America, and elsewhere—to a market nearly as large as our own, whose negotiators can speak with one voice but whose internal differences make it impossible for them to negotiate item by item.

The growing pressures on our balance-of-payments position have, in the past few years, turned a new spotlight on the importance of increasing American exports to strengthen the international position of the dollar and prevent a steady drain of our gold reserves. To maintain our defense, assistance and other commitments abroad, while expanding the free flow of goods and capital, we must achieve a reasonable equilibrium in our international accounts by offsetting these dollar outlays with dollar sales.

The need to accelerate our own economic growth, following a lagging period of 7 years characterized by three recessions, is more urgent than it has been in years—underlined by the millions of new job opportunities which will have to be found in this decade to provide employment for those already unemployed as well as an increasing flood of younger workers, farmworkers seeking new opportunities, and city workers displaced by technological change.

The Communist aid and trade offensive has also become more apparent in recent years. Soviet bloc trade with 41 non-Communist countries in the less-developed areas of the globe has more than tripled in recent years; and bloc

trade missions are busy in nearly every continent attempting to penetrate, encircle, and divide the free world.

The need for new markets for Japan and the developing nations has also been accentuated as never before—both by the prospective impact of the EEC's external tariff and by their own need to acquire new outlets for their raw materials and light manufactures.

To meet these new challenges and opportunities, I am today transmitting to the Congress a new and modern instrument of trade negotiation—the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. As I said in my state of the Union address, its enactment "could well affect the unity of the West, the course of the cold war, and the growth of our Nation for a generation or more to come."

I. THE BENEFITS OF INCREASED TRADE

Specifically, enactment of this measure will benefit substantially every State of the Union, every segment of the American economy, and every basic objective of our domestic economy and foreign policy.

Our efforts to expand our economy will be importantly affected by our ability to expand our exports—and particularly upon the ability of our farmers and businessmen to sell to the Common Market. There is arising across the Atlantic a single economic community which may soon have a population half again as big as our own, working and competing together with no more barriers to commerce and investment than exist among our 50 States—in an economy which has been growing roughly twice as fast as ours—representing a purchasing power which will someday equal our own and a living standard growing faster than our own. As its consumer incomes grow, its consumer demands are also growing, particularly for the type of goods that we produce best, which are only now beginning to be widely sold or known in the markets of Europe or in the homes of its middle-income families.

Some 30 percent of our exports—more than \$4 billion in industrial goods and materials and nearly \$2 billion in agricultural products—already goes to the members and prospective members of the EEC. European manufacturers, however, have increased their share of this rapidly expanding market at a far greater rate than American manufacturers. Unless our industry can maintain and increase its share of this attractive market, there will be further temptation to locate additional American-financed plants in Europe in order to get behind the external tariff wall of the EEC. This would enable the American manufacturer to contend for that vast consumer potential on more competitive terms with his European counterparts; but it will also mean a failure on our part to take advantage of this growing market to increase jobs and investment in this country.

A more liberal trade policy will, in general, benefit our most efficient and expanding industries—industries which have demonstrated their advantage over other world producers by exporting on the average twice as much of their prod-

ucts as we import—industries which have done this while paying the highest wages in our country. Increasing investment and employment in these growth industries will make for a more healthy, efficient, and expanding economy and a still higher American standard of living. Indeed, freer movement of trade between America and the Common Market would bolster the economy of the entire free world, stimulating each nation to do most what it does best and helping to achieve the OECD target of a 50 percent combined Atlantic community increase in gross national product by 1970.

Our efforts to prevent inflation will be reinforced by expanded trade. Once given a fair and equal opportunity to compete in overseas markets, and once subject to healthy competition from overseas manufacturers for our own markets, American management and labor will have additional reason to maintain competitive costs and prices, modernize their plants, and increase their productivity. The discipline of the world marketplace is an excellent measure of efficiency and a force to stability. To try to shield American industry from the discipline of foreign competition would isolate our domestic price level from world prices, encourage domestic inflation, reduce our exports still further, and invite less desirable governmental solutions.

Our efforts to correct our adverse balance of payments, have, in recent years, roughly paralleled our ability to increase our export surplus. It is necessary if we are to maintain our security programs abroad—our own military forces overseas plus our contribution to the security and growth of other free countries—to make substantial dollar outlays abroad. These outlays are being held to the minimum necessary, and we are seeking increased sharing from our allies. But they will continue at substantial rates—and this requires us to enlarge the \$5 billion export surplus which we presently enjoy from our favorable balance of trade. If that surplus can be enlarged, as exports under our new program rise faster than imports, we can achieve the equilibrium in our balance of payments which is essential to our economic stability and flexibility. If, on the other hand, our surplus should fail to grow, if our exports should be denied ready access to the EEC and other markets—our overseas position would be endangered. Moreover, if we can lower the external tariff wall of the Common Market through negotiation, our manufacturers will be under less pressure to locate their plants behind that wall in order to sell in the European market, thus reducing the export of capital funds to Europe.

Our efforts to promote the strength and unity of the West are thus directly related to the strength and unity of Atlantic trade policies. An expanded export program is necessary to give this Nation both the balance-of-payments equilibrium and the economic growth we need to sustain our share of Western military security and economic advance. Equally important, a freer flow of trade across the Atlantic will enable the two

giant markets on either side of the ocean to impart strength and vigor to each other, and to combine their resources and momentum to undertake the many enterprises which the security of free peoples demands. For the first time, as the world's greatest trading nation, we can welcome a single partner whose trade is even larger than our own—a partner no longer divided and dependent, but strong enough to share with us the responsibilities and initiatives of the free world.

The Communist bloc, largely self-contained and isolated, represents an economic power already by some standards larger than that of Western Europe and hoping someday to overtake the United States. But the combined output and purchasing power of the United States and Western Europe—nearly a trillion dollars a year—is more than twice as great as that of the entire Sino-Soviet world. Though we have only half the population, and far less than half the territory, we can pool our resources and resourcefulness in an open-trade partnership strong enough to outstrip any challenge, and strong enough to undertake all the many enterprises around the world which the maintenance and progress of freedom require. If we can take this step, Marxist predictions of capitalist empires warring over markets and stifling competition would be shattered for all time—Communist hopes for a trade war between these two great economic giants would be frustrated—and Communist efforts to split the West would be doomed to failure.

As members of the Atlantic community we have concerted our military objectives through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We are concerting our monetary and economic policies through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It is time now to write a new chapter in the evolution of the Atlantic community. The success of our foreign policy depends in large measure upon the success of our foreign trade, and our maintenance of Western political unity depends in equally large measure upon the degree of Western economic unity. An integrated Western Europe, joined in trading partnership with the United States, will further shift the world balance of power to the side of freedom.

Our efforts to prove the superiority of free choice will thus be advanced immeasurably. We will prove to the world that we believe in peacefully tearing down walls instead of arbitrarily building them. We will be opening new vistas of choice and opportunity to the producers and consumers of the free world. In answer to those who say to the world's poorer countries that economic progress and freedom are no longer compatible, we—who have long boasted about the virtues of the marketplace and of free competitive enterprise, about our ability to compete and sell in any market and about our willingness to keep abreast of the times—will have our greatest opportunity since the Marshall plan to demonstrate the vitality of free choice.

Communist bloc nations have negotiated more than 200 trade agreements in recent years. Inevitably the recipient

nation finds its economy increasingly dependent upon Soviet goods, services, and technicians. But many of these nations have also observed that the economics of free choice provide far greater benefits than the economics of coercion—and the wider we can make the area of economic freedom, the easier we make it for all free peoples to receive the benefits of our innovations and put them into practice.

Our efforts to aid the developing nations of the world and other friends, however, depend upon more than a demonstration of freedom's vitality and benefits. If their economies are to expand, if their new industries are to be successful, if they are to acquire the foreign exchange funds they will need to replace our aid efforts, these nations must find new outlets for their raw materials and new manufactures. We must make certain that any arrangements which we make with the European Economic Community are worked out in such a fashion as to insure nondiscriminatory application to all third countries. Even more important, however, the United States and Europe together have a joint responsibility to all of the less-developed countries of the world—and in this sense we must work together to insure that their legitimate aspirations and requirements are fulfilled. The "open partnership" which this bill proposes will enable all free nations to share together the rewards of a wider economic choice for all.

Our efforts to maintain the leadership of the free world thus rest, in the final analysis, on our success in this undertaking. Economic isolation and political leadership are wholly incompatible. In the next few years, the nations of Western Europe will be fixing basic economic and trading patterns vitally affecting the future of our economy and the hopes of our less-developed friends. Basic political and military decisions of vital interest to our security will be made. Unless we have this authority to negotiate and have it this year—if we are separated from the Common Market by high tariff barriers on either side of the Atlantic—then we cannot hope to play an effective part in those basic decisions.

If we are to retain our leadership, the initiative is up to us. The revolutionary changes which are occurring will not wait for us to make up our minds. The United States has encouraged sweeping changes in free world economic patterns in order to strengthen the forces of freedom. But we cannot ourselves stand still. If we are to lead, we must act. We must adapt our own economy to the imperatives of a changing world, and once more assert our leadership.

The American businessman, once the authority granted by this bill is exercised, will have a unique opportunity to compete on a more equal basis in a rich and rapidly expanding market abroad which possesses potentially a purchasing power as large and as varied as our own. He knows that, once artificial restraints are removed, a vast array of American goods, produced by American know-how with American efficiency, can compete with any goods in any spot in the world.

And almost all members of the business community, in every State, now participate or could participate in the production, processing, transporting, or distribution of either exports or imports.

Already we sell to Western Europe alone more machinery, transportation equipment, chemicals, and coal than our total imports of these commodities from all regions of the world combined. Western Europe is our best customer today—and should be an even better one tomorrow. But as the new external tariff surrounding the Common Market replaces the internal tariff structure, a German producer—who once competed in the markets of France on the same terms with our own producers—will achieve free access to French markets while our own producers face a tariff. In short, in the absence of authority to bargain down that external tariff, as the economy of the Common Market expands, our exports will not expand with it. They may even decline.

The American farmer has a tremendous stake in expanded trade. One out of every seven farmworkers produces for export. The average farmer depends on foreign markets to sell the crops grown on 1 out of every 6 acres he plants. Sixty percent of our rice, 49 percent of our cotton, 49 percent of our wheat, and 42 percent of our soybean production is exported. Agriculture is one of our best sources of foreign exchange.

Our farmers are particularly dependent upon the markets of Western Europe. Our agricultural trade with that area is 4 to 1 in our favor. The agreements recently reached at Brussels both exhausted our existing authority to obtain further European concessions, and laid the groundwork for future negotiations on American farm exports to be conducted once new authority is granted. But new and flexible authority is required if we are to keep the door of the Common Market open to American agriculture, and open it wider still. If the output of our astounding productivity is not to pile up increasingly in our warehouses, our negotiators will need both the special EEC authority and the general 50-percent authority requested in the bill described later in this message.

The American worker will benefit from the expansion of our exports. One out of every three workers engaged in manufacturing is employed in establishments that export. Several hundred times as many workers owe their jobs directly or indirectly to exports as are in the small group—estimated to be less than one-half of 1 percent of all workers—who might be adversely affected by a sharp increase in imports. As the number of jobseekers in our labor force expands in the years ahead, increasing our job opportunities will require expanding our markets and economy, and making certain that new U.S. plants built to serve Common Market consumers are built here, to employ American workers, and not there.

The American consumer benefits most of all from an increase in foreign trade. Imports give him a wider choice of products at competitive prices. They introduce new ideas and new tastes, which

often lead to new demands for American production.

Increased imports stimulate our own efforts to increase efficiency, and supplement antitrust and other efforts to assure competition. Many industries of importance to the American consumer and economy are dependent upon imports for raw materials and other supplies. Thus American-made goods can also be made much less expensively for the American consumers if we lower the tariff on the materials that are necessary to their production.

American imports, in short, have generally strengthened rather than weakened our economy. Their competitive benefits have already been mentioned. But about 60 percent of the goods we import do not compete with the goods we produce—either because they are not produced in this country, or are not produced in any significant quantity. They provide us with products we need but cannot efficiently make or grow (such as bananas or coffee), supplement our own steadily depleting natural resources with items not available here in quantity (such as manganese or chrome ore, 90 percent or more of which must be imported if our steel mills are to operate), and contribute to our industrial efficiency, our economic growth, and our high level of consumption. Those imports that do compete are equal to only 1 or 1½ percent of our total national production; and even these imports create jobs directly for those engaged in their processing, distribution, or transportation, and indirectly for those employed in both export industries and in those industries dependent upon reasonably priced imported supplies for their own ability to compete.

Moreover, we must reduce our own tariffs if we hope to reduce tariffs abroad and thereby increase our exports and export surplus. There are many more American jobs dependent upon exports than could possibly be adversely affected by increased imports. And those export industries are our strongest, most efficient, highest paying growth industries.

It is obvious, therefore, that the warnings against increased imports based upon the lower level of wages paid in other countries are not telling the whole story. For this fear is refuted by the fact that American industry in general—and America's highest paid industries in particular—export more goods to other markets than any other nation; sell far more abroad to other countries than they sell to us; and command the vast preponderance of our own market here in the United States. There are three reasons for this:

(a) The skill and efficiency of American workers, with the help of our machinery and technology, can produce more units per man-hour than any other workers in the world—thus making the competitive cost of our labor for many products far less than it is in countries with lower wage rates. For example, while a U.S. coal miner is paid 8 times as much per hour as the Japanese miner, he produces 14 times as much coal—our real cost per ton of coal is thus far

smaller—and we sell the Japanese tens of millions of dollars' worth of coal each year.

(b) Our best industries also possess other advantages—the adequacy of low-cost raw materials or electrical power, for example. Neither wages nor total labor costs is an adequate standard of comparison if used alone.

(c) American products can frequently compete successfully even where foreign prices are somewhat lower—by virtue of their superior quality, style, packaging, servicing, or assurance of delivery.

Given this strength, accompanied by increasing productivity and wages in the rest of the world, there is less need to be concerned over the level of wages in the low-wage countries. These levels, moreover, are already on the rise, and, we would hope, will continue to narrow the current wage gap, encouraged by appropriate consultations on an international basis.

This philosophy of the free market—the wider economic choice for men and nations—is as old as freedom itself. It is not a partisan philosophy. For many years our trade legislation has enjoyed bipartisan backing from those members of both parties who recognized how essential trade is to our basic security abroad and our economic health at home. This is even more true today. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is designed as the expression of a nation, not of any single faction, not of any single faction or section. It is in that spirit that I recommend it to the Congress for prompt and favorable action.

II. PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

New negotiating authority: To achieve all of the goals and gains set forth above—to empower our negotiators with sufficient authority to induce the EEC to grant wider access to our goods and crops and fair treatment to those of Latin America, Japan, and other countries—and to be ready to talk trade with the Common Market in practical terms—it is essential that our bargaining authority be increased in both flexibility and extent. I am therefore requesting two basic kinds of authority to be exercised over the next 5 years:

First, a general authority to reduce existing tariffs by 50 percent in reciprocal negotiations. It would be our intention to employ a variety of techniques in exercising this authority, including negotiations on broad categories or sub-categories of products.

Second, a special authority, to be used in negotiating with the EEC, to reduce or eliminate all tariffs on those groups of products where the United States and the EEC together account for 80 percent or more of world trade in a representative period. The fact that these groups of products fall within this special or "dominant supplier" authority is proof that they can be produced here or in Europe more efficiently than anywhere else in the world. They include most of the products which the members of the Common Market are especially interested in trading with us, and most of the products for which we want freer access to the Common Market; and to a considerable extent they are items in which our

own ability to compete is demonstrated by the fact that our exports of these items are substantially greater than our imports. They account for nearly \$2 billion of our total industrial exports to present and prospective Common Market members in 1960, and for about \$1.4 billion of our imports from these countries. In short, this special authority will enable us to negotiate for a dramatic agreement with the Common Market that will pool our economic strength for the advancement of freedom.

To be effective in achieving a breakthrough agreement with the EEC so that our farmers, manufacturers, and other free world trading partners can participate we will need to use both the dominant supplier authority and the general authority in combination. Reductions would be put into effect gradually in stages over 5 years or more. But the traditional technique of trading one brick at a time off our respective tariff walls will not suffice to assure American farm and factory exports the kind of access to the European market which they must have if trade between the two Atlantic markets is to expand. We must talk instead in terms of trading whole layers at a time in exchange for other layers, as the Europeans have been doing in reducing their internal tariffs, permitting the forces of competition to set new trade patterns. Trading in such an enlarged basis not possible, the EEC has found, if traditional item-by-item economic histories are to dominate. But let me emphasize that we mean to see to it that all reductions and concessions are reciprocal, and that the access we gain is not limited by the use of quotas or other restrictive devices.

Safeguarding interests of other trading partners: In our negotiations with the Common Market, we will preserve our traditional most-favored-nation principle under which any tariff concessions negotiated will be generalized to our other trading partners. Obviously, in special authority agreements where the United States and the EEC are the dominant suppliers, the participation of other nations often would not be significant. On other items, where justified, compensating concessions from other interested countries should be obtained as part of the negotiations. But in essence we must strive for a nondiscriminatory trade partnership with the EEC. If it succeeds only in splintering the free world, or increasing the disparity between rich and poor nations, it will have failed to achieve one of its major purposes. The negotiating authority under this bill will thus be used to strengthen the ties of both "common markets" with, and expand our own trade in, the Latin American Republics, Canada, Japan, and other non-European nations, as well as helping them maximize their opportunities to trade with the Common Market.

The bill also requests special authority to reduce or eliminate all duties and other restrictions on the importation of tropical agricultural and forestry products supplied by friendly less-developed countries and not produced here in any significant quantity, if our action is taken in concert with similar action by the

Common Market. These tropical products are the staple exports of many less-developed countries. Their efforts for economic development and diversification must be advanced out of earnings from these products. By assuring them as large a market as possible, we are bringing closer the day when they will be able to finance their own development needs on a self-sustaining basis.

Safeguards to American industry: If the authority requested in this act is used, imports as well as exports will increase; and this increase will, in the overwhelming number of cases, be beneficial for the reasons outlined above. Nevertheless ample safeguards against injury to American industry and agriculture will be retained. Escape-clause relief will continue to be available with more up-to-date definitions. Temporary tariff relief will be granted where essential. The power to impose duties or suspend concessions to protect the national security will be retained. Articles will be reserved from negotiations whenever such action is deemed to be in the best interest of the Nation and the economy. And the four basic stages of the traditional peril-point procedures and safeguards will be retained and improved:

The President will refer to the Tariff Commission the list of proposed items for negotiations;

The Tariff Commission will conduct hearings to determine the effect of concessions on these products;

The Commission will make a report to the President, specifically based, as such reports are based now, upon its findings of how new imports might lead to the idling of productive facilities, the inability of domestic producers to operate at a profit and the unemployment of workers as the result of anticipated reductions in duties; and

The President will report to the Congress on his action after completion of the negotiations. The present arrangements will be substantially improved, however, since both the Tariff Commission recommendation and the President's report would be broader than a bare determination of specific peril points; and this should enable us to make much more informed use of these recommendations than has been true in the past.

Trade adjustment assistance: I am also recommending as an essential part of the new trade program that companies, farmers, and workers who suffer damage from increased foreign import competition be assisted in their efforts to adjust to that competition. When considerations of national policy make it desirable to avoid higher tariffs, those injured by that competition should not be required to bear the full brunt of the impact. Rather, the burden of economic adjustment should be borne in part by the Federal Government.

Under existing law, the only alternatives available to the President are the imposition or refusal of tariff relief. These alternatives should continue to be available.

The legislation I am proposing, however, provides an additional alternative called trade adjustment assistance. This alternative will permit the execu-

tive branch to make extensive use of its facilities, programs, and resources to provide special assistance to farmers, firms, and their employees in making the economic readjustments necessitated by the imports resulting from tariff concessions.

Any worker or group of workers unemployed or underemployed as a result of increased imports would, under this bill, be eligible for the following forms of assistance:

1. Readjustment allowances providing as much as 65 percent of the individual's average weekly wage for up to 52 weeks for all workers, and for as many as 13 additional weeks for workers over 60, with unemployment insurance benefits deducted from such allowances to the extent available;

2. Vocational education and training assistance to develop higher and different skills;

3. Financial assistance for those who cannot find work in their present community to relocate to a different place in the United States where suitable employment is available.

For a businessman or farmer adversely affected by imports, there should be available:

1. Technical information, advice, and consultation to help plan and implement an attack on the problem;

2. Tax benefits to encourage modernization and diversification;

3. Loan guarantees and loans otherwise not commercially available to aid modernization and diversification.

Just as the Federal Government has assisted in personal readjustments made necessary by military service, just as the Federal Government met its obligation to assist industry in adjusting to war production and again to return to peacetime production, so there is an obligation to render assistance to those who suffer as a result of national trade policy. Such a program will supplement and work in coordination with, not duplicate, what we are already doing or proposing to do for depressed areas, for small business, for investment incentives, and for the retraining and compensation of our unemployed workers.

This cannot be and will not be a subsidy program of Government paternalism. It is instead a program to afford time for American initiative, American adaptability and American resiliency to assert themselves. It is consistent with that part of the proposed law which would stage tariff reductions over a 5-year period. Accordingly, trade adjustment assistance, like the other provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is designed to strengthen the efficiency of our economy, not to protect inefficiencies.

Authority to grant temporary tariff relief will remain available to assist those industries injured by a sudden influx of goods under revised tariffs. But the accent is on "adjustment" more than "assistance." Through trade adjustment prompt and effective help can be given to those suffering genuine hardship in adjusting to import competition, moving men and resources out of uneconomic production into efficient production and competitive positions, and

in the process preserving the employment relationships between firms and workers wherever possible. Unlike tariff relief, this assistance can be tailored to their individual needs without disrupting other policies. Experience with a similar kind of program in the Common Market, and in the face of more extensive tariff reductions than we propose here, testifies to the effective but relatively inexpensive nature of this approach. For most affected firms will find that the adjustment involved is no more than the adjustment they face every year or few years as the result of changes in the economy, consumer taste, or domestic competition.

The purpose of this message has been to describe the challenge we face and the tools we need. The decision rests with the Congress. That decision will either mark the beginning of a new chapter in the alliance of free nations or a threat to the growth of Western unity. The two great Atlantic markets will either grow together or they will grow apart. The meaning and range of free economic choice will either be widened for the benefit of freemen everywhere—or confused and constricted by new barriers and delays.

Last year, in enacting a long-term foreign aid program, the Congress made possible a fundamental change in our relations with the developing nations. This bill will make possible a fundamental, far-reaching and unique change in our relations with the other industrialized nations—particularly with the other members of the Atlantic community. As NATO was unprecedented in military history, this measure is unprecedented in economic history. But its passage will be long remembered and its benefits widely distributed among those who work for freedom.

At rare moments in the life of this Nation an opportunity comes along to fashion out of the confusion of current events a clear and bold action to show the world what it is we stand for. Such an opportunity is before us now. This bill, by enabling us to strike a bargain with the Common Market, will "strike a blow" for freedom.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1962.

MARITIME INDUSTRY DISPUTE— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, I am reporting to the Congress about the recent labor dispute in the maritime industry.

A strike took place at 12:01 a.m., June 16, 1961. Although only the ships in port and the employees on such ships were immediately affected, the dispute involved virtually all American shipping companies, some 70,000 employees and about 900 ships and affected the trade

and commerce of every Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf port in the United States.

On June 26, by Executive Order 10949, I established a Board of Inquiry, consisting of the Honorable David Cole, Chairman, Judge Samuel I. Rosenman and Prof. James J. Healy, to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and report to me on or before June 30, in accordance with the provisions of section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended. I subsequently extended the time for the submission of the initial report of the Board of Inquiry to July 3.

That report concisely presented the facts with respect to the dispute and the positions of the parties as required by law.

On July 3, acting on my instruction, the Attorney General filed a petition in the District Court for the Southern District of New York seeking an injunction against the continuance of the strike. A hearing was held on the Government's motion for a temporary restraining order on July 3, and the court, after finding that the strike affected a substantial portion of the maritime industry, and that it would imperil the national health and safety if permitted to continue, temporarily restrained the strike activities until July 8. A stay of that order sought immediately by the unions was denied by Circuit Judge Clark. (*United States v. National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, et al.*, 292 F. 2d 190, CA 2, July 8, 1961.)

A hearing was held on the Government's motion for a preliminary injunction on July 7, and the temporary restraining order was extended until July 12. Two days before this order was to expire, the court found that it had been "abundantly and overwhelmingly established" that the strike was affecting a substantial portion of the industry, and if permitted to continue would imperil the national health and safety. In addition, it rejected the contention of the National Maritime Engineers' Beneficial Association and the International Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots that, because their membership consists of "supervisors," their participation in the strike could not be enjoined. (*United States v. National Maritime Union of America, et al.*, 196 F. Supp. 374, S.D.N.Y., July 10, 1961.)

The unions appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, which, in an opinion issued August 22, affirmed the lower court's decision. (*United States v. National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, et al.*, 294 F. 2d 385, CA 2.)

Pursuant to section 209(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, I reconvened the Board of Inquiry. The Board held meetings with the parties and obtained the information required for its further report of the current position of the parties and the efforts which had been made for settlement, including a statement by each party of its position and a statement of the employer's last offer of settlement. This final report of the Board of Inquiry was submitted to me September 1.

On September 25, the Attorney General moved the district court to discharge the injunction, which motion the

court that day granted effective September 21.

I am happy to report that settlements were reached by all parties to the dispute.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1962.

ELEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 315)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with illustrations, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 11th annual report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1962.

TENTH SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 10th semi-annual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1962.

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8900, ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 527, Rept. No. 1292), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be

equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority Member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

NEXT MEETING DATE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the postal rate increase bill was before the House on Tuesday of this week the majority saw fit to limit debate on a substantial number of important amendments to 1 minute and 30 seconds. I was under the impression that the schedule of work for this week must be exceedingly heavy if it was necessary to apply a virtual gag procedure to an important bill increasing revenues—in effect a tax upon the American people—by some \$600 million, at least more than half a billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have this heavy workweek I think we should go on into Friday.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JANUARY 29

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for the following week.

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

Mr. CAHILL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALBERT. There is no legislative business tomorrow. For next week, on Monday, the program is undetermined.

On Tuesday we will have H.R. 8900—Schools, College Academic Facilities Act.

For Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday we will have S. 320—Interstate Commerce Act, Registration of State Certificates.

This announcement is made subject to the usual and general reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT ON TRADE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his message on trade, has sounded a ringing challenge to the Congress and to the country. This is the most important matter the Congress has been asked to consider since the Marshall plan. Both our continued economic progress and our position as the free world's leader demand this bold new approach to world trade. We must commit the economies of the free world to a common effort in our struggle for economic as well as military strength and in our common fight against communism. We must capitalize now on the rise of the European Common Market. We must harness that great economic power with our own to pull together as freedom's greatest weapon.

It is indispensable not only to our balance of payments but to the expansion of our trade, the development of our agriculture and industry, the growth of our economy and the maintenance of our high living standards. Can we, by choice and by democratic process, muster the initiative and be the vanguard of change rather than submit later in the wake of events? This is our challenge, our opportunity to prove to the world the worth of democracy.

I know we will all join together at this historic moment.

EUCLID (OHIO) "Y" PHYSICAL FITNESS DAY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I had a very interesting experience recently in Euclid, Ohio, watching several hundred youngsters between the ages of 9 and 15 receiving physical fitness tests at the "Y". Sit-up, divers stance, standing broad jump, shuttle run and chinups were included. The results were excellent, showing the youngsters to be above the national average even though not high enough to be classified in top physical condition.

This particular program was developed to give parents an accurate record of the physical fitness of their children, to increase a mutual pride between parents and children in this basic area of living, and to develop an awareness on the part of the children, the parents and the community of the need for more planned, coordinated physical activity programs. Euclid's Youth Physical Fitness Day starts a precedent that many others will follow for it highlighted the fact that the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, has established definite standards which our young people will want to attain.

As part of my remarks, I would like to include the following article from the Euclid News Journal of January 18, describing the day's events:

Y FITNESS EVENT TO ATTRACT MANY

Euclid's Youth Physical Fitness Day this coming Sunday, January 21, is attracting county and national interest and receiving the support of many local civic leaders and organizations. The Euclid Exchange Club and the Chamber of Commerce have added their support to the purposes of the program.

Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON and Mayor Kenneth J. Sims will be among the prominent figures in government who will be in attendance at the Euclid "Y" on Sunday. In addition to local civic leaders such as professional athletes as Bob Gain, Bernie Parish, Bill Willis (assistant director Cleveland Recreation Commission), John Wooten, Rich Krietling, Dick and Ed Modzelewski and Frank Clark.

The basic tests which will be given children between the ages of 9 and 15 who are accompanied by an adult are as follows:

1. Situps—test of flexibility and endurance.
2. Divers Stance—test of balance.
3. Standing Broad Jump—test of power.
4. Breath Holding—test of endurance.
5. Shuttle Run—test of agility.
6. Chinups—test of strength.

These tests will be scored and graded by percentile on established standards according to Robert Vanderveer, Y Physical Director who is in charge of testing.

As an added optional test the committee has been very fortunate in obtaining John Miller, Willoughby, East Cleveland school districts speech and hearing specialist who will give hearing tests to any children whose parents might request it.

The program will start at 1:30 p.m. Sunday, January 21, at the Euclid Y, 631 Babbitt Road.

THIS IS THE PROBLEM

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, few people not directly affected by the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions have concerned themselves with the circumstances which brought them about, or the far-reaching impact they will have on our civilization.

One person, Carleton Putnam, probably because of an inquisitive mind and a desire to preserve the integrity of race, has made a penetrating study of these

problems. He is quite aware of the fact that these decisions were politically motivated, and predicated upon unsubstantiated and unproven allegations, deliberately slanted psychological treatises, and an obvious obsession with the hoax of equalitarianism.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks the text of an address delivered by Mr. Putnam at Jackson, Miss., on October 26, 1961; also a brief biography of Mr. Putnam, prepared by Dr. W. D. McCain, president of Mississippi Southern College:

WHO IS CARLETON PUTNAM?

(By Dr. W. D. McCain, president, Mississippi Southern College)

It is both a pleasure and a privilege to tell you something of Carleton Putnam's background. He is a man who has won distinction in many fields—as a businessman, flier, scholar, historian, writer, biographer, and philosopher.

Carleton Putnam was born in New York City in 1901. His first American ancestor on his father's side arrived in Massachusetts from England in 1634. On his mother's side, his first American forebear landed in 1636—also in Massachusetts, and also from England. He is directly descended from the grandfather of Israel Putnam, George Washington's first major general, and from the brother of General Rufus Putnam, Washington's engineering officer and founder of the Ohio Colony.

His grandfather Putnam was a judge of the appellate division of the New York Supreme Court. His grandfather Carleton was a New York publisher. His father received the silver star citation for gallantry in action against insurgent forces in the Philippines at the age of 20, remained to found the first American newspaper in the Philippines, and was killed in action in the 1st World War at the age of 39.

Putnam graduated from Princeton in 1924 with a degree in science, having taken honors in history and politics, and having been an editor of the Nassau Literary Magazine. He received a law degree from Columbia in 1932.

Only 1 year after graduating from Columbia—in 1933—he founded Pacific Seaboard Air Lines with an investment of \$25,000. I think that proves something about him—a young college graduate establishing a business of that magnitude in the depths of the depression. This airline originally operated between Los Angeles and San Francisco, but moved to the Middle West in 1934, and changed its name to Chicago and Southern Air Lines.

He continued as its president until 1948, at which time he became chairman of the board and moved to Washington, D.C., to begin work on a four-volume biography of Theodore Roosevelt. In 1953, he merged Chicago & Southern with Delta Air Lines and became chairman of the board of the merged companies. At the time of this merger, Chicago & Southern was valued at \$10 million and its routes had grown from the initial 450 miles of the California company to a mileage of over 5,000, serving 12 States and 6 foreign countries.

He lived for 7 years in Memphis, Tenn., during his association with Chicago & Southern. During the rest of his life, his home has been either in New York City or Washington, D.C., but he has traveled a good deal throughout North America, the Caribbean, and Europe, having also visited Africa, the Middle East, China, Japan, and the Philippines.

He began flying for pleasure in 1930, and has held a pilot's license ever since, being now a commercial pilot with instrument and multiengine ratings.

He published a contemplative autobiography of his aviation career in 1945 entitled "High Journey, a Decade in the Pilgrimage of an Air Line Pioneer."

In 1958, the first volume of his biography, "Theodore Roosevelt," was published by Scribners, and won universal acclaim from critics and historians. The Chicago Tribune called the book "Magnificent—a good thing for scholarship, and a good thing for America."

The Evansville (Ind.) Courier & Press wrote, "From here it is apparent that Carleton Putnam will be to Theodore Roosevelt what Douglas Southall Freeman was to Robert E. Lee. And that's about as high as you can go in that field."

The New York Times Book Review termed the work "vivid and convincing * * * a biography of first importance."

"Remarkable" was the word used by the New York Herald Tribune Book Review, while the Christian Science Monitor called Putnam's book "an outstanding success * * * a masterful portrait."

The Detroit News hailed Putnam's "sheer brilliance of presentation," and the Washington Post described the book as "a major contribution to American history and to American literature."

Atlantic Monthly called the biography of TR "Admirable, formidable, decidedly likeable." The Saturday Review found it "immensely entertaining * * * infinitely engaging."

"Putnam has done a valuable service to our age of conformity," the Houston Post declared. "No one can read this book and not have serious fears about our loss of individualism."

"A well-organized, highly evocative study," said the Dayton News. The Chicago Daily News critic termed the work "a masterpiece * * * unquestionably the best biographical portrait yet written."

"A superlative exercise in definitive biography," the Newark News agreed, while the Baltimore Sun noted the book's "brilliance of description and narrative."

Putnam "presents a constructive and inspiring challenge to every serious-minded believer in democracy," the Wichita Falls Times added. "The timeliness of this outstanding biography can hardly be measured."

Such applause from the critics makes the next book even harder to write, since a high standard has already been set which the author must meet in his next work.

In Putnam's case, the next book was his justly-celebrated "Race and Reason"—a book he hadn't planned to write.

The now-famous Jutman letters to the President and Attorney General, expressing indignation over forcible integration, were widely distributed throughout the Nation. As a result, Putnam heard from thousands of interested citizens, including many persons prominent in scientific and academic circles. Many of the letters asked questions which required answers not then readily available in published form.

So, "Race and Reason" was published early this year. And you know the rest. The book has been hailed by critics, educators, scientists and public officials throughout the Nation. It has become a best seller, filling the need for a clear presentation of the South's position in terms the North can understand.

How did "Race and Reason" impress the critics? Did it measure up to the standard achieved in Putnam's earlier biographical work?

A recent tabulation of published reviews of "Race and Reason" answers this question in no uncertain terms. With a total of 248 reviews of the book published to date in this country and overseas, the reaction is better than 90 percent favorable—an almost unprecedented showing for a book dealing with such an emotion-laden subject.

A total of 220 reviewers were favorably impressed by "Race and Reason," 8 were non-committal; and only 20 unfavorable reviews have been published. This amazing record is all the more remarkable if one considers that four of the unfavorable reviews appeared in Negro newspapers which could scarcely be expected to view the book objectively.

Perhaps this response indicates that our northern friends are finally willing to listen to reason on the matter of race. If this be the case, they will find abundant food for thought in "Race and Reason."

THIS IS THE PROBLEM (By Carleton Putnam)

Chairman Williams, Governor Barnett, Governor White, Mayor Thompson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your welcome. I can assure you it's warmer than I'd be likely to get in the North tonight. I'm always interested to notice how enthusiasm for integration goes up exactly in the proportion that experience with the Negro problem goes down. Everywhere, all over the world today, you'll find the amateurs telling the professionals what to do about this subject.

I come to you, in a sense, as an intelligence officer from behind the "paper curtain." I am obviously honored by your invitation to speak tonight, by the great courtesy and kindness of the compliment paid me by your governor in this plaque. I suppose any publisher—as well as any author—would love to see this on one of the pages of the New York Times Book Review as an advertisement. It might make quite an impression. I'm not sure that there has ever been a case in our history where a book has had a proclamation of this kind devoted to it.

Of course, personally, and apart from anything I have written, I am grateful for this chance to refresh my point of view among people of your outlook. We obviously share certain ideals that we have inherited from the early days and which we intend to preserve. Those ideals are timeless. They are not affected by winds of change. They are as steadfast as our self-respect, our independence of mind, and our love of our homes and our families.

Mississippi is the heartland of the struggle for racial integrity. You are not an unkindly people—but you are an experienced people. You know your own conditions. Unlike some cities of the South, the newspapers of Jackson are not controlled by northerners. You have not fallen victim to the ceaseless barrage of false science, false sentimentality and false political theory with which the North, and some part of the South, are being inundated. Your leaders are not selling your heritage or your children for a bloc of votes.

Nor are you persuaded by the fantasy that, in order to please everybody all over the world, you must give away everything your forefathers earned for you over a thousand years of effort and self-discipline. You may be willing to give money within reason to please the Congo, but you are not willing to give your children. The capital of Mississippi is still in Jackson. It is not in Leopoldville.

For all this, as I say, I am grateful. But at the same time I cannot close my eyes, any more than you can close yours, to the realities of the situation. In spite of the unassailable logic of your position you are under harassment and attack from all sides. The dean of the Harvard Law School fumes with fury at the mention of Mississippi. The kindly housewife in Wisconsin turns away at the name of Jackson. I am sure you often wonder why. And since there's an old adage that to get anything done you must first define the problem, I am going to inquire, What is the problem in this case?

Some of you may answer, "It's the Supreme Court decision of 1954." Others are wont to say, "It's the power-hungry centralists trying to destroy the rights of the States." Still others will say that "It's minority group pressure or Communist infiltration."

Now, in my judgment, to some extent all of those things are true. All of them are problems, but they all exist because of something else. If you could correct the fundamental difficulty, these others would disappear. And I speak from an embroilment in this matter, as you know, of about 3 years now, from Seattle to Miami and from Maine to California.

When I think about this underlying problem, I think about a night on the Outer Banks of North Carolina some 8 or 10 years ago. I was sitting after dinner one summer evening looking at the ocean and talking to a friend. He was a graduate of the Yale School of Forestry; he was also a writer of western adventure stories. He was an expert chess player. He was one of the leaders in the United Nations conservation movement and in world forestry. I mention these things because I want to make clear that he was a man of above average training and experience, and had some knowledge of science.

The conversation drifted around to the race problem, and at one point this man said to me: "Of course, you realize it has now been proved that there is no difference between the brain of a white man and a Negro. As far as any differences exist between the races, these must be accounted for exclusively by environment and lack of opportunity."

I confess that at the time, this remark startled me. I had given no thought in those days to our racial situation—that was long before my embroilment began. So I didn't argue. But after my letters to the President and the Attorney General were published, I became involved in correspondence and personal conversation with countless people from many walks of life throughout the North, the Midwest, and the West. And it didn't take me long to realize that this comment of the man on the Outer Banks was typical of northern opinion—that is, it characterized the thinking of those who were willing to accept the Supreme Court's decision in 1954 and everything that has happened since.

These people all believed that in spite of conditions in Africa, in spite of what we see of the Negro masses in the United States, in spite of what we find in Haiti, where the Negro has had every opportunity to develop a stable, free society, this race is simply the victim of adverse circumstances. In fact, they believe the fault is mostly the white man's.

And since they believe the fault is mostly the white man's, they think it's up to the white man now to do something about it. We must call in religion to help us redeem ourselves. We must call in the sociologists. We must reeducate our children in the colleges. We must even reinterpret the Constitution of the United States so that we can put Negro children in schools with ours. Perhaps in that way we can relieve our consciences. And it's only right that the South should suffer most, because the South, they believe, is the most guilty.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is the problem. Don't think for one minute that the Supreme Court would have handed down its decision in 1954 if it hadn't been counting on this point of view among great numbers of people up North. Don't think for an instant that our minority pressure groups would succeed if they weren't floating on an ocean of tacit public acceptance. Yes, the politicians are betraying you for the Negro vote, the centralists are grabbing power away from the States in this field, but the reason they're able to do so is

because the white majority is confused, hypnotized, misled and beguiled into standing aside and letting them get away with it.

Now I don't suppose I need to point out that it makes a great difference whether a man is where he is because of what he is, or whether he is what he is because of where he is. It matters greatly whether a man is no good because he has spent his life in the slums, or whether he has spent his life in the slums because he's no good. It matters in our sense of guilt about him; it also matters in what we can do about him. Moreover, when we substitute a race for an individual in such a situation, it makes a decisive difference in the chances we can take in our own exposure to that race.

So the question is crucial. Is the Negro the creation of his environment or is his environment the creation of the Negro? To put it more precisely, taking the problem on the racial scale, are the Negro's limitations hereditary, and thus only subject to change over a great many generations? Or are they exclusively a matter of surroundings and thus curable in this generation? Are they genetic and thus transmittable to our descendants if we intermarry? Or are they environmental and thus of no consequence to future generations? To that question the North answers with a resounding "Environment," and the Supreme Court echoes with its decision on the schools.

Well may you ask, how did all this happen? How can a view so contrary to observation and experience have captured so large a public? Almost everyone is ready to admit that heredity makes a difference in individuals within a single race, and to maintain that the process stops when we compare averages and qualities between races is a strange and forced bit of wishful thinking. Science, of course, does not dismiss anything because it seems strange and forced. But the burden of proof is clearly upon those who would deny the obvious, and this burden of proof no equalitarian scientist has been able to sustain.

Under these circumstances then, how can we account for the mirage that floats before the eyes of the North? To explain it I'm going to have to go back about 30 years. The idea that all races are equal in their natural endowments and in their adaptability to our Western culture took root in America in the classrooms of Franz Boas at Columbia University in the late 1920's. With Boas, as students or assistants, we find the names of Otto Klineberg, Melville Herskovits, Gene Weltfish, and Ashley Montagu. Gene Weltfish later became a member of certain organizations cited by the Attorney General as subversive and publicly announced that she had evidence to prove that the United States had used germ warfare in Korea. Some of the others were doubtless sincere, though perhaps biased by their personal backgrounds. I'm not sure about all of them. After Boas died, Columbia brought in Ralph Linton, who dismissed all of Boas' employees who had no tenure, and the university finally dropped Weltfish on the grounds of "too long" tenure.

But the Boas group, in America at least, was the beginning of the environmental ideology as far as science was concerned. Russia made its contribution in Lysenko, who claimed wheat could be turned into rye, and these men drew to them other scientists with leftist inclinations in Europe and the United States. They built up quite a clique at Harvard and Columbia and other universities here and abroad. As the New Deal came along and we went further left in the United States, they fitted in with the climate.

It was a time when the underdog more and more was becoming king, and men with socialistic and equalitarian ideas were willing to go to absurd lengths to pay him homage.

The outgroups in this country, after a long, hungry spell, were beginning to feel their oats, and were gaining favor with the ingroups. These things made it possible for the Boas clique to become the dominant academic power. It wasn't long before they were able to dictate policy, and eventually a whole generation of American young people were delivered into their hands.

Persecution of scientists who disagreed with them became one of their techniques. In Russia, of course, this was easy. Scientists who contradicted Lysenko were simply arrested. In the so-called free world, the matter had to be handled a bit more subtly. It will be apparent to you that I cannot here tonight name names. It is because there is risk of persecution that I cannot call specific witnesses. But I can cite cases and I can ask that you accept my word for their genuineness.

So I will mention the southern anthropologist who wrote me using such terms as "avoidance" and "suppression" and "discouragement" of research. I will cite the northern sociologist who, having made a public statement on the nonequalitarian side, went back to his university and was told: "We won't fire you. That would be too obvious. But as long as you stay here you will never get a promotion and you will never receive a raise in pay." I will mention the middle western psychologist who wrote me: "Where in the United States could a psychologist, sociologist or anthropologist find work if he openly espoused the theory of racial inequality?" I will give you my experience with one of the world's most distinguished anthropologists who asked me after I had seated myself in his living room in a northern city: "Are you sure you haven't been followed?" And I will add still another scientist who said, "I can't commit academic suicide. I still have work to do. But, when I retire."

The process wasn't always one of suppression. Sometimes it was one of prostitution. Back in the middle of the New Deal days, a friend of mine was assistant naval attaché at Caracas, and while he was stationed there he met three anthropologists who were returning from Africa. These scientists told my friend they had been sent to Africa with the blessing of the President of the United States, but with specific instructions that they were to return with equalitarian findings. "Go to Africa, study the natives, and discover that they have all the natural endowments of white men." Those were their orders. Needless to say, the anthropologists were a bit disgruntled—they told my friend their actual findings had been quite the opposite. What they told the President, I don't know.

At this point I'm going to turn to the northern press, to the northern television and radio broadcasting networks, and ask them: What do you think of this business? I'm going to ask Luce and Jackson of Time and Life, and Dryfoos and Sulzberger of the New York Times: How much longer are you going to vilify the South and divide this Nation on the basis of evidence spawned under these conditions? Do you call this academic freedom? And if we don't have academic freedom, what kind of freedom do we have?

And what about some of you so-called southern newspapers? I salute the Jackson press, but what about Atlanta? What about Dallas? What about Memphis? How much effort have you given to studying the facts in this situation? I'll say to you editors who are the servants of northern masters, I'd rather quit my job than betray the people in my hometown. I'd rather die poor than mislead my neighbors about something as important as this. I'd rather starve than corrupt the thinking of the father and mother across the street. Men who will do that sort of thing are in the same class with the

businessmen who favor integration because they fear resistance may hurt their pocket-books. I wouldn't want to sell my descendants' future for 30 pieces of silver, but there's no accounting for taste these days.

As a matter of fact, Mississippi is the heartland of resistance to integration, yet Jackson County has just been chosen as the site for a \$125-million oil refinery and southern Mississippi has been picked for a space facility. But I hate to even mention that. Are we going to balance our children's future, the very integrity of our civilization, against a dollar sign?

I shall come back to this subject later. First I'd like to explore a few other parts of the picture. The followers of Boas had no difficulty, for instance, in capturing the United Nations, because it goes without saying that at the United Nations the wish-fulfilling attraction of the environmentalist doctrine reached its height. You might expect committees to be set up at the U.N. to prove all sorts of equalitarian theories, and that is precisely what you do find. You find it most noticeably in the UNESCO statements of 1950 and 1951 on the subject of race, signed by a long list of scientists which is flaunted in the faces of the North at all times. The first statement in 1950 was signed by Klineberg, Montagu and Myrdal, the Swedish Socialist (we don't find Weltfish) and by a man named Ginsberg for England and Levi-Strauss for France, Juan Comas signed for Mexico, and there will be more to say about him in a moment.

You may wonder why it was found advisable to issue a second statement so soon after the first. The published reason was that some of the contentions in the first statement and some of the terms used "were much criticized, especially by physical anthropologists and geneticists." (They're the ones that know the most about this subject.) Then we read: "They (the scientific critics of the first statement) also declined to acknowledge as a proved fact that there are no mental differences between racial groups and stressed that there was insufficient evidence to support that view * * *." So they issued a second statement in 1951 which carried water on both shoulders a little more skillfully and made it possible to bring a few more signatures under the tent.

Let me give you an example. On one page we find this sentence: "Available scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development." On the page directly opposite we read: "It is possible, though not proved, that some types of innate capacity for intellectual and emotional responses are commoner (sic) in one human group than another." Is it surprising that the president of one of the scientific societies most concerned with this subject wrote me a few weeks ago: "The two contradictory statements invalidate the whole thing. * * * The fact that a certain person signed it means little about his personal convictions."

So much for the United Nations. But remember that public opinion in the North doesn't have a chance to analyze the situation as we are analyzing it here. All they are given in the propaganda they read is the equalitarian statement, and all they get is a general impression of agreement. Remember, too, what I said at the outset about the burden of proof. A scientist cannot deny the obvious (what we see when we look at Africa, or Haiti, or at our own crime statistics), plus all the evidence of history, without himself accepting the burden of proof. You don't abandon all the experience of mankind, flaunt established tradition and annihilate the status quo on the basis of an ideological guess. You don't crucify the South on a cross of equalitarian propaganda.

This propaganda, I must emphasize, has two parts. Its proponents are not satisfied

with preaching a wish-fulfilling gospel. They try to persuade you and the people of the North that all other scientists agree with it. And let me show you how false that is. You have, first of all, the four distinguished men who signed the introduction to "Race and Reason." In July of 1961, one of these men, Dr. Henry Garrett, wrote an article from the nonequalitarian viewpoint for the *Mankind Quarterly*. Thereupon Garrett and the *Mankind Quarterly* were attacked by our friend Comas of the University of Mexico in an article in *Current Anthropology*. The editor of *Current Anthropology*, one Sol Tax, first submitted Comas' article to 21 scientists for their comments, and these comments were published with the article.

The selection of the 21 scientists by Sol Tax and the resulting cross section of opinion gives us a strange sort of ballot on this issue—not a secret ballot, nor one in which the voters acted as free agents. Reading their remarks is an interesting exercise in how to escape committing oneself. In fact, I had to scrutinize each opinion carefully, coupling it sometimes with what I knew from the voter himself, to find out what it implied. Giving the benefit of the doubt in every case to the equalitarian side, I would estimate that 14 of the 21 agreed with Comas, which looks offhand like a two-thirds endorsement of equalitarianism. The trick here is that 6 of the 21 voted from behind the Iron Curtain. They are scientists living in Communist countries, where the party line requires strict conformity. Eliminate those six names and you see what happens to the ratio. It becomes eight to seven. And you started with a list of voters selected by an equalitarian.

I place only minor emphasis on this episode, because I don't believe that in the present climate of fear of reprisal and general timidity we can get a count of scientists that means much. We laymen will have to read the books on each side, understanding the background against which they are being written, and make up our own minds where the truth lies. Having done this myself, I'd be willing to put the matter in the hands of any intelligent jury. I might caution such a jury against being misled by the natural effort of certain scientists to avoid hurting anybody's feelings. I'd also want to clarify the meaning of certain terms the scientists use.

If you can bear with me while I give you another example, I'd like to offer a case that covers both of these points. It is coming to be recognized that there is a relationship between the fissuration—the grooving—of the frontal lobes of the brain and the higher forms of human activity—the capacity for analytical reasoning, foresight, self-control, judgment, and abstraction. The number of fissures or sulci gives us a sort of index of that kind of intelligence. (You will find the subject developed in Ward C. Halstead, "Brain and Intelligence.") In comparing fissuration or sulci as between white and Negro brains, C. J. Connolly, professor of physical anthropology at Catholic University, has this to say in his "External Morphology of the Primate Brains": "The sulcal features occasionally alleged to be characteristic of the Negro brain in all cases are not supported in this study. For example, the opinion that the frontomedial sulci are few in number in the Negro brain fails to be verified. They are sometimes highly developed in the Negro brain . . . (up to this point, what more could an equalitarian ask? Then Father Connolly quietly closes his sentence) . . . at most it is a matter of frequency differences."

Now, of course, the frequency differences are the whole point. When a scientist talks about frequency differences in a case such as this he means that the averages differ, and the average is what we care about when we're dealing with a race. No one questions

that there are overlaps in performance between the races, and one would expect to find overlaps, so to speak, in the structure of the brains. Yet the unwary layman might well be misled by Connolly's statement.

Again Connolly says: "The fissural pattern of the frontal lobes differs in a general way in the two races though one could not distinguish a particular brain as belonging to a particular race on the basis of a difference in fissuration of the frontal lobes." And again we must say, "Of course." The nonequalitarian does not claim that individual Negroes present any particular or universal limitation. It is entirely a matter of averages. You cannot tell an individual Negro brain from an individual white brain, but if you had a hundred random Negro brains on one side of this room and a hundred white brains on the other side you could tell which group was which. And that's the issue where racial interbreeding is involved.

Finally, having done his best to avoid hurting the Negroes' feelings, having given the equalitarians something they can pull out of context and quote in New York, Connolly sums the matter up for us in these words: "As to racial differences to morphological feature was found to be exclusively characteristic of either the white or Negro brain. It would be quite erroneous, however, to conclude from this fact that cerebral differences do not exist in the two races. There is first of all a difference in the frequencies of morphological features in the sulcal pattern such as has been illustrated. . . . The differences in frequencies combined with other morphological features such as the shape of the brain and the relative size of its parts are of anthropological significance."

In other words, we have no difficulty in reading between the lines, nor actually on the lines, with these truth-oriented scientists—once we recognize what they are up against. Sometimes we have to put two and two together, or even two scientists together, as in the case of Halstead and Connolly. One scientist may not be willing to say it all. But with a little practice we soon learn the code.

At the same time, let's not underestimate the openings for equalitarian deception in this area. Unless the layman is alert, it's easy to deceive him, and the northerner is deceived. The too-simple statement that you can't tell an individual black brain from a white brain is only one example. The equalitarians have all sorts of plausible clichés they inflict on the northern public. They will repeat, for instance, that the difference within a race are greater than the differences between races, as if this fact had some relevance. Over and over we must point out that of course there is overlap, of course some Negroes surpass some whites, of course the differences within are greater than between. This does not change the fact that when the graph of variation of one is laid against the graph of variation of the other, in those capacities involved in adapting to our civilization, the black as a whole falls below the white as a whole. And again we must emphasize: there you have the danger in interbreeding. Marry those two graphs and the white must come down.

I might say here that "Race and Reason" has been in circulation for 6 months and there has yet to be any serious attempt to attack it scientifically. At least none has come to my attention. There have been a few reviewers who have referred to the book as full of errors and contradictions, but unfortunately none of these reviewers have had the time to point the errors or contradictions out. The nearest attempt was an article in the *Eugenics Review* signed by a doctor in the Public Health Service and the gist of his attack was as follows: "With respect to the sort of hereditary variations that might influence adaptation to civilization, an individual's manifest traits are the best

guide to his genotype. . . . Thus, even when intermarriage is in question, science demands that each person be considered on his merits."

Now if that statement is science, then I'm speaking tonight in Italian. Such a comment in effect negates the influence of heredity entirely, except as it may express itself in one individual in one generation. It assumes that a brilliant son of a stupid father may not in turn have a stupid son—a position that no trained geneticist would accept for a moment. Perhaps the writer expects to give his assertion plausibility by his phrase "with respect to the sort of hereditary variations that might influence adaptation to civilization," but I must point out that the fissuration of the frontal lobes is just as much a matter of heredity as skin color.

The writer also makes the epigrammatic remark that "marriages are contracted between individuals, not between races," forgetting that when enough individuals marry, the races in effect do marry, that much of the breeding is nonselective, and that the end result is a wide distribution of Negro gene-traits through the white race. This is what accounts for the general deterioration always found in the resultant mulatto culture.

At the risk of being accused of a lack of modesty, I am tempted to tell those of you who may wish to use "Race and Reason" as a tool in this controversy that Dr. Ruggles Gates, who signed the introduction, has no superior in the field of human genetics, that he is the author of the definitive work in this field and that he was kind enough to write Dr. Garrett a personal letter last March in which he spoke in a not entirely uncomplimentary way of "Race and Reason." One of his comments is printed on the jacket of the paperback edition. Until we get something more solid than the article in the *Eugenics Review*, I am content to rest my case on that comment.

Now, I turn to still another part of the picture. The situation would be bad enough if we had only to deal with these left-wing pseudo-scientists. But we are faced with something else. Out of the scientific cloisters exudes a doctrine which seeps into the churches, into the press, into the movies and other mass media, until all the instruments for molding public opinion are corrupted.

Let me give you a rather startling illustration. In my hand I hold a pamphlet, written by one Father C. J. McNaspy, S.J. (Society of Jesuits). It's called "Let's Talk Sense About the Negro." It bears the nihil obstat of Austin B. Vaughan, S.T.D., and the imprimatur of Francis Cardinal Spellman. We are told that these guarantee the pamphlet's freedom from moral error. Yet on page 14 we find these two sentences: "If some Negroes show tendencies toward delinquency, if they suffer from lack of ambition, lack of drive, apathy—we may blame this on the environment we have compelled him [sic] to live in, not on some imagined inferiority in his biology. This is not my opinion; it is the conviction of all scientific psychologists and anthropologists."

Ladies and gentlemen, no one wants to stress the importance of environment more than I do, no one wants to improve the Negro's environment more than I do, but it would be difficult to conceive of a more profound, a more complete or a more inexcusable falsehood than Father McNaspy's last sentence. The whole statement is the rankiest sort of unqualified environmentalism coupled with the assertion that all scientists agree with it. I don't have to go back and quote Professors Gates, Garrett, George, Millot, Le Frou, Connolly, Hardin, Shuey, McGurk or Gayre to you now. But apparently Father McNaspy knows nothing about them. I can't bring myself to believe he knows. Yet if he doesn't know, he should. He had no business putting out a pamphlet like this unless he'd made some

study of the subject. You may say, what about your friend on the Outer Banks? And my answer is, he wasn't publishing a pamphlet.

Or take this article by the Episcopal bishop of Michigan. It's an attack on "Race and Reason" in the Detroit News of June 4, 1961, in which the bishop, one Richard Emrich, brings Abraham Lincoln into the argument, and notice the way he does it. He says, "Abraham Lincoln's clear mind can lead us to see the heart of this struggle which is still America's chief agony. (The Bishop doesn't pause to consider who started this most recent agony.) The logic of segregation, discrimination, or exclusion leads to the destruction of all civil liberties everywhere. Why? Because, says one man writing about Lincoln, 'the essence of his position was that the principle of exclusion has no inner check; that arbitrarily barring one minority from the exercise of its rights can be both a precedent and a moral sanction for barring another and that it creates a frame of mind from which no one can expect justice or security.'"

To examine the minor error in this thing first, am I correct in my recollection that our American Republic has been in existence since 1787, that between that time and 1954 we have grown from very small beginnings to be the leading free society of the world and that during all of that time we had segregated schools in the South? And if I am correct in my recollection, may I ask Bishop Emrich what he means when he says, "the logic of segregation leads to the destruction of all civil liberties everywhere?" Jesus tells us to love God with all our minds as well as with all our hearts, and I ask Bishop Emrich: "Where was your mind when you wrote that sentence?"

But in my judgment this is the minor fallacy in the quotation from the bishop. You notice he talks about Lincoln's clear mind and then he phrases matters in such a way that you get the impression that what he quotes next is practically a citation from Lincoln on segregation. Actually, Emrich's words are, "Says one man, writing about Lincoln, 'the essence of his position was—'" and so forth. Certainly I don't have to tell this audience what Lincoln actually said about the Negro: "I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races." True, that was in 1858. By the end of the Civil War, Lincoln had made it plain that he hoped "very intelligent" Negroes might be given the franchise by the State governments, and I would not hesitate to assume that today Lincoln would favor a franchise on the same basis—for "very intelligent" Negroes under the control of the States. However, there is no indication anywhere that Lincoln today would approve forced social integration of whites and blacks in the South. Yet Bishop Emrich deliberately offers us what some unnamed person thought Lincoln thought, when he had on the record what Lincoln actually said.

I have difficulty in understanding the mentality of men who misrepresent Lincoln's position on the Negro. In fact, I'm inclined to quote further here from Lincoln for the benefit of both the bishop and the editor of the Detroit News. On September 16, 1859, Lincoln in a speech was commenting on an editor who had distorted his views, so where I quote "editor" you can supply "of the Detroit News" and you can also supply "Bishop Emrich." I now quote from Lincoln: "Having shown you this, there remains but a word of comment on that newspaper article. It is this: that I presume the editor of that paper is an honest and truth-loving man, and that he will be very greatly obliged to me for furnishing him thus early an opportunity to correct the misrepresentation he has made, before it has run so long that malicious people can call him a liar."

Is Bishop Emrich as well as Father McNaspy the victim of ignorance? We can only hope so, because otherwise the moral deterioration in our churches is alarming to say the least. Earlier this evening I addressed a question to the leaders of the northern press. I now address myself to the clergy and to them I say: There has been no case in history where whites and blacks have integrated without destruction of the white civilization, and there is no human right greater than the right of a civilization to defend itself against such destruction. That right you would watch the Federal Government take forcibly from the South while you sit with your hands folded in prayer. I'm tired of empty phrases with no thought behind them, I'm tired of the sort of combined ignorance and stupidity shown by your McNaspy and your Emriches, I'm tired of your timid conformity with the popular drift.

And finally, I'm tired of your milk and water suggestions that we pass the buck to God while you support a policy which forces the white children of the South against the wishes of their parents into associations they understand better than you do. You pose as idealists, yet you hide behind the skirts of religion while you condone a crime against 50 million Americans.

There are two things in this state of affairs that I want to stress. One is that the environmental ideology is false—or perhaps I should say that it is the worst kind of a half-truth, which can do more damage than a fallacy. The second thing is that nevertheless this fallacy, this half-truth, has gained complete possession of the northern and western mind. Some, perhaps many, of the leaders in our press, our clergy, our entertainment, our colleges, and our politics may recognize the fallacy and either through timidity or cupidity are pressing on with it just the same. But my experience has satisfied me that the great majority of northerners are simply misled. I'm talking now of the inarticulate masses of the people who only speak at the polls. The scientists, educators, editors, and churchmen make it easy for the northern politicians, who nowadays would much prefer to do what they think a misinformed public wants than bother to inform them correctly.

I am reminded by contrast of a comment that was made on the duty of statesmanship by quite a different kind of leader a generation ago. This leader remarked: "People used to say of me that I was an astonishingly good politician because I divined what the people were going to think. This really was not an accurate way of stating the case. I did not divine what the people were going to think. I simply made up my mind what they ought to think, and then did my best to get them to think it." If we had leaders like that today, we wouldn't be in this mess. Certainly we haven't got such leaders in the North or in the Federal administration, and the question now is, can the South supply them?

Let me restate the situation: We have in the North a great body of public opinion hypnotized by the belief that all the Negro's limitations are environmental, that the only reason he does not appear to be the white man's equal in every respect is because the white man has forced him into an inferior environment—has held him back as they say—and this belief includes conditions in Africa as well as America. Once you accept that idea, it follows logically that white men ought in justice and morality to take every possible step by way of restitution to correct this environment, even at the expense of disadvantage to themselves.

Over the last several years I have talked or corresponded with thousands of sincere, intelligent Americans and I have found this point of view almost universal. I have had it repeated often enough so that I can assure

you it permeates our northern society as a whole. They read an occasional book on science, the books that are kept at the front of the bookstores, and there they find the environmentalist view. They go to a movie and they get it there. On Sundays they hear it preached in church. When they turn on TV they hear news and documentaries and plays all slanted in the same direction. Their children come home from school with books written by environmentalists. I could go on forever. The point is: You have a completely indoctrinated society in the North. On that indoctrination the integration movement rests. It gives it all the sanctions of a moral crusade. It makes it shine, like the Holy Grail. And what is the South doing about it? It is talking about something completely beside the point, it is concentrating almost exclusively on the subject of States rights.

Citizens of Mississippi, I give you this as axiomatic: The Supreme Court's decision on desegregation simply follows the trend of public opinion in the North and West, and the average man in the North and West doesn't give a damn about States rights in the face of his belief that the South is committing a wrong against the Negro.

You might as well try to use States rights to justify mass murder.

And the northerner goes further—when you talk about States rights he thinks to himself, "Sure, the southerner is willing enough to plead States rights when he wants to browbeat and oppress the Negro—but when it comes to getting his hands in the Federal Treasury, he sings a different tune." In other words, this line of defense not only doesn't do you any good up North, it does you harm.

I don't have to repeat that I am completely in sympathy with the principles of States rights. I only say it's out of place in dealing with your racial problem. Or, if you prefer, let's say you've tried it and it hasn't worked. In my opinion, there is just one solution now to this problem: Tell the North over and over again that you're fighting for the integrity of your civilization. Remind them that there has never been a case in history where whites and blacks have lived together, without segregation, in such numbers as you have in the South today, and have failed to intermarry. Remind them that such intermarriage has always resulted in the deterioration of the white civilization. Point out to them that the facts of science, when viewed through unbiased eyes, support the facts of history. Show them that the historical evidence is what you would expect to find from the scientific evidence, the genetic nature of the latter accounting for the deterioration apparent in the former. Make clear that you have in most cases done all you could—and a lot more than most—to improve environment for the Negro, and that you intend to do even more. Continue forward in that area, but when it comes to social segregation, say to the North: "Here we stand four square."

I need scarcely remark that you should prepare yourselves to meet the reflex action you will get from the North. I've met it so often and found it so stereotyped and superficial that it's hard to take it seriously, but it must be met. When they say to you, "But we can't hold the Negro back," answer, "Any race that is held back by segregation is held back by associating with itself, and such a race had better do something about itself, instead of demanding that another race also be held back by forced association with it."

Or when they suggest that your children don't have to marry Negroes just because they must go to school with them, call their attention to the gradually erosive effect of the equalitarian ideology implicit in this movement. Remind them that it is not solely a question of the impact on one gen-

eration but upon a series of generations, each becoming a little less aware of what's involved. Tell them that time and familiarity, coupled with the hypnotic repetition of the equalitarian doctrine, can slowly make black seem white and something which at first repelled seem eventually acceptable. Paraphrase Alexander Pope's famous quatrain for them:

"Here is an evil of such frightful mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too often, familiar with its face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

Be on your guard against the leftist who is obsessed with the idea of "change," who wants "change" just because it's fashionable, and who talks continually about "winds of change." Remind him that every burglar who breaks into a house wants change. He wants to change the possession of the savings and heirlooms of the owner who earned or conserved them through the years. And sometimes nations and races want to do the same thing.

Straighten out the North on this all-men-were-created-equal concept. Explain that that phrase has never referred to cultural, social, or genetic equality except in Communist countries. Our history is full of evidence on the point, but if you want it in a page or two you'll find it in "Race and Reason."

And don't let them seduce you with this notion that your "image before the world" will be damaged by segregation. It goes without saying that riots are damaging, but what these equalitarians are trying to tell you is that segregation itself is damaging. All you have to do is to ask them which is more important—to keep the integrity of your civilization—to conserve the standards and traditions your forefathers developed through a thousand years—or to please some African who thinks freedom is a package you go down and get at the post office? Remind them that if a thing is wrong, you don't do it to please anybody. Put your heel on this spirit of appeasement, this idea that we must run twittering around smoothing the fur of folly—which is the surest way to gain everybody's contempt.

Most important of all, do what you can to persuade southern leaders—Governors, mayors, and Federal representatives—to take advantage of their national radio and television time to put these points across to the northern public. The newspapers and magazines are full of items against you every day. TV can't completely shut you out, however, when some crisis brings one of your leaders into national attention.

It's so easy to see opposition of a politician or scientist or a minority group leader and say "Well, we've got to attack there and we must fight him and it's getting so hopeless." The point is that the only reason he's succeeding is because he's floating on a tide of the masses of the American people who have a false conception of the humanitarian side of this matter. That's why I urge you, at every opportunity that presents itself, to take advantage of the opportunity to quash this environmentalist point of view.

And don't deceive yourselves that the South as a whole has tackled this particular problem. I remember a short while ago, when the eyes of the Nation were on a southern city at the opening of the school year, the Governor of the State appeared on a national television network at prime twilight time. He had the entire country watching. And he called a newspaper reporter to him. He said "Come here a minute." It was quite a dramatic setting.

Then he asked, "Would you want your daughter to marry a Negro?" He had the beginning of a point. But by itself meant absolutely nothing. I could almost hear the northern audience saying, "Well, why not? There's nothing the matter with the Negro except he hasn't a chance." Or else asking,

"Why can't you control your children?" Or more likely saying, "That old gag! We've heard that one before." The chance to say something really convincing was wasted because there was no appreciation of what the problem was.

Perhaps the most tragic example of what I have in mind—although similar things are happening somewhere almost every day on a lesser scale—occurred at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles in July a year ago. There the South really had the Nation captive in front of its television sets. It was superprime nighttime at a super-exciting convention. And the South had a whole hour to state its case. My wife and I sat in front of our set and we thought "By golly, this is going to be it. At last they've gotten through the paper curtain, the TV curtain, all the other curtains." And so the hour began. James Gray made an excellent presentation of the legal side of the South's case, and we felt that next would surely come the fundamental issue. And the hour went on, and it went on, and it went on. And then it was over. And the South, which had the most at stake and ought to have known the subject best, had uttered not one word on the most vital issue in the world today. A succession of southern leaders had gone across the platform talking about how "my great-grandpappy had been a member of the Democratic Party." The hour was over, and my wife turned to me and said, "This is a disaster."

Can nothing be done to convince southern leaders, Governors, Senators, Congressmen, mayors, to use their precious airtime, whether it be at a riot or on "open end," to strike back at this dishonesty, this creeping paralysis of mind, this ignorance? What's wrong? What's holding them back? Why do so few have the discernment of your leaders here in Mississippi?

All of us know that no war was ever won by staying on the defensive. When it comes to the racial issue, the States rights argument is both defensive and evasive. On the other hand, the racial integrity issue—which you in Mississippi, more than any other State, have made an issue—puts the attack into your hands where it belongs.

There you have an issue that has just as much moral sanction, just as much power, just as much of the Holy Grail appeal as any issue on earth. You won't find a pastor in any church in America who can choose a text to surpass it. There is your cause. With that cause history is on your side, science is on your side, righteousness is on your side—I'll go so far as to say the American people are on your side, if you'll arouse them and inform them.

Challenge the parents of America. Say to them: "Do you have any doubt about the genetic foundation of life? Look in that crib tonight and answer the question." Say to some of these well-meaning and blind northern leftists: "If you must take money out of the pocket of the man who earned it and put it into the pocket of the man who didn't, that's one thing. That may sometimes be justified. (But, less often than you think.) Go ahead, if you must, and spend other people's money, but, you hypocrites, stop trying to spend other people's children."

If I were in a southern Governor's shoes, those are some of the things I'd say. And here are a few more. I'd suggest to the American people that they examine the personal backgrounds and political leanings of the Myrdals and the Herskovitces and I'd ask, "Do you see any indication of political bias in their books? Read some of them. Do you think their science is nonpolitical in its motivation? Do you see no personal motives in any of this?"

I'd remind my audience that Clyde Kluckhohn, the Harvard anthropologist, recanted before he died. And then I'd call attention

to this statement signed by Professors Gates, Gayre, Garrett, and George: "We do not believe that there is anything to be drawn from the sciences in which we work which supports the view that all races of men, all types of men, or all ethnic groups are equal and alike, or likely to become equal or alike, in anything approaching the foreseeable future. We believe on the contrary that there are vast areas of difference within mankind not only in physical appearance, but in such matters as adaptability to varying environments, and in deep psychological and emotional qualities, as well as in mental ability and capacity for development. We are of the opinion that in ignoring these depths of difference modern man and his political representatives are likely to find themselves in serious difficulties sooner or later."

And I'd say further to the American people: "All right, here you have the Myrdals and the Herskovitces, the Klinebergs, and the Ginsbergs on one side, and there you have the Hardins and the Georges, the Gaseses and the Garretts on the other side. And in front of you, staring you in the face, you have the Congo with its chaos, you have Angola with its hidden horror, you have Haiti with its comic opera government, and you have America's crime and relief statistics. Do you mean to tell me we're holding this race back. I say to you we've done more for this race in two centuries than they've done for themselves since the beginning of the world. If they hadn't been brought over here as slaves to white men, they would have been slaves to other Negroes and many of them would have died in Africa as human sacrifices. You nation of sheep. Have you no minds of your own? Can't you see through this hoax? How much longer must we be offered up on the altar of your gullibility?"

Those are some of the things I'd say to the American people if I were a southern Governor and had some national TV time. I'd ask them, "How many stable, free societies can you name, in all history, that had any substantial mixture of Negro genes? Not one. And yet you want us to try the experiment again. All right, my northern brothers, you try it. If you're fools enough, you try it. But don't come down here and tell us what we've got to do."

In conclusion, let me ask a favor, and also give you a word of comfort. First the comfort:

I learned last week that within the next 6 months there will be an announcement of what I would consider a major breakthrough in anthropology. It will go to the core of this racial equality business. It will come from a scientist of unimpeachable standing and if it is substituted for Myrdal in footnote 11 of the Supreme Court's decision of 1954, I do not see how the Court can refuse to reverse itself. The announcement will be attacked, but once you have it in your hands, take the ball and run for a touchdown. Marshal this and all the other evidence, and carry a new case to the Supreme Court.

Now for the favor:

Please don't whisper to yourselves, "Isn't it too late? Haven't we lost this fight?" If you take the road we've been discussing tonight, it's not too late. It's never too late to go to the heart of this kind of an issue, because when you do eternal forces come over to your side. There's something about lifting a banner like this and keeping it clean that attracts the unseen as well as the visible hosts. And if there was one quality that characterized the breed that built America it was that they were not afraid to slap the devil in the face. They didn't sit down and bargain with him, or offer him sacrifices. When men do that, the forces of righteousness, seen and unseen, desert them.

In the last analysis, however, if you want to be faithful to the Founding Fathers, you won't ask whether you're going to win. That's not your affair. The fight is your affair. Do the best you can. I'll put it in the words of George Washington himself: "Erect a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower issued a proclamation before leaving office naming the new airport facility at Chantilly, Va., the Dulles International Airport. I understand from reading the press that the present Federal Aviation Administrator believes that this should be limited to the terminal building only because the name may not meet with the favor of foreign visitors coming into the United States. To have the Congress express its feeling on this matter I therefore introduce a joint resolution, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING THE AIRPORT CONSTRUCTED AT CHANTILLY, VA., UNDER THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1950, AS THE "DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT"

That the airport constructed under the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of the public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia," approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 770), as amended, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Dulles International Airport," in honor of the late John Foster Dulles, a renowned diplomat and statesman, whose public service was dedicated to the ideals of democracy and the cause of freedom and peace throughout the world. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such airport is referred to shall be held to refer to such airport by the name of "Dulles International Airport."

The late John Foster Dulles served his country long and admirably. His distinguished career as a public servant extended from World War I until his untimely death. He served under Presidents of both political parties at their request and was respected by all of the nations of the world.

It is my hope that the Congress will adopt this resolution and perpetuate the name of this great American.

TO BUILD UP SHRUNKEN PENSIONS OF U.S. EMPLOYEES IN RETIREMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, after a man or woman has worked as a civil employee of the U.S. Government for a dozen years, he finds himself committed to its service for the rest of his life, unless he loses his job through a reduction in force.

He is in a sense trapped by the deductions of 6½ percent taken from his salary for the civil service retirement fund. He cannot move to a job in private industry and take this pension credit with him to strengthen his old-age and survivors insurance account, which is beginning at a later date in his life.

So, he must continue in Federal employment in the hope that when he retires, he will have adequate security for the years during which little or no additional income will be available to support himself, and his wife, or to support his widow.

Working for the Federal Government should be a career—and not a sacrifice. Yet many Federal retirees, who devoted 30, 40, and even more years of faithful service to the Government and the people of the United States, find themselves on an annuity treadmill, where their pension benefits fail to keep up with the cost of living.

This depreciation is due to the fact that Congress has abandoned its custom of increasing annuities of retirees to match cost-of-living increases awarded to active employees. With the prices of food, rent, clothing, medicine, and other necessities climbing beyond reach of their fixed pensions, retirees have had to make drastic economies in order to pay for their living expenses. The resulting distress and hardship have weakened the original purpose of the U.S. civil service retirement system to provide retirement security above the subsistence level, for employees who have given the productive years of their lives to the service of the Federal Government. The decline in the purchasing power of these annuities has been matched by a deterioration in the pride and the morale of retired civil servants who cannot understand why the Government has not kept faith with them.

The disappointment of some has changed to bitterness. "If I had the chance to relive my life, I'd never seek a career in the employment of the U.S. Government," one of them recently confided to me. "There are more rewards in private industry, more recognition of one's ability and loyalty."

To make up for the disillusionment and the straitened circumstances that deprive retired civil employees of the security and the happiness they have earned, I believe we should amend the Civil Service Retirement Act through enactment of H.R. 3987.

I introduced this bill nearly a year ago, on February 7, 1961. Its objective is to increase the annuity of each retired employee who, on the date of this act is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil service retirement and disability fund. The increase shall be 20 percent of the amount of such annuity, not in excess of \$1,500, and by 10 percent of the remainder of such annuity.

Furthermore:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each annuity payable from this fund shall be increased whenever (1) there is a general adjustment of salaries of classified employees or of postal employees, or (2) the formula for computing annuities of retiring employees generally is liberalized. * * * Such increase in annuity of a retired employee or Member shall operate to increase the annuity of his survivors proportionately.

An increase in benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act is necessary for the relief of retired civil employees whose pensions have been squeezed by the rising cost of living.

SOLUTION TO SOME OF PROBLEMS OF AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, no one will deny that a strong and financially sound transportation system is essential if our Nation's economy is to be sound and progressive. Consequently, the public, the investors, the Congress, and the executive branch of our State and Federal Governments have become increasingly alarmed by the economic ills which afflict the railroads and the air carriers of our country.

As a member of the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have been and am deeply concerned with the adverse earnings position of our railroads and commercial air transport companies. These two great segments of our vitally needed transportation system appear to have reached a blind economic alley and insurmountable adverse earnings wall.

It has seemed to me that the answer to the problems of the railroads and airlines can only be found if government and these two essential transportation media are willing to cooperate openly, candidly, and constructively to find sound and permanent solutions to the complex, basic problems which must be solved if ultimate nationalization is to be avoided.

Consequently, it was with great pleasure that I read an address, "Our Imposed Problems and Their Solution," by Mr. W. A. Patterson, president of United Air Lines, before the Wings Club of New York on January 12.

This is a timely, constructive, informative, and interesting speech by a man who has been with United Air Lines for over 31 years, the last 27 of which he has been president of that fine airline, and who deservedly enjoys a distinguished reputation for industrial statesmanship.

Because of the number and variety of legislative proposals now before the Congress affecting transportation and the rumored imminency of the President's message on transportation, I am inserting Mr. Patterson's address as part of

my remarks, and earnestly urge all Members of both Houses to read it carefully and thoughtfully:

OUR IMPOSED PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTION

(An address by William A. Patterson, president, United Air Lines, before the Wings Club, New York City, January 10, 1962)

Last year, for the first time since 1948, the combined trunkline operations resulted in a net loss, estimated as high as \$30 million. This is approximately 6 times the industry loss in 1948 and it has aroused about 10 times as much advice on what is wrong and how it should be corrected.

Doctors have gathered around the patient to diagnose and prescribe treatment. Some say, adopt a Spartan regime in cabin service, penalize no-shows, and pool your ground equipment. Others say, sell harder, invade the automobile travel market, tap the mass market. This one says, your trouble is overcapacity, and that one says, you're suffering from jet age growing pains.

I'm sure you're familiar with the various contentions on the cause and cure of airline problems. The advice is generally well meant and it reflects some fraction of the truth, but the question is—who decides when the doctors disagree?

Disagreement—diversity of opinion—is no novelty in the air transport industry. More often than not, it is a dominant characteristic of the industry. Conflict of thought and freedom of expression are necessary to arrive at the truth.

I have had honest disagreement with the philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Board at various times in the past. And it would be strange, indeed, if I had been in continuous agreement with every person who has ever served as a Board member. I have known many of them as capable, intelligent gentlemen, and I have never doubted that their motives are every bit as sincere as mine. But a problem exists and it will not be solved by the sincerity with which we hold opposing views.

The airline problem, actually, is related to a larger problem which is sometimes overlooked in concentrating on our own immediate cares. The larger problem is that common carrier passenger transportation has been slipping for many years. In 1947, for example, the railroads, buses and airlines operated almost 71 billion passenger miles. In 1960 the total was less than 62 billion.

Overall slippage of common carrier passenger business has not been of pressing concern to the airlines in the past because of extremely vigorous growth. Industry traffic volume in the decade of the fifties just about tripled. But a large part of the growth represents diversion from surface carriers, particularly the railroads. And the harsh fact is that the airlines have been getting a larger and larger share of a total volume that is steadily dwindling.

The villain, so to speak, is the private automobile. A decline of approximately 13 percent in common carrier passenger-miles since 1947 has been accompanied by an increase of more than 140 percent in intercity automobile passenger-miles. This trend has been stimulated by the construction of toll roads, superhighways, and cars designed for greater speed and driving comfort.

The shrinkage in common carrier business has not gone unnoticed by the CAB. Its researchers and economists also have observed that some 90 million people have never taken a trip on an airplane. The airlines, accordingly, have been urged to siphon off automobile travel and to develop a market among those 90 million. This advice is well intended but I maintain it is more of a pious hope, rather than a realistic goal to be profitably achieved by human effort.

It's a mistake to assume that those 90 million constitute a market merely because

they exist and have never been airline customers. A potential market of any worth must meet other criteria. Now elaborate studies can be made to determine the size, depth, and shape of a market but I have a simple rule of thumb which is generally reliable. It consists of three questions: First, is the desire there? Second, is the need there? And, third, does this particular market have the means?

Business travel, as you know, is the backbone of our operations. More than two-thirds of our volume is derived from that source. If you apply the rule of desire, need and means, it is clear that the business traveler meets the test squarely on all counts.

In considering the 90 million who have never flown on airlines, great numbers obviously can be ruled out on any one of the main counts. Some haven't the desire to fly and no amount of advertising can awaken the desire. Others haven't the need—the pattern of their lives is such that they just don't have to go anywhere.

Many of the 90 million have jobs that keep them in shops, offices, and factories. They may have the desire to travel but, unlike the business traveler, there is no connection between their everyday work and the necessity to travel. The only time their desire to travel can be reasonably exercised is during vacation periods, assuming they have the means.

What about the means?

It has been suggested that the airlines should make special efforts to develop a market among those with modest annual incomes—on the order of \$5,000. In support of this view, some economists have said that as much as 10 percent of that \$5,000 is budgeted for travel. Now, \$500 is a sum worth going after, but I have no proof it is there, waiting to be claimed by the airlines.

The person with a \$5,000 income must pay out a substantial portion for food, clothing, and other necessities. Housing alone—the servicing of mortgages, rental payments—claims about 25 percent of the average income. And there are other costs that grow in relation to family size, such as education and medical care.

But let's assume that 10 percent remains for travel. And having accepted that assumption, I'd like to offer one of my own: I am convinced that the 10 percent, 8 percent—whatever it happens to be—is irretrievably earmarked for the family car. It pays the monthly installment. It buys gas, oil, and tires. And when vacation time comes along, the man with a \$5,000 income is going to use what he already has for travel—the automobile. And he'll take the kind of vacation on which he can be accompanied by his wife, children and vacation equipment, if he wants it.

To further control costs, he's going to bypass the luxury hotels and the fashionable resorts. Chances are, he'll seek some out-of-the-way place, remote from cities and airline service. Now, he could get from an airport by renting a drive-yourself car but this is not inexpensive and he has a limited budget.

So we come back to the automobile.

A CAB spokesman has expressed the opinion that airline fare reductions would woo motorists from the highways. Ostensibly with this in view, one of the trunklines several months ago proposed a jet fare reduction of 25 percent. We protested. Other airlines joined us and the fare was rejected by majority vote of the Board members.

Such experiments—in the absence of proof they can succeed—are perilous at a time when the economic health of the industry is impaired. They have a ring of hasty improvising about them—as though created in a spirit of let's try it and see if it works.

I haven't a closed mind on experimentation but I am reluctant to risk the interests of our stockholders by participating in un-

tested schemes. Surely no one in his right senses is averse to tapping a vast new profitable market—if the market is there. Now, some people think the market is there and some are sure it's not there. I have a proposal on how to settle this difference of opinion.

The Federal Government and private industry invest billions each year in research to develop new techniques, procedures, and products. No reasonable person questions the value of this effort. Things are tested in the laboratory and by consumer panels to determine their potential worth before heavy investments are made. I suggest adoption of similar methods by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

It should not be too difficult to arrange actual field tests and learn, for example, if low fares can attract a large volume of motorists and result in airline profits. Routes could be carefully isolated for control purposes, with costs, traffic levels and other factors under thorough study for a suitable period. And, just as laboratory research is underwritten, the carriers taking part in the experiment could be subsidized for any losses.

So, very seriously and constructively, I recommend field studies and pretesting of various theories which some CAB officials hold. The airlines cannot reasonably be expected to experiment at their own expense, especially when a profit cushion is lacking. And the airlines should not stand accused of being opposed to low fares that—in some unexplained and so far unproved way—might restore their economic health.

The facts available to us show that past low-fare experiments have failed to generate the high volume required to offset the revenue reduction and the costs of providing the service. I'll give you cases—omitting, of course, the recent youth fare which, as with our own youthful years, passed very soon.

As many of you know, some time back we reduced Hawaiian fares by 25 percent and we promoted this bargain for 4 years. Travel increased 24 percent—and that's a considerable increase—but it was still 1 percent less than the volume required to break even on the discount. Let's also remember that, apart from fares, the growth occurred in a period when public interest in Hawaii began to quicken and expand.

Some years ago we established coach fares, offering a 25-percent differential between coach and first-class service. Coach travel has grown, yes, but not as a result of tapping a new market. Its growth has been accompanied by a steady decline in first-class travel. One expands while the other contracts. We know that hundreds of corporations have instructed their representatives to travel by coach. For every four who shift to coach, we have to get one new passenger to break even.

Last year the trunklines gained about 1 percent over 1960 by flying 29½ billion passenger miles. Fifty-seven percent of the total was coach travel. In 1960 it was 49 percent and just 6 years ago it was 35 percent. The reduction in revenue due to this kind of inward growth has contributed to the industry's present financial condition.

When did the trouble begin? Well, the date is fairly well fixed in a recent CAB document which points out that a declining rate of earnings has been experienced over the last 6 years.

What happened approximately 6 years ago?

Let me refresh your memory. In the period from July 1955 to December 1956, the CAB decided 15 proceedings that changed the operating authority of every domestic airline. These decisions piled more than 21,000 miles of extra competition on the industry and the stage was set for a large part of our present problems.

The New York-Chicago case, the Denver Service case and the Southwest-Northeast case were all decided in the fall of 1955. And

there are others continuing down to recent times. I mention these specifically and by date to illuminate a further point.

The year 1955, you may recall, was a year of decision in still another way. Beginning in the early 1950's, British progress with the Comet was watched with great interest and there was growing speculation on when the U.S. airlines would commit themselves on jet aircraft.

Some of our critics implied we were dragging our feet—allowing British technology to pass us by while we wrung every last penny out of the piston-engine plane. Actually, as you know, the major airlines were conducting an intensive evaluation of jet aircraft. In our case, thousands of man-hours were spent in economic studies, consulting with manufacturers and working up specifications.

We ended the jet speculation in October 1955, by ordering the DC-8 and shortly thereafter the other trunklines began making their commitments. Because of the lead-time required to manufacture jet aircraft and place them in service—about 4 years for the DC-8—our order was based on what studies and forecasts indicated the market would be in the sixties.

Our analysis of the future market was well drawn in terms of foreseeable conditions, and I'm sure that our competitors made theirs with equal care. But, no matter how well drawn—all the research and planning was disrupted by route award piled on route award. To give a few examples—two airlines flew the New York-Chicago route, now there are four; two airlines flew the New York-Washington route, now there are nine; one airline flew between Denver and the west coast, now there are four.

I could continue this rollcall with city-pairs across the Nation, but let's consider for a moment the economic effects.

Three years ago the nonstop market between San Francisco and New York was served by United and TWA. We were operating with a 54-percent load factor, which indicated there was ample room for growth. Aircraft were on order to accommodate that growth. These facts failed to carry, however, and American Airlines was authorized to fly the San Francisco-New York nonstop. The award diverted \$13 million from United and TWA.

Any jubilation this may have occasioned at American was brief. Within several months three airlines were authorized to fly the southern transcontinental route which American had been serving without competition. These awards diverted approximately \$16 million from American.

Aside from obviously creating excessive competition, multiple route awards produce various inefficiencies that help build up airline costs. As an example, airlines receiving new routes sometimes purchase additional planes to compete against the carrier or carriers already serving the route with an adequate fleet. Or again, a carrier faced with added competition is well advised to reduce flight frequencies at the stations concerned. Fixed costs remain the same but the ability to spread the handling costs per passenger over a greater number of flights is severely limited. In other words, the operation is less efficient.

One of the standard replies to protests about route awards and excessive competition is that the CAB has merely awarded what the airlines have requested. That is true, but I must point out that regulatory power includes the power to hold individual interests in check. If overly ambitious, disruptive demands are not brought into shape and balance by the CAB, then who will do it? Under the Civil Aeronautics Act, it is an express duty of the Board to foster sound economic conditions and maintain competition to the extent necessary to assure sound development.

I don't wish to seem presumptuous in mentioning this responsibility, nor would I

have my remarks interpreted as critical of any Board member. My usage of the word "Board" itself is in an impersonal sense, referring to an accumulation of policies and decisions, rather than to a group of officials. The gentlemen who presently constitute the Board have inherited problems of great magnitude and my sympathies are with them.

I was encouraged several months ago when airline representatives were invited to discuss the situation with CAB officials in Washington. I hoped that the main cause of the industry's affliction would be laid open and skillfully treated. Instead, what I regard as mere surface symptoms were marked off for treatment.

Now, I regard small economies as part and parcel of ordinary, everyday, good business housekeeping. It's important to keep operations tidy by detecting petty waste and inefficiency. But it's more important to detect opportunities for major savings that can be achieved through research and the use of new machines and techniques. This type of economy advances and improves air transportation.

Understanding this, you will understand my disappointment when the Washington sessions resulted in discussions of meal service, pooling ground equipment, no-show penalties, and the like. Such matters are worth consideration but why not plunge into the main areas for improvement and economy? The idea of discussing types of meal service at a time when industry losses were nearing \$30 million struck me as incongruous. It seemed we were invited to concern ourselves with trivia.

It would be far more rewarding, for example, to explore ways in which traffic control can be smoothed out to reduce holding periods and terminal delays that cost the airlines many millions annually. Surely science—electronics, engineering—can produce a better system with enduring benefits that would far outweigh any amount of menu juggling.

I'll cite one more:

As captive tenants of airports, the airlines are subject to fiscal policies that are increasingly burdensome. Neither controls nor uniformity exist in determining costs. United's bill for landing fees and terminal expenses was about \$1,800,000 in 1952. For the current year, it will amount to \$16,500,000, exclusive of \$7,250,000 for hangar rents. Our airport costs for 1963-64 will border on \$20 million—an increase of 1,000 percent over 1952. Surely, this is an area worth looking into.

But the problem of excessive competition overshadows all other problems, and I have yet to hear of any program to remedy the situation. Lately, there's been much discursive and hopeful talk about mergers. To hear some tell it, a merger is a mystical union that melts away problems and the two merged companies live happily ever after. We've been given to understand that the CAB is kindly disposed toward mergers. But, so far as I know, a rationale has not been worked out. No criteria have been established as to what kind of merger is desirable. Will any old merger do? Obviously not.

A merger between two weak airlines will merely spread the weakness. By the same token, a merger between two strong, aggressive airlines can produce such strength that weaker carriers will be forced into bankruptcy or back to subsidy, if they can get it. I doubt that any policy designed to reduce competition by forced or planned bankruptcy would meet with congressional acceptance.

Now what is a good merger? Well, I would place the United-Capital merger in that category. Capital was spared bankruptcy and no competing carrier has been brought to the brink of financial disaster as a result

of the merger. Greater efficiency has been achieved. Outmoded aircraft have been withdrawn and jets are continuing to be placed in service on Capital's former system. And the result is clearly in the public interest.

I believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board should assert leadership at this time by determining what kind of mergers are best for the public, the industry and the stockholders of the companies involved. Guidelines must be set up and objectives clearly defined to prevent blunders and senseless combinations that could aggravate an already sorry situation.

I would be remiss if I left you today with gloom hanging in the air. I've talked frankly of our problems. I've not minimized my concern, nor have I skirted the issue of regulatory responsibility, as I see it.

But this industry has great vitality, as shown by its past development and the confidence with which the challenge of jet conversion was accepted. It retains that vitality in spite of burdens, reverses and imposed problems. We need sound judgment now, patience and the good sense to avoid hasty cure-all remedies.

In a recent speech in Connecticut, Mr. Boyd, the CAB Chairman, was frank and accurate in discussing excessive competition. Judging from his comments, we are in agreement on the fundamental problem. The question is, What can be done to correct it? Excessive competition is solidly imbedded in the industry's structure and there is no fast or easy way to root it out. The CAB is entitled to every constructive idea we can offer.

I have devoted many hours of thought to possible solutions, but I come full circle when I reflect on the tedious procedures that must be followed. For example, I visualize the Board holding public hearings that would stretch out day after day, week after week, while the parties gave detailed testimony. And I know of no way to dispense with such hearings, if the final decision is to be honest and just.

Then, after the decision is announced, I visualize a series of court actions. I don't think we could criticize the delay that would occur. Due process must be observed, and anyone involved would have the right to be heard. Management, understandably, would make every effort to protect the interests of stockholders.

A more direct alternative method would be to conduct a thorough study of excessive competition and clarify what should be stripped away to produce balanced competition and economic health. The next step would be to achieve airline agreement on a withdrawal policy, so that those who were last to begin service on a route would be the first removed. Perhaps the subtractions could be offset by gains in other areas and, of course, such possibilities would be analyzed in the basic study.

This alternative method also would take considerable time and in that period the position of the airlines would deteriorate further. Consequently, only one realistic course is open in the interim—and that is to provide temporary fare increases as a measure of relief while legal analysis and factfinding are in progress.

Most of you know that United filed for an increase in November, amounting to about 7 percent. This would have yielded less than what we need to consider ourselves a financial success. It was a moderate request but it was suspended. However, the CAB approved a 3-percent increase, which is acceptable, but we plan to refile for the 7 percent. And, in connection with that refile, we look forward to a full public hearing.

The hearing should include facts already on the record and also cover those points in business philosophy, service, and costs which have been subject to a clash of opin-

ion. It is my fervent hope that the proceedings will reconcile the opposing points of view and bring about an understanding that will enable the industry to advance and prosper. Conflict of thought has constructive uses, as I mentioned earlier, but when continued aimlessly year after year it is damaging and disruptive.

I have great regard and affection for this industry I've been talking about today. In the 1920's I worked in a bank and the prospects were good, but I left the bank to join the Boeing Airplane Co. I was optimistic about air transportation when many looked upon it as a doubtful enterprise with a vague, uncertain future.

I was optimistic then, ladies and gentlemen, in the 1920's, and on this day in January 1962, I continue optimistic.

PRESIDENT'S CALL FOR FREE TRADE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the trade message from President Kennedy today is truly a ringing call for free trade—a ringing call for one-worldism, and a ringing call for a brandnew built-in welfare program for industry, business and labor in this country.

I am opposed to it.

A FIVE-POINT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE AMERICA'S POSITION IN WORLD COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SANTANGELO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables and a report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a distinct honor to be able to address the House today following President Kennedy's eloquent message on America's role in the stream of international commerce. Mr. Kennedy's message brings renewed hope to the free world that reasonable men can reach reasonable agreement in the community of free nations.

There is no question however that we here in Congress will have a tiger by the tail when we take up renewal of American trade agreements with the free world later in this session.

I had the honor of visiting six European capitals during the recess, where I discussed the effect of the European Common Market on the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, based on my observations in Europe, I should like to discuss today a five-point program which, in my judgment, must be considered if we are to consider all the aspects of the international trade problems confronting the United States and the free world.

Regardless of what action Congress finally determines, it is apparent that some segments of the American economy may suffer as Europe's industrial potential unfolds, while other segments of the American economy may greatly benefit from common trade association in Western Europe.

Congress will be faced with a most difficult challenge in drawing the fine balance to sustain American employment without closing the door to foreign competition.

My discussions with business leaders, labor representatives, and government officials in Europe lead me to the conclusion that Americans will have to use all of their Yankee ingenuity to meet the increasing economic challenge of the rest of the free world.

Member nations within the European Common Market are experiencing this same problem on a smaller scale. In London, Lord Rootes, auto manufacturer who is frequently called the Henry Ford of England, said he is not afraid that removal of trade barriers will cause French and Italian auto producers to squeeze him out. He said confidently:

We'll have to work harder at selling our cars.

It should come as no surprise, as post-war Europe and Japan develop their industrial complex, that many of the business advantages which the United States has enjoyed for several decades will be confronted with stiffer competition.

There is a tremendous drive for economic expansion throughout free Europe, now experiencing an unprecedented prosperity. European businessmen quite confidently predict that as trade barriers within the Common Market are removed, and as Western Europe's production increases, there will be a more intense drive by European manufacturers not only for world markets, but for American markets.

While this development should quite properly be of concern to the United States, we can find comfort in the fact that economic revival in Western Europe has virtually eliminated any fears that our European allies could fall into Communist hands, short of aggression.

Communism is suffering a tremendous philosophical setback through the whole Western sector of Europe where the people are intent on developing their economies within the basic framework of free enterprise.

It would be a mistake, however, to ignore the fact that there are some fundamental weaknesses in the Common Market which may not come to light unless and until the European economy suffers a readjustment such as our own American economy experiences during economic cycles. When I asked various spokesmen with whom I dealt in Europe whether the concept of free trade within the Common Market nations would be met with the same degree of enthusiasm if there were labor surpluses in any of the member nations, as we are now experiencing in the United States, I found the answers not very conclusive.

Most spokesmen said they would meet this problem when they were confronted

with it, but many argued that with expansion of trade within the Common Market, they do not anticipate any serious setbacks in the foreseeable future. My own judgment and experience leads me to believe this latter group is overly optimistic.

There is no question in my mind that large industrial centers like Chicago will want to study the complex nature of the European economy because sooner or later it will have a direct bearing on the employment of these industrial centers.

The electronics industry in Chicago already is experiencing serious problems as a result of foreign competition.

The same can be said about the textile industry in Chicago, and I could not help but conclude that other industries in Chicago would experience similar difficulties when I saw large factories in Europe producing component parts which only a few years ago were the mainstay of Chicago's diverse industry.

In West Berlin, despite the tensions created by the Communist wall, a large modern factory is producing component parts which are being shipped throughout the world for assembly in local markets. I saw the same activity in England, France, Switzerland and Italy.

I also had an opportunity to view American factories built in Europe with American capital.

It would appear to me that the great danger which confronts America as Congress begins debate on the renewal of trade policies with the free world is the tendency to oversimplify the complexity of this problem. I can recall no single piece of legislation which will require a greater degree of study, debate and careful scrutiny than renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1962.

It is clearly apparent to me that survival of a capitalistic system as we Americans know it may very well hang in the balance. President Kennedy will have to marshal all the resources at his command to explain to the American people the complex nature of this problem.

The people of Chicago and Illinois have a particularly vital stake in seeing to it that Congress enacts legislation which will not close the stream of foreign commerce, but at the same time will not open floodgates so that small industries, in particular, could be wiped out.

Aside from the complex nature involving the political aspects of international commerce and the very difficult question of balance of payments, foreign exports from the Chicago area in 1960 provided jobs for an estimated 178,000 people. Nationwide, the Department of Commerce estimate that international trade activities, including services, provided 4½ million jobs for Americans.

Nevertheless, while our Nation's foreign exports continue to create a sizable number of jobs for Americans, I have received protests from Chicago employers that foreign imports are seriously curtailing their production and causing layoffs of workers.

I believe that every American recognizes the fact that the United States cannot completely close off its channels

of commerce to the free world, but by the same token, those Americans who are being affected by increasing foreign competition should quite properly look to their Congress and their President for some avenues of assistance.

On the basis of my observations, I believe the time has come when we must appraise this problem of economic survival in a free world along a much broader basis than just a discussion of reciprocal trade agreements. President Kennedy has quite properly indicated that he will ask Congress for a more liberal trade policy in international economic relations. The increasing purchasing power of the free world can very well provide for America the impetus it needs for economic growth, but we cannot avoid the fact that as we seek foreign markets, foreign markets will seek to compete for our own Nation's purchasing dollar.

It appears to me the problem must be approached from two directions: the United States must provide the leadership in the free world to establish a set of ground rules which will permit free nations to compete among themselves within a spirit of equity; the United States must also recognize the fact that our own American industrialists must be given a greater degree of latitude in meeting the competition of foreign imports. I would hope that as the debate on reciprocal trade agreements begins in Congress, we can give consideration to the following aspects of this problem:

INTERNATIONALLY

Adoption by the free world of an international fair labor standards agreement, which would be based on capital investment, wage standards, cost of raw materials, and profits per unit of output.

It is my belief that the American worker is perfectly willing to match his skill and productive capacity against any foreign worker, if he is assured that there is some ratio of equality in wage standards.

A suggestion has been made by Frank Darling, president of Local 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Chicago, that the United States might lead the way in reducing or even completely eliminating restrictive tariffs and quotas to those nations which make a sincere effort to at least partially increase their wage standards so that American workers will be competing on a more equitable basis with their foreign counterparts.

The International Metal Workers Federation, in Geneva, an affiliate of the International Association of Machinists, has completed an exhaustive survey of the possibility for the free world to adopt a code of international fair labor standards and, while fully recognizing the complex nature of such a proposal, has concluded that it is indeed possible of achievement. I shall include the report in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks. I believe Mr. Al Hays, president of International Machinists Union in America, deserves particular praise for initiating the study. As far as I know, this is the only such study available in the world today. Mr. Hays has per-

formed a tremendous public service in helping finance the study which was made under the direction of Mr. Adolph Graedel, general secretary, International Metal Workers Federation, in Geneva.

I was particularly impressed with the fact that virtually everyone in Europe in a responsible position, with whom I discussed this type of an approach to international trade agreements, stated that such a course would be desirable for the free world to explore.

It would appear to me that by advocating adoption of minimum wage standards geared to specific industries and countries and based on local problems and local currencies, the United States would be giving full meaning to our basic foreign policy by raising the standards of working people throughout the free world, thus putting the lie to false promises of international communism.

Minimum wage standards have worked well in the United States and I feel confident that properly drafted, they can work in the rest of the free world.

It would appear to me that the U.S. Congress would be inclined to adopt more liberal trade policies if we had some assurance that the free world will at least make an effort toward bringing wage standards into closer harmony with those under which American industry must compete for world markets.

DOMESTICALLY

First. Revision of tax laws relative to depreciation to permit the earlier replacement of obsolete equipment.

It was most interesting to me to see the very liberal tax laws which European industry enjoys to develop its industrial potential.

While undoubtedly a faster writeoff on plant investment may in some instances lead to automation, the fact remains that a good part of Europe's industrial complex is competing for world markets which the United States held for a long time simply because they are able to produce better products with more modern equipment.

I am confident that the American worker can improve his productivity considerably, given the proper tools with which to work.

In my discussions with European labor leaders and industrialists, I could only conclude that the United States is the only large industrial country which has not modernized its tax laws in a manner to encourage heavy capital expenditures. In looking at the modern European plants which have been built since the end of World War II, one cannot help but conclude that a vast segment of our American industry is working with tired and obsolete equipment.

While the European manufacturers speak with confidence that they can meet successfully the economic challenge of Soviet Russia, too frequently this type of confidence seems to be lacking in American industry. It would appear to me that we must give American industry a greater degree of freedom to put American ingenuity to work at full capacity. I doubt if this can be done with an obsolete tax structure which too often pe-

nalizes expansion and discourages modernization.

I should like to call your attention to an article which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times and which describes how accelerated writeoff is bringing new vigor to the textile industry hard hit by foreign competition. I ask unanimous consent the article be placed in the RECORD in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

Second. Improve facilities for small American manufacturers to display their wares in foreign markets.

I visited the modest American Trade Center which the U.S. Embassy has opened in London. The Embassy had no appropriation for this purpose and established the center primarily on a somewhat temporary basis in order to give American manufacturers at least some place to display their products. The center is working out very well, and it appears to me there are thousands upon thousands of small manufacturers in America who, while they cannot afford to maintain their own offices or display showrooms in the major markets of the world, would avail themselves of a trade center maintained by the American Government.

It is my hope that Congress will seriously consider an appropriation for this purpose so that the small businessman of America will be given a better opportunity to compete in the European stream of commerce. Large American corporations maintain such facilities in many parts of the world, but the small industrialist of America has been left out of international competition because he lacks display facilities.

My visit to the American Trade Center in London convinces me that Europeans are ready and willing to buy American products for resale if they are made more readily available. The experience of our Trade Center in London, in my judgment, justifies the opening of similar centers, particularly for the small American businessman, throughout the free world.

Third. An increased effort to improve the quality of American workmanship.

I believe that American industry should eliminate speedup techniques, and the American labor movement should foster a program of encouraging workers to develop a greater spirit of pride in their craftsmanship.

This point is best brought out by the results of a survey among employers in the German Federal Republic regarding the reasons for their success with exports, which I saw in Bonn. Eighty-five percent of engineering firms in West Germany quoted good quality as the reason. With 42 percent, price came a long way behind; followed by service to customers, 33 percent; advertising, 28 percent; and prompt delivery dates, 27 percent. Government export promotion schemes came last, with 5 percent.

Perhaps another example are the Scandinavian countries which, I have been told by European manufacturers who buy their products, have the highest degree of quality in their products. It is interesting to note that while the Scandinavian countries are the lowest tariff

countries in Europe, because of the high respect for their products, they have built up the highest standard of living on the European Continent.

Fourth. Additional assistance to those American companies who suffer temporary setbacks because of competition from foreign imports.

This assistance could include additional tax benefits, more liberal loan policies through the Small Business Administration for converting to different products, and Federal assistance in retraining displaced workers. I believe, however, that it is only fair to point out that a similar approach to industry hurt by foreign imports within the European Common Market has not yet met with too much success. In virtually every country I visited, the spokesmen told me that this type of assistance usually comes too late and is thwarted by an unnecessary bureaucracy which administers it.

A recent survey by the Department of Commerce regarding the meaning of foreign trade to the State of Illinois showed that 80 percent of all the people engaged in manufacturing in the State of Illinois are employed by firms in nine major manufacturing classifications, each of which sell at least part of their products directly to foreign markets. There is no question that foreign trade can mean employment for many of our citizens in Illinois. However, with the changing industrial complex of the free world, the same survey showed that many Illinois producers will be adversely affected. Some examples and the number of plants—many of them in Chicago—affected are: certain types of machine tools, 50 plants; aluminum sheets and circles, 20 plants; hand tools, 5 plants; plumbing, brass goods, 10 plants; wire products (fences, nails, barbed wire), 6 plants; men's dress shoes, 4 plants; shoe uppers, 16 plants; fancy leathers, 11 plants; leather handbags and pocketbooks, 7 plants; cotton textile mill products, 33 plants; knit goods, 15 plants.

The survey did not reflect the impact of foreign competition on the electronics industry, which in Chicago alone employs 196,000 people and constitutes the largest single industry in the city of Chicago.

We can see from these figures that there is no simple solution to the increasing problem of international trade within the free world. However, I am firmly convinced that unless freemen are able to resolve the differences and evolve international trade agreements based on a spirit of fair competition, many of our economic allies may very well have to seek their markets behind the Iron Curtain, thus weakening our position and strengthening communism.

Too many of our allies already are dealing with Iron Curtain countries. It would appear to me that the greater opportunities we provide for the free world to trade among itself, the greater success we will have in demonstrating to the world the false economic idealogies preached by the Kremlin.

This is the great challenge which confronts President Kennedy and Congress in the next session.

The articles previously referred to are as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1962]
TEXTILES INDUSTRY CHEERED BY EASING OF TAX REGULATION

(By William M. Freeman)

The textile industry, which consistently wears a pessimistic face while its customers in the clothing and apparel field consistently present an optimistic appearance, took heart for the future last week.

The specific cause was a further broadening by the administration of special tax relief for the industry.

In October the White House and the Internal Revenue Service made it possible for textile manufacturers to write off the cost of equipment used in spinning thread and making cloth in a much shorter period than was allowed previously.

Last week a new depreciation schedule was announced for sewing and cutting equipment used in making a wide variety of clothing. On the average, the new setup permits the owner of a machine to claim tax deductions for depreciation over a period 40 percent shorter than before.

MORE TO COME

There is more to come. The White House said similar revisions were in process for equipment used to make hosiery, knitwear, and other products.

The most important change in the latest schedule covers sewing machines and allied equipment, which the White House said represented about 70 percent of the apparel industry's total investment. A new sewing machine can be written off in a return filed January 15 or later in 9 years instead of 15, as before.

The action points up the recognition by Washington of the textile industry's troubles, which range all the way from equipment to problems of discounting, merchandising, and selling.

William I. Kent, chairman of the executive committee of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, told the Senate Commerce Subcommittee last week that a trend to liquidation continued in the wool textile field in 1961, with a large worsted mill and other important units closing down.

Imports of wool products generally have continued at high levels, he noted, although the industry was struggling to make sales in the first half of 1961.

Mr. Kent, who is president of the Kent Manufacturing Co., Clifton Heights, Pa., and who operates a cloth mill in Charlottesville, Va., and a worsted spinning mill in Pickens, S.C., urged support for comprehensive quotas by countries and categories on imports of wool textiles and apparel.

R. Dave Hall of Belmont, N.C., president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, which, despite its name, covers textiles of all fibers, called for exact ceilings on textile imports. He urged the use of a formula by which other nations could share in the future growth of the U.S. market, along with proportionate reductions in the event of a decline. He also suggested an overall allowance for textile imports, with provisions for shipments from new sellers abroad to be offset against shipments from established suppliers.

Mr. Hall urged the acceptance of a multinational agreement for control of textile traffic and the avoidance of bilateral agreements such as this country now has with Japan.

RULING SOUGHT

Mr. Hall noted that the unified industry was seeking an official ruling from the Office of Emergency Planning that textile imports were adversely affecting the national security. He said that such a finding would give President Kennedy "the flexible powers he needs in working out varying remedies" not only

for cotton textile imports but also for goods made of wool, manmade fibers and silk, in the form of apparel or textiles ready for cutting.

Textile distributors have problems of their own. Some distributors deal with discount houses and some do not, and there is a split among wholesalers as to which way their salvation lies.

Some feel that doing business with short-markup discounters does not produce as much income as dealing through conventional merchandisers. Their opponents argue that the conventional type of business is dwindling and that the discounters are achieving ever-increasing volume.

The general feeling at the convention of the National Association of Textile and Apparel Wholesalers here last week was that the best way to fight the discounter and so preserve a better markup was to limit selling efforts to fewer and better moving lines. This has been the pattern in one industry after another, with the consumer finding less choice but at more attractive prices.

EXAMPLE GIVEN

By way of example, the recent acquisition by Revco Discount Drug Centers of the Standard Drug Co.'s outlets in the Cleveland area brought sharply reduced prices on cigarettes. At the same time, consumers lost the opportunity of buying paperback books, New York newspapers, and similar items, since Revco concentrates on drugs, cosmetics, vitamins, and prescription items.

This is what has been taking place in one type of outlet after another, but not without opposition. In Cleveland, the Ohio Association of Tobacco Distributors, whose members sell cigarettes and make a profit, cannot compete with an organization such as Revco, which sells them as a loss leader, although it calls them a convenience item.

A hearing is set for January 29 before Common Pleas Judge Arthur H. Day on whether Revco should be forced to increase its cigarette prices.

The ruling is likely to have an immediate effect, if only by implication, on all discount selling. In Ohio the basis of the action is the Cigarette Sales Act of 1941, which sought to prevent price wars. There has been no test of the law in the civil courts.

FAVORED ITEMS

Discounters like textile and apparel items, since sheets and pillow cases, towels, clothing, hosiery, and so on for a long list of articles are worn or used by just about everyone. For the most part, they also run to national brands, which are heavily advertised, giving the discounters a price level from which to cut. In this respect they are similar to cigarettes, since the prices are well known and a cut price is an obvious bargain.

Sol Berger, president of Colonial Corporation of America, which makes popular-price shirts and blouses under its own name and for private label merchandisers, made this comment on the outlook:

"I think 1962 should be a banner year for manufacturers and retailers in the soft goods industry. The low level of inventories of both apparel makers and retail outlets has spurred a marked upsurge in our orders. However, because of competition from discount outlets, both manufacturer and other types of retail stores will have to increase efficiency in order to make their profits grow at a comparable rate with sales volume.

"Some ray of light for the textile industry is seen in new synthetics and in new blends of synthetic and natural fibers, along with more imagination in fabric design.

"One of the developments that is stirring interest is the appearance of blankets made by a tufting process. It consists of a product with a high, dense acrylic pile surface tufted on a cotton sheeting, which serves as the

backing. Both sides of the backing are tufted so that the finished blanket resembles a conventional woven product."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
London, January 23, 1962.

SECRETARY OF STATE:

Toy exhibition opened today with largest initial attendance to date, about 150. This result attributable to (1) lively advance interest by United Kingdom trade (2) excellent preshow publicity (3) quality of United States participants and their products. Quality of attendance exceptional. Fact that all exhibits, except one, are attended by United States or United Kingdom representative, has made exhibit most effective and resulted in favorable comments.

Four separate type reactions noted: (1) Hobbycraft participants reported particularly brisk interest because of design, quality and only marginal price disadvantage, (2) firms with broad general lines report large number of trade contacts at all levels with most visitors much impressed by creativity and originality of design and high quality of toys. While some prices appear high believe there are respectable sales possibilities for many general line items, (3) majority of trade visitors are pessimistic on sales possibilities for electrical train, doll and metal toy lines but a few judge some of these may find moderate sales in specialized shops on originality. These lines face greatest price disadvantages of any items in exhibition and United Kingdom market already has large representative selection of these available, (4) existing United Kingdom agents much impressed by quality and size of attendance. All found several potential new customers. Some took moderately large orders and all have promise of further orders.

In summation, exhibition will give United States participants wide look at United Kingdom market, opportunity for their own market analysis and in many cases opportunity to pick and choose among potential agents. Eventual sales volume, however, difficult to predict.

Freshow advertisements in about 10 trade journals paid dividends. So did feeding out good material furnished by participants to trade press which resulted in good stories. Several good exclusive stories obtained in press as well as wide photo coverage. Excellent TV coverage on both commercial and BBC-TV has sparked national and provincial press coverage and we expect excellent press coverage of opening day.

BRUCE.

INTERNATIONAL METALWORKERS' FEDERATION—
REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL FAIR LABOR
STANDARDS

(By the International Metalworkers'
Federation Secretariat)

FOREWORD

In compliance with instructions given by the executive committee at its meeting held in Vienna, on March 18, 1959, arising out of a proposal made by the United Automobile Workers of America, the International Metalworkers' Federation secretariat submits to the central committee this report on international fair labor standards.

In drawing up the present report, the IMF's primary concern has been to preserve a realistic and objective approach, combined with an endeavor to present a fundamentally trade-union solution.

The introductory section I represents an attempt to set forth the economic background into which any proposed agreement on international fair labor standards would need to fit.

Section II shows how an agreement on international fair labor standards would serve to complement the action programs

hitherto advocated by the International Metalworkers' Federation.

The broader aims of an agreement on international fair labor standards are set out in section III.

Section IV illustrates, by means of specific cases, the problems involved in an agreement on international fair labor standards.

Again out of a sense of realism, a special section V analyzes the practicability of suggestions for an agreement on international fair labor standards.

Our conclusions as to the scope for the trade unions to achieve the aim of fair labor standards, by action they can take in their own field of operation and through governments and their international institutions, are to be found in the final section VI.

Appendix I contains suggestions for an agreement on international fair labor standards, which would need to be submitted to an international agency, such as GATT, for instance. Detailed explanations on the mechanics of the proposed agreement follow the draft text.

To elaborate one of the conclusions in section VI, appendix II gives an example of a proposed trade adjustment program.

In drafting the text for a proposed agreement, the IMF secretariat has been in close contact and consultation with experts of the GATT secretariat and the International Labor Office. From these bodies assurances have been received, in unofficial contacts with a leading officer of the former organization and with several ILO departments, that the IMF's suggestions might provide a practicable basis and should offer possibilities for convincing governments of the need to take action on international fair labor standards along the lines proposed.

I. THE WORLD ECONOMIC SITUATION AND ITS
CONSEQUENCES

For economic, social, and political reasons the crucial problem for the free world is the gap between living standards in industrialized countries and those in the economically developing countries. At all costs that gap must be narrowed as rapidly as possible by expansion and reorganization of the economy in the developing countries, as well as by a gradual improvement of those regions' living standards, at present deplorably low.

The second problem of decisive importance for the future of the free world is the need to insure that, with all these vast wants unsatisfied, both in the poorest and the more highly developed parts of the world, there should be no relaxation of productive efforts. In particular, the industrialized countries must maintain such a state of trade as will guarantee to them full employment and provide the economically more backward countries with the two primary conditions vital for their development—assistance in the form of capital and industrial equipment, as also markets for their constantly growing production.

Thus economically underdeveloped countries and the advanced nations both have major problems to solve. All of them must strive for growing cooperation and mutual economic assistance, designed to expand international trade so as to promote the prosperity and well-being of all nations.

Unfortunately, in the first half of 1958 trade developed contrary to these economic and social aspirations which, in the long run, will decide the future of the free world. It is appropriate, therefore, to analyze briefly the world economic situation and its tendencies, for the purpose of pinpointing the problems facing the democratic countries and the free trade-union movement. In this respect special responsibility rests on the metal industry, the key to economic progress, and hence on free metalworkers' unions.

A. Problems of economically underdeveloped
countries

A Social Situation That Is Untenable and an
Offense to Human Dignity

Two-thirds of mankind—almost 2 billion inhabitants of our globe—are still largely untouched by economic progress and rising standards of living. Some 1.2 billion of them live in non-Communist parts of the world. Most of them, like their forefathers before them, are vegetating on bare subsistence levels, a prey to disease and every kind of hardship. In those countries infant mortality is high and the average expectation of life is only 30 years, compared with almost 70 in European countries.

Dangerous Trend in International Trade

The gap between living standards in industrialized countries and those in nations still on the threshold of economic development is widening alarmingly.

In 1938 trade between industrialized and underdeveloped countries accounted for 54 percent of world trade, but in 1957 that percentage had dropped to 50 percent. This means that industrialized countries have expanded economically and have increased the volume of trade between them, a development which the retarded countries have been unable to follow.

In 1938 exports of economically backward nations to industrial countries represented 28 percent of world trade, while goods exported by the industrialized to the undeveloped parts of the world made up only 26 percent of the total; in 1957, the position was reversed, with underdeveloped countries' purchases from industrialized nations amounting to 27.5 percent of world trade, and their sales to only 22.5 percent.

Thus the economically weak countries' position in world trade has deteriorated, so that they are no longer able to earn, out of their own resources, the foreign exchange they need to procure imports for the maintenance and development of their economy.

The following figures illustrate the situation: In 1938 the economically underdeveloped countries, in their trade with industrialized nations, had a credit balance of \$600 million (expressed in 1938 prices); in 1950, as a result of the considerable rise in commodity prices, which had advanced 42 percent more than industrial products, the underdeveloped countries had \$2,800 million credit balance in their trade. By contrast, in 1957 there was a \$5,200 million deficit in the underdeveloped nations' balance of trade with industrialized countries.

According to GATT's latest report on the development of world trade, the total value of nonindustrialized countries' exports fell in 1958 by \$1,376 million, to \$32.19 billion. These countries' imports, which already from 1952 to 1956 had increased at a faster rate than exports, declined in 1958 by \$1,331 million, chiefly due to austerity measures designed to compensate for the unfavorable effects of the lower prices for basic products and the reduction of dollar reserves. Despite such countermeasures, the deficit in all non-industrialized countries' balance of trade remained very high.

Among the nonindustrialized nations, those hardest hit by the recent recession were oversea territories in the sterling area. The deficit in their balance of trade rose from \$342 million in 1955, to \$678 million in 1956, \$1,609 million in 1957 and further to \$1,695 million in 1958. In fact, in the last of these years it would have been \$1.13 billion even higher, had not the Middle East petroleum exporting countries, hitherto belonging to the sterling area (Kuwait, Iraq, Bahrain, and Qatar), shown large returns from petroleum exports.

This continued deterioration in underdeveloped countries' balance of trade has latterly, indeed, become so serious as to give cause for fears that, sooner or later, these

nations' excess of imports over exports may reach such proportions that their financial resources will no longer suffice to keep even the most vital trade going. This trend is highly dangerous. The underdeveloped countries have no reserves. If they are unable to increase their exports at a normal rate, they cannot maintain a proper flow of imports. They will be forced to slow down their present rate of industrial development, which in many instances is already inadequate to prevent the steady whittling down of living standards under the pressure of increasing population.

India offers a typical example in this respect. Its new 5-year plan is gravely threatened and cannot be achieved, even in part, unless the industrialized countries substantially increase their financial aid. In Pakistan the population is growing faster than the national income. Accordingly, living standards have fallen further, with a consequent accentuation of the appalling want in the country.

Decline in Traditional Exports of Economically Underdeveloped Countries

Up until the present, exports from the developing countries consisted mainly of foodstuffs, raw materials, fuel (especially petroleum), while they had hardly begun to export manufactured products.

For some years now, trade in those basic products has tended to become stabilized and such exports are expanding less rapidly than are exports of industrial products. There are various reasons for this. The quantity of raw materials required per unit of manufactured goods is declining. Raw materials and energy which, in 1938, accounted on the average for 33.5 percent of the value of manufactured products, made up only 24 percent of their value in 1954, because industrial products are more highly developed and have a smaller raw material content. Moreover, branches of industry such as chemicals and engineering, which are constantly progressing, consume less in the way of raw materials from the economically underdeveloped countries than does the textile industry for instance. Finally, the industrialized countries themselves are producing more raw materials and energy than they used to do.

In addition to all this, natural products must now face growing competition from substitute materials, such as nylon, synthetic rubber, plastics, etc. Another case in point is aluminum, which is taking the place of copper and lead, and contains a smaller part by weight of natural material, to say nothing of the fact that bauxite is cheaper than these other metals.

GATT's report, relating to the years 1957 and 1958, notes the fact that world trade in industrial products has grown considerably faster in recent years than has trade in basic products. It also states that the setback to world trade which occurred in 1958 affected basic products to a greater extent than industrial products. The share of total world trade made up of industrial products rose from 46 percent in 1953 to 51 percent in 1957 and to 52 percent in 1958. The value of industrial products exported throughout the world increased from 1953 to 1957 by 54 percent, to reach the sum of over \$50 billion, from which peak it declined by 3 percent in 1958. By contrast, world trade in basic products rose during the same years by only 31 percent, to reach \$49 billion, but in 1958 it fell back by as much as nearly 9 percent. The rapid expansion in world trade in industrial products, as against the much slower growth in basic products trade, finds expression in the figures for commerce between the industrialized nations and the volume of goods those states supply to non-industrialized countries.

All these factors explain why demand for products exported by the underdeveloped countries is tending to weaken. The decline

in volume of exports helps to worsen the terms of trade. This is an almost fatal phenomenon and it may be wondered whether it is not possible to reverse this trend which is causing underdeveloped countries' exports to fall back, first of all in relative value, then perhaps in absolute value.

In view of the limits to uninterrupted development of exports of basic products, the broadening of these countries' markets entails a need for them to open up outlets for their manufactured products, either in other underdeveloped countries, or even in industrialized nations.

The Problem of Semi-Industrialized Countries

A very special problem is posed for semi-industrialized countries, among which are, according to the U.N., Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Australia, India, South Africa, Finland, and Yugoslavia. At the present time, these countries account for 80 percent of industrial production outside the territories which are, properly speaking, industrialized. The rate of growth of exports of basic products from these countries has slowed down, whereas the underdeveloped countries are maintaining that rate at a normal level. It is interesting to note that the relative fall in exports for the entire group of economically weak countries is almost solely due to the eight semi-industrialized nations.

The share of these semi-industrialized countries' exports in world trade has, as a matter of fact, fallen from 9.6 percent to 6.6 percent, whereas that of other underdeveloped countries remained at about 18 percent. Production of primary materials by the eight semi-industrialized nations has risen by only 12 percent since the war, compared with a 53-percent increase for countries still at the very start of industrialization. It will be seen, then, that economic development and industrialization in these eight countries have, to a large extent, been accompanied by a tapering off in their production of exportable goods, and hence a decline in their share of developing world trade. On the one hand, it has been a fortunate coincidence that the semi-industrialized countries have slowed their primary production down at a time when the industrial countries are no longer prepared to absorb as large a volume of agricultural products and other raw materials as in the past, since the most needy countries have thus been able to avoid the losses they would have suffered if they had had to face the competition of countries now attaining a certain level of industrialization. On the other hand, however, this has not solved the underdeveloped countries' balance of payments problem, and it is the semi-industrialized countries which are feeling this problem most acutely. Efforts to develop industries have induced these nations to consume some of their raw materials themselves and restrict exports of such materials, while at the same time they have become more dependent on imports of industrial equipment. This means that they cannot continue their efforts unless they can sell on the international market the manufactured products which necessarily represent their industries of the future. The other retarded countries which have not yet really embarked on industrialization will go through an equally critical period, which gives some indication of the magnitude this problem will assume in the future.

Economic aid alone is not enough

The most immediate means of counteracting the fatal effects of the deterioration in the position and terms of trade of the economically weak nations is to be found in economic aid from industrialized countries. In this connection, some thought should be given to the vastness of the needs and the paucity of aid. An alarming revelation comes from GATT, which has estimated

that the drop in raw material prices in 1958 exceeded the amount of all forms of assistance granted by industrialized to underdeveloped countries during that year.

In other words, the recession in the United States and the setback to trade in Western Europe had the effect of canceling out the benefit which economic aid from the industrialized nations should normally have had. Such aid as was given did not permit the economically weak countries to narrow the immense gap between their economies and those of the advanced nations. It served merely to prevent the difference in living standards from growing too much more marked, to the less developed countries' disadvantage. However, it did not stop the growth of unemployment and underemployment due to demographic pressure in those countries. The free world must not blind itself to the fact that, while aid to the economically retarded countries has indeed enabled shaky ground to be held, it cannot deal effectively with the structural problems that must be solved if there is to be any tangible improvement in the situation.

The problem of loans

Economic aid is granted frequently and to a large extent in the form of loans. The economically underdeveloped nations receive such loans from the United States, Western Europe, Communist countries and international organizations. These loans come either from governments—\$2,800 million in 1956-57 from free nations—or are advanced by industrialists who supply the developing countries with industrial equipment, a contribution which had a net value of \$1,400 million in 1956. Although some of these loans are advanced by governments, rather as donations, with little expectation of repayment, there is also a wide variety of short, medium, and long-term credits. All that such loans can do is to put off the day of reckoning, but not solve the fundamental problem. Some day a loan must be repaid, and even if the rate of interest is low or nonexistent, the principal will still have to be repaid. And how can such loans be repaid, except by the recipients exporting goods or services—that is, by a better integration of these countries into international trade?

Undoubtedly international loans are most helpful. They give borrowing nations a useful respite, but provide no final solution, especially as these loans are insufficient to finance basic structural changes in the economies of the countries concerned.

Special attention, too, should be directed to private investments, the volume of which is steadily growing. However, even though some of the profits are used on the spot, lenders certainly intend later on to call in both the capital invested and the profits made. Moreover, such investments are dictated by the economic interests of the companies or businessmen who lend the money, and their interests do not always coincide with those of the countries in which the investments are made. For instance, in the case of investments made by American industry in underdeveloped countries, it will be noted that such operations are directed mainly to the exploitation of oilfields or mineral deposits, while investments in other sectors are relatively insignificant. For some time now, a certain change of front has been coming about, inasmuch as powerful industries with international connections, such as the electrical goods industry, have been establishing subsidiaries abroad, equipped with the most modern means of production. As they produce within economies lacking in purchasing power adequate to absorb their goods, such subsidiaries figure as competitors on industrialized nations' traditional foreign markets. Desirable as it may be for efficient industries to be set up in economically weak

countries, all the same their establishment should not be commanded by the financial power of large international corporations, nor be restricted to branches where the profit motive predominates over considerations of a healthy economic structure in the country concerned. Hence such investments do not aim primarily at enhancing the general prosperity of countries in process of development, nor do they contribute necessarily to raising their level of social well-being.

Orientation of the Economy Toward Integration of World Trade

It is obvious that the economically developing countries must reorient their economies, so as to fit better into the pattern of world trade. This aim may be achieved by diversification of their production, to include lines which they are well suited by nature to produce, thanks to the availability of raw materials that would otherwise be exported without having undergone any manufacturing process, and thanks to exploitation of potential sources of energy. This necessitates development of the country's economic infrastructure and a certain amount of planning as regards private investments, in order to open up markets for the future.

At the same time this integration in world trade cannot come about unless living conditions and purchasing power are improved in such countries, thus providing broader sales outlets in those nations to match the growing volume of goods they are offering on the world market.

In addition, fresh and genuine efforts must be made to sign international agreements for the stabilization of commodity prices and markets. In this manner the economically developing countries will obtain the benefit of a sounder basis for their traditional exports, which will facilitate the considerable effort they must make to diversify their economy by industrialization.

Future Prospects

According to a study effected by GATT, commodity exports of underdeveloped countries in 1953-55 were worth \$13 billion. It is likely that in 1973-75, if there is no change in industrial countries' agricultural policy, imports required will be worth \$14.5 billion, or 15 percent more, which is clearly less than the probable development of imports the retarded nations will need to finance modest economic progress. Countries most seriously affected will obviously be those which export agricultural products that can be grown in the temperate zone, but all the underdeveloped countries generally speaking run a danger of seeing their income from exports shrink distressingly, and, with it, their means of executing economic development programs. In their turn, industrialized nations will find their export outlets for manufactured goods and machinery, so much in demand in retarded countries, dwindling away.

The importance of markets in the developing countries is shown by estimates of the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe. The commodity producing nations absorb 94 percent of European exports of energy generating equipment, 89 percent of their exports of agricultural machinery, 93 percent of railway rolling stock and 75 percent of most other types of plant and machinery.

This development means that the free world faces one of two alternatives. Either the underdeveloped nations will have to abandon their economic development programs, or some solution will have to be found for the problem of maladjustment in their balance of payments. It is unthinkable that populations in those countries should be kept in their present state of want and that demographic pressure there should be allowed to go on without there being any hope of improving the lot of this vast section of humanity.

For economic, social and political reasons, some rapid solution is vital, especially as the Western World must counter the risk of extension of Communist influence in economically weak countries. As a matter of fact, Eastern Europe and Communist China have become important trading partners for the underdeveloped countries. If the problem is not solved within the framework of an agreement between the Western and the underdeveloped nations, the latter will be tempted to seek a way out by means of an agreement with the Communist countries and will turn, first of all economically and then politically, toward the nations that follow the Communist line.

The Communist Regime's Trump Cards in Trade With Economically Retarded Countries

Such a danger is all the greater, inasmuch as existing structural conditions may promote development of this kind. The U.S.S.R., its satellites in Europe and China, have channeled their economic development in a diametrically opposite direction to that of the West, by forcing on heavy industries, perhaps to an excessive degree. Today, by slowing down even very slightly their rate of military output, they can make available a considerable surplus of the capital goods and machinery needed by underdeveloped nations for their economic advancement. On the other hand, the Communist countries have neglected to develop their primary production and, still more so, their output of consumer goods. As regards output of primary products, they have adopted the same process as have most semi-industrialized countries; their industrialization has proceeded at the expense of primary production, besides which they have devoted greater efforts than have the semi-industrialized nations to building up heavy industry.

At the present day, therefore, Communist countries are in a position, on the one hand, to deliver almost all the plant and machinery required by underdeveloped countries and, on the other hand, to absorb almost limitlessly the agricultural products, raw materials and even the industrial consumer goods which the underdeveloped or semi-industrialized nations wish to export and have difficulty in selling to the West.

Thus there is coming about, between the underdeveloped and Communist countries a stream of trade strangely reminiscent of that witnessed at the beginning of the 19th century between Great Britain and the raw material producing countries. At that time, Britain had developed its consumer goods industries and put a brake on agricultural output; it exported its surplus of manufactured products and purchased almost all its foodstuffs and raw materials from underdeveloped countries. Soviet Russia, Eastern European countries, and Communist China, without having consciously intended to do so and simply as a result of the direction in which their economies have been developing, now find themselves in the same key position as was occupied by Britain at the start of last century. Those countries are now in a position to increase more and more their trade with underdeveloped nations, and there is a possibility that trade with Communist countries in the East may progressively come to occupy the place in underdeveloped nations' trade that was formerly held by trade with the West.

The growing volume of Soviet trade, especially with underdeveloped countries, is made clear by 1958 import and export figures which, at 34,600 million rubles (\$8,650 million) were 3.9 percent above 1957 figures. Trade with other Communist countries rose by 4 percent—from 24,500 million rubles to 25,500 million, and with the rest of the world by 3.7 percent—from 8,800 million rubles to 9,100 million. The biggest increases in Soviet trade with non-Communist countries occurred in South America and

Southeast Asia. Trade with Uruguay was up by 65.7 percent on 1957, India 43 percent, Indonesia 53.5 percent, Malaya 138.4 percent, and Japan 122 percent.

A typical instance is the new Japan-Soviet trade agreement, which was signed in December 1958. The greatly increased volume of trade provided for in that treaty reached half the annual figure of \$77 million agreed on within the space of 5 months only from the date of signing the treaty.

Economic aid from Communist countries

Contrary to the practice followed with American aid, nations in the Eastern bloc, with very few exceptions, do not make donations, but rather grant credits, bearing low rates of interest, as a rule 2½ percent, which represents favorable terms by international standards, or in exceptional cases, as little as 2 percent. In addition, experts are sent out to such countries to provide technical assistance. According to the Dillon Report, in the second half of 1957 no less than 2,300 technicians and engineers spent 1 month or longer in 19 different countries. Reversing the case, some 2,000 technical staff and students from the developing nations attended Soviet universities or spent time in appropriate factories in the same year.

Looking at the matter from another angle, the grants of credit which are the usual form of Soviet-Chinese economic aid place developing nations in a somewhat unfavorable position, and indeed one which is often criticized by them, since such credits are not made available for the purchase of goods to be freely selected, but must be used to procure goods from the Soviet Union only, in fact almost exclusively products of the heavy industry, if not armaments. On top of this, such credits are mostly subject to the condition that they must be repaid, when they fall due, in production goods. With such restrictive terms, these credits, despite the low rate of interest of 2½ percent or 2 percent do not always seem particularly advantageous. Besides, there have been instances where goods promised could not be delivered because the country granting the credit had to meet its own investment needs first, and where the quality and choice offered by Soviet goods was criticized. The prices charged are quite unrelated to international competition, being unilaterally determined by the Soviet Union. Insofar as nations which accept credits are forced to concentrate their exports for a long time to come on the Soviet-dominated area, in order to repay such credits, they forfeit the chance to maintain their traditional position on free markets.

From July 1954 to February 1958 the Sino-Soviet bloc granted to developing countries credits, both medium and long-term, worth \$1,947 million. Of these, \$1,569 million were credits for economic purposes, while \$378 million were for military aid. By way of comparison, it may be noted that up till the present the World Bank has granted to over 30 developing countries credits roughly equal in amount to aid granted by the Soviet Union. In addition, American credits, offered both by the Government and by private bodies, to 20 countries in Asia and the Middle East from 1954 till February 1958 amounted to some \$3 billion.

Despite the potential threat, referred to above, represented by the possibility of the Soviet Union's trading with nations in process of development, its export capacity and hence its scope for increasing credits to such countries outside the Eastern bloc remain limited, although the gross social product of the Soviet Union has been increasing at an annual rate of about 7 percent. However, its industrial production has been rising faster than the gross social product, which was estimated in 1957 to be about \$170 billion. The industrial capacity of the Eastern bloc is bolstered up by highly industrialized nations, such as Czechoslovakia, Eastern

Germany, and Poland. China, despite the less developed state of its industry and its low living standards combined with rapidly increasing population, has also contributed to increase the industrial potential of the Eastern bloc. With an estimated gross social product of only \$40 billion, China's share must remain relatively modest.

The political complexion of economic aid from the Eastern bloc is well illustrated by the fact that the only nonrepayable advances made by Communist China, totaling \$55 million donated to Ceylon, Egypt, Cambodia, and Nepal, were granted in return for those countries' recognition of the Peiping government.

If the West fails to find a proper solution for problems involved in the trade gap between the industrialized and underdeveloped nations, the latter will not stop their economic development, but will simply trade rather with Communist-thinking nations. This is hardly a pleasant prospect. For the West, besides the purely economic and commercial consequences of this reorientation of trade, entailing the loss of important markets for its engineering industries, there would be a far more serious danger—not only for the West, but also for the underdeveloped countries themselves—that a major part of the world would become economically dependent on countries where the political outweighs the economic motive. Ultimately the underdeveloped nations would fall into the clutches of communism, thus missing the chance to evolve a state of well-being while at the same time safeguarding freedom and human dignity.

Hesitation of Economically Weak Countries To Fall Into Communist Orbit

If the underdeveloped countries were to supply their vital industries with plant and machinery purchased from Communist countries, the latter could bring effective political pressure to bear by ceasing their deliveries. From one day to the next a totalitarian country can stop its imports or exports, thus upsetting the whole economic life of any nation which may have been so rash as to become utterly dependent on that particular supplier.

Accordingly, tempting as they may be, offers made by the Eastern European countries to certain nations in Asia and elsewhere are not always accepted by the developing countries, which hesitate to equip themselves with plant and machinery obtained in Eastern Europe. For industrialized countries in the free world, this represents a factor favorable to economic cooperation, but it is one which imposes certain obligations on them.

For instance, India, while it has agreed to have a steelworks built and equipped by Russian engineers and financed with Russian credits, has at the same time concluded deals with Western German and British firms for the construction of two other steelworks included in its program, apart from extensions to be made with U.S. aid at an existing steelworks. It might seem that this prudence was not inspired solely by technical considerations, but that India felt it was wise not to let its industry depend exclusively on supplies from a country in which trade is dictated by political objectives.

If countries which benefit by financial aid from totalitarian nations feel such doubts, might not the Western countries find it to their best interests to prevent the problem of underdeveloped nations' trade imbalance being settled by understandings with the Eastern bloc? While it may seem an easy way out to let trade grow with the East at the expense of trade with the West, this abdication would have extremely serious political and economic repercussions for the whole of the free world.

How To Remedy This Situation

Faced with these problems, the free world must take action. One form of possible ac-

tion is already underway, but it is unfortunately inadequate. That is financial aid. In spite of the ingenious granting of donations for humanitarian purposes and loans advanced either by international banks or special funds, such as SUNFED, at very low rates of interest, up till the present little more than mere stopgaps have been provided. If financial aid is to constitute a lasting solution, the industrialized nations must be prepared to take all the underdeveloped countries under their wing, not for 5 or 10 years, but for an indefinite period, and they must undertake to make good the deficit in the underdeveloped countries' balance of trade, since that deficit is unlikely to be compensated for in any other manner within the near future.

With this in view, efforts to promote international coordination of development aid should be encouraged. Moves to that end are now underway, through the establishment of an International Development Association, which would be closely linked with the World Bank. Such a multilateral institute, in which highly industrialized nations, especially Western European countries, would participate side by side with the United States, could provide funds for development projects in countries in process of industrialization, these funds to be repayable in local currencies, as is the practice in the American Development Loan Fund. This latter body, which suffers from the disadvantage of being purely American, would be replaced by the International Development Association, thus making it possible to "internationalize" development aid, which would offer advantages, not only of a financial, but also of a political nature.

A second measure to facilitate the provision of such aid would be a world investment convention, which would fix the rules of conduct for the granting and acceptance of credits to underdeveloped countries, and which all nations concerned would be free to join. Such a convention is the proposal advanced by an all-party committee of Members of the British House of Commons, under the chairmanship of Mr. Creech Jones, former Colonial Minister in the Labor government. The committee's report stresses that a world investment convention should pay as much heed to the rights of borrowers as of lenders, for the former fear exploitation as much as those who provide capital fear confiscation or unfair discrimination.

Also to be borne in mind is the need for industrialized countries, by wise economic policy, to prevent at all costs any setback or recession in their economies which, as the recent past has proved, strikes a direct blow at underdeveloped countries. It is through economic expansion and constant prosperity in industrial countries that the conditions will be created and the necessary means will be found to promote the economic development of retarded nations.

Once again, it is well to repeat, among measures required to be taken, the need to conclude international agreements for the purpose of stabilizing commodity prices and markets.

The experience of recent years shows that semi-industrialized countries are reducing their exports of primary products, but have available exportable surpluses of manufactured products, such as textiles and other consumer goods. If structural changes come about in the retarded countries' economies, the industrial nations will have to adjust their economies also, either by reducing protectionism in certain branches which, by the nature of things, are in a state of decline, or by lowering the sometimes excessive taxes levied, for instance on coffee, tea, and cocoa.

Clearly those sections of advanced nations' economies which suffer from the repercussions of such structural changes must be assisted by the community as a whole in their efforts to convert to other forms of activity and to reabsorb their labor in jobs with a more secure future.

As they stimulate, or even deliberately bring about readjustment in their economies, the advanced nations must develop their plant and machinery producing industries, for these will provide exportable surpluses; at the same time, they must slow down expansion of certain consumer goods industries, including some forms of manufacturing, which should be prepared to face growing competition on their home markets.

Any trade policy that aims at mutual prosperity demands a minimum amount of solidarity. No country can refuse the advantages of the international division of labor without endangering its own living standards, nor can any country enjoy those advantages unless it is willing to cooperate closely with others.

Obviously it is not by donations and financial aid alone that the industrial nations will solve the extremely knotty problem of raising living standards in retarded nations to acceptable levels, for the imbalance outstrips in magnitude the resources of national treasuries. There must be closer and frank collaboration between the two groups of countries, in order to insure that their economies are dovetailed in world trade patterns.

The pursuing of this aim constitutes a political problem of primary importance, which governments and enlightened sections of the population should explain to public opinion, in an attempt to solve it as rapidly as possible. In the absence of early correction of the trend to imbalance in trade between industrialized and underdeveloped countries, the consequences may be very grave indeed for the free world.

B. Problems in economically advanced parts of the world

Now that attention has been directed to economic developments in poor countries and the problems involved there for the free world, it is necessary, so as to throw light on all aspects of world economy and their effects on the various individual nations and regions, to point out the economic position of advanced parts of the world, as regards its general trends.

First of all it must be remembered that the group of economically weak nations contained in Asia, Latin America, the West Indies and Africa account for more than three-quarters of the population in the free world; their people number 1.2 billion human beings who live under appalling conditions. Apart from that group, there are Australia and New Zealand, whose exports are largely made up of agricultural produce. Australia, for instance, regards the meat and wool checks as a major item in its balance of payments, as does New Zealand, together with income from dairy products. However, the per capita national income of these two countries is among the highest in the world, being greater than that of most European countries. Two countries in the midst of striking industrial development are the Union of South Africa and Japan. The latter, despite its industrial population's low living standards, is ranked in Asia among the most important industrial nations.

Specific problems connected with the state of trade and trading relations must be faced in the most advanced parts of the free world; namely, the United States and Western Europe. In view of the growing importance these problems are assuming for the labor movement, it is becoming vital to analyze carefully a situation which is, to some extent, absolutely new since the economic reconstruction of Europe.

Key Position Occupied by United States and European Economies in State of World Trade

It is an old saying that if the American economy sneezes, European economy catches a cold. This proved to be correct in 1958, when the recession in the United States was followed in Europe by stagnation, indeed a

downturn in trade, which revived simultaneously in both continents.

Since the 1958 recession in the United States and the trade setback in Europe caused such a deterioration in underdeveloped countries' economic situation that financial aid, even though on an increased scale, was insufficient to compensate fully for the adverse effects on the needy countries' balances of payments, it is vital for the two industrialized continents to pursue an economic and trade policy designed to avoid to the utmost possible extent any unfortunate turn of trade.

Western Europe Is the Cornerstone for Developing Countries

After the United States had so generously aided in the revival of European economy, this has reached the point where its activity has become more important than that of the United States for the economically underdeveloped lands. In Western Europe the trade-to-production ratio is much higher than in North America; Western Europe's trade is also much more diversified, both as regards range of products and its structure related to the various geographical regions.

Total f.o.b. value of imports in 1953-55 was 30 percent of the value of production in Western Europe, compared with 9 percent in the United States and Canada. Taking the United States alone, the percentage was as low as 6.5 percent. In absolute figures, U.S. imports in 1957 were valued at \$12,921 million, as against \$46,973 million for imports of OEEC countries.

The fact that Western Europe is much more dependent than is North America on imports, as may be seen from the above figures, is likewise made clear by the greater diversity of those imports, especially of basic commodities. As a matter of fact, imports into North America, especially the United States, are concentrated mainly on a relatively limited number of basic products.

Hence the number of countries that supply goods to Western Europe is much larger than those which sell to North America. In 1953-55, Western Europe's imports accounted for 45 percent of the total value of exports from nonindustrialized regions, especially those having basic products for sale, whereas North American imports made up only 22 percent of those countries' exports.

Taken on the whole, variations in the volume of imports are largely in keeping with fluctuations in the volume of industrial output, both in Western Europe and North America. (See table below.) This means that any given fluctuation one way or another in the industrial activity of Western Europe would have wider effects on basic products supplying countries' export income—and hence on international trade—than the same amount of fluctuation in the state of trade in North America. Thus the maintenance of prosperity and continuity of economic development in Western Europe is a key factor for world economy as a whole, in particular for nonindustrialized regions which derive almost the whole of their income from exports.

Volume of imports and industrial production from 1948 to 1956
[1953=100]

	United States		Western Europe	
	Imports	Industrial production	Imports	Industrial production
1948.....	78	78	73	69
1949.....	76	72	79	79
1950.....	92	84	89	86
1951.....	91	90	96	95
1952.....	96	93	93	95
1953.....	100	100	100	100
1954.....	93	93	111	110
1955.....	103	104	125	120
1956.....	111	107	134	125

The following figures illustrate Western Europe's growing importance as a prop to general efforts to promote development of economically retarded areas. From 1953 to 1957, imports into Western Europe increased by 65 percent, as against a 17.5 percent increase in American imports and a 41 percent increase in imports of the free world in general.

Structure of Trading Relations Between the United States and Western Europe

Trade between the United States and Western Europe, especially the six Community countries, is marked by a surplus of European imports of basic commodities and investment goods, while for consumer goods and semifinished articles European exports to North America are strikingly in excess of imports of those goods into Europe.

This points to a structural equalization which has developed more and more in recent years between the advanced economies of these two continents. Care must be taken not to upset the balance, so as to prevent either side, but especially Western Europe, which is more susceptible to fluctuations in its partner's economy, from suffering setbacks in the state of trade, both in their own interests and in that of overall world economy. On the other hand, it is clearly rather risky for European economies to build up their markets, above all for durable consumer goods, in North America, for this would render them too sensitive to economic fluctuations there. The reason why Western Europe is directing such branches of trade, like the automobile industry, preferably to the U.S. market, is that the developing countries do not possess the purchasing power necessary to absorb these nonessential products. It may be also that Western Europe's own purchasing power is not growing fast enough to keep up with the development of certain durable consumer goods industries.

The high index for the volume of U.S. imports in 1950 results wholly from raw materials and semifinished products imported on account of stockpiling of strategic materials.

Every effort must therefore be made to enable the retarded countries to progress rapidly and earn the foreign exchange they need, by trading with advanced countries in the free world, so they can absorb a growing share of Western Europe's manufactures. Europe would be deluding itself if it were to seek to practice a policy of self-sufficiency in trade with the United States, as a measure of protection against the effects of any economic fluctuations in America, for it should bear in mind that the nonindustrialized countries will not be able to absorb all the output of its manufacturing industries. The economies of the two advanced continents should thus be made to serve as a mutual stimulus in their efforts to achieve expansion. This means that they must agree on a positive solution for problems which may arise in any branches where one continent's manufacturing industry may do injury to the other's, for lack of adequate markets in third countries still in the initial stages of development. It will greatly help to solve such problems if Western European countries and North America can succeed in maintaining their economies in a state of expansion.

If, on the other hand, trade between the United States and Western Europe were to meet obstacles, that would make it difficult for Western Europe to market its manufactured products and would force European countries to trade to a much greater extent with countries in the Eastern bloc. Hitherto, however, such trade has proved extremely difficult, because the U.S.S.R. and its satellites cannot offer the goods Western Europe needs most, and also because of the absence of a reliable basis for trade, so that buyers

cannot count on receiving regular supplies in major quantities. Besides this, trade relations between Western European and Communist countries are on an individual bilateral basis, thus creating difficulties in the way of settling reciprocal trade accounts. Austria, for instance, has had to grant to the five Danubian Communist states large credits, which it is having much trouble in getting reimbursed. Last but not least, there would be a risk of protests against dumping by Communist countries in Western Europe; indeed, this has already created no slight trouble for various European countries' industries.

Economic Integration Must Come About in a Setting of Expansion

If Western Europe wishes to insure balanced trading relations with the United States, it must integrate its national economies in order to strengthen its position. In this manner, it will broaden its domestic market by supplying goods on better terms to its consumers. What will the effects of such economic integration be on third countries?

A study made by GATT has shown that, from 1951 to 1955, the liberation of inter-European trade has not caused imports of products of European origin to increase faster than imports from other sources. The reason for this trend is to be sought in the marked and constant improvement that took place in the state of trade during those years.

In prosperous times, unprotected imports—that is, imports which do not enjoy any preferential tariffs, such as those from the Commonwealth—have been able to develop satisfactorily, with the result that the special treatment granted by Common Market countries to their overseas territories should not prove too serious a handicap, in good times, to other commodity exporting nations.

This makes plain the crucial importance of the steady development of economic activity among the six, as also among other Western European countries. That development must be a long-term one and must cover the whole transitional period which will lead, after 12 to 15 years, to the ultimate achievement of the Common Market. It is true that the probable effect of the Common Market on the various products and various countries will of course be very different from one to the other. However, the GATT study concludes that there is reason to think, generally speaking, that the Common Market will have beneficial effects on international trade and that the harmful effects of the discrimination inevitable during the transitional period will be reduced to a minimum, subject to the reasonable assumption that, during that period and subsequently, the Common Market will make a positive contribution to maintaining and even speeding up the constant increase in output of all the six countries together.

If, on the other hand, plans for economic integration in Europe were to be executed under unfavorable conditions, the developing countries would be exposed to trade discrimination of a kind likely to prejudice their advancement seriously.

As the second largest industrial producer in order of size and as the territory most dependent on imports, Western Europe, by achieving a healthy development of trade thanks to economic integration, will be able to turn its wealth in the form of its men of science, technicians and highly skilled labor force to good account for a valuable contribution toward placing world economy on a sound footing.

Striking Increase in U.S. Private Investments Abroad

In the past, the United States experienced dynamic development of its economy, thanks to rapid expansion of its domestic market. After the Second World War, the collapse

of Germany, the accumulated need in European countries that lay in ruins, and destruction in Japan, induced the United States to take a greater interest in the international market. Since that time, the cold war has stimulated exports. However, the free countries, which were short of hard currency, were temporarily forced to impose rather severe restrictions on imports from the dollar area, which has caused American companies to invest large sums of money abroad, where they have set up subsidiaries. Those investments were channeled into the production of raw materials and the building of factories for fabricating purposes, which served the interests of U.S. foreign trade.

This policy began to take clear shape as long ago as 1950, and has assumed marked proportions in recent years, for such investments rose from \$1,211 million in 1955 to \$2,980 million in 1956, \$3,211 million in 1957 and \$2,924 million in 1958. Even assuming (as the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. estimates) that there is a 5 percent increase in the 1959 figure over that for 1958, this will still mean that American oversea investments in 1959 will be 5 percent lower than in 1957. However, according to the same source, prospects are that there will be a certain decline in such investments in 1960. Although the finished goods manufacturing industry is expected to invest \$957 million abroad in 1959, equal to 26 percent more than in 1958, that figure will probably fall back in the following year to \$888 million. As always, oil company investments account for the lion's share.

Apart from American investment interest in Latin America, India, and Japan, the establishment of subsidiaries is at present concentrated on Europe. In 1960 the finished goods manufacturing industry will place 47 percent of its foreign investments in European countries, whereas in 1957 and 1958 more than 50 percent of those investments went to Canada and South America, with less than 40 percent for Europe. American firms reckon on being able to benefit from the economic expansion expected as a result of European integration, besides which they seek to protect themselves in this way against the disadvantages of the six-country customs union. In actual fact, these countries' tariffs on imports from non-Community countries like the United States will be maintained and indeed, in some instances, even increased as a result of uniformity in their rates. The free trade area among the Outer Seven European countries will also lead to the gradual abolition of tariffs amongst themselves, but will not bring any decrease in tariffs imposed in trade with the outside world.

These U.S. investments have already grown to such an extent that the turnover of American subsidiaries abroad is already considerably higher than the value of American exports. It is primarily big American firms which are engaging in such operations, through branches, commercial companies, or plants working with American patents, often with large American capital invested. Ninety-nine percent of major American enterprises have interests abroad, either in the form of direct shares of some other type of activity.

It is primarily oil companies, steel firms, nonferrous metals producers, automobile firms, rubber manufacturers, internationally integrated electrical engineering corporations, agricultural machinery makers, pharmaceutical and foodstuffs firms which are establishing productive facilities abroad. Some 3,000 American firms have invested large sums of money in production and distribution facilities abroad, to say nothing of the existence in oversea territories of American research institutes, sales organizations, and branch banks. Investments al-

ready made amount to nearly \$59 billion. Their 1958 turnover figure was \$30 billion, while nonmilitary exports for 1958 were worth \$17 billion, compared with \$12 billion in 1949.

American industry's interest in the European market is evidenced by the two following examples. The first is the establishment of a roller bearing factory, set up in Colmar, France, by the Timkim Co., and the second is the building of a chemicals plant in Italy, with the participation of the Edison Co. of Milan. These new installations will serve as a base for American companies' operations within the Common Market.

As regards projects for European integration on a wider scale than that of the six countries, mention may be made of the efforts of the Aluminum Co. of America and the Reynolds Metals Co. to gain control of the British aluminium industry.

The stiffest competition by American capital in Europe is occurring in the petroleum and electrical engineering industries.

Other instances of intensified American investment activity throughout the free world are the construction by Kaiser Steel of an aluminium plant in India and the establishment by Ford of a motor vehicle factory in Australia to compete with General Motors.

U.S. Economy Face to Face With Greater Foreign Production

In its commercial dealings, the American economy constantly shows an excess of exports over imports, as also an excess in invisible earnings. This is illustrated by the following figures:

[In millions of dollars]

	Credit balance in trade	Credit balance in invisible earnings ¹
1950.....	1,009	1,856
1951.....	2,921	3,534
1952.....	2,481	3,757
1953.....	1,291	2,355
1954.....	2,445	3,849
1955.....	2,753	4,304
1956.....	4,530	5,981
1957.....	6,036	8,354
1958.....	3,263	5,232

¹ Excluding defense expenditure abroad and U.S. military aid to other countries.

The United States also accounts for an important share of world exports of manufactured products, as may be seen below:

[Percentage of total value]

	United States	Great Britain	Germany	Japan
1951.....	26.5	22.0	10.0	4.3
1952.....	26.2	21.6	12.0	3.8
1953.....	25.9	21.3	13.3	3.8
1954.....	25.1	20.4	14.8	4.7
1955.....	24.5	19.7	15.4	5.1
1956.....	25.2	19.1	16.4	5.7
1957.....	25.4	18.1	17.5	5.9
1958.....	23.2	18.0	18.6	6.0

Despite a relative decline in these exports, the drop in 1957 was only 1.1 percent compared with 1951. Thus the United States is holding its ground fairly well, if compared with Great Britain, especially if growing competition from the German Federal Republic and Japan is taken into account. On the other hand, losses suffered by the United States in 1958 are considerable, which shows that it was most affected by the difficulties in world trade in that year.

The proportion of the world total represented by all kinds of exports from the United States was 17.2 percent in 1958, which meant only a slight loss compared with the 1950 figure of 17.7 percent, but was a greater setback as against the higher percentages

achieved in 1956 and 1957. Year-to-year figures are:

U.S. share, as percentage

1950.....	17.7	1955.....	17.1
1951.....	18.5	1956.....	18.7
1952.....	18.4	1957.....	19.4
1953.....	17.0	1958.....	17.2
1954.....	17.0		

Part of the decline in U.S. exports in 1958 was due to a cyclical decline in raw materials, fuels and metals. Another factor was the great dependence on the Canadian market, where imports of manufactured goods decline rather sharply during recession periods. The 1958 export figures look particularly unfavorable if compared with 1957, when U.S. exports reached an unusually high level, owing to the Suez crisis. It is very likely that, as world economy resumes its expansion, American exports, especially of manufactured goods, will again improve their position considerably.

These figures show that establishment of production facilities abroad has not led to any real difficulties as regards either exports or the balance of payments.

In considering the above figures on the U.S. relative position in world trade in post-war years, two other important aspects have to be taken into account. Firstly, the recent GATT report reveals that the U.S. share of world production (excluding Eastern Europe, U.S.S.R. and Communist China), which was 44 percent in 1948, had dropped by 1954 to 40.5 percent. This means that despite its strong position in world production, since 1948 the United States has been steadily losing its power of expansion. The loss in its share of world production, however, is at least as great, if not greater, than the loss suffered in its share of world trade.

Secondly, the U.S. share in world production (again excluding Eastern Europe, the U.S.S.R. and Communist China) was 30 percent in 1938 and, for the same year, its share in world trade, according to GATT, was 11 percent. Thus the United States is still in a greatly improved position, as compared with prewar years.

This whole evolution shows that American management's arguments that inflation is cutting them out of world markets are unfounded. Another proof that such claims have no justification may be found in the Consumer Price Index worked out by the I.L.O. Taking 1953 as 100, the index for May 1958 is: United States 108, Great Britain 120, France 121, Germany 111, Sweden 119, and Japan 108.

With the revival of productive power in other countries, the United States will, of course, be more exposed to international competition.

Notwithstanding the positive factors in favor of the U.S. economy, it has shown a constant deficit in its general balance of payments ever since 1950, except for 1957, the year following the Suez crisis. That deficit has evidenced itself in a decline in gold reserves, as illustrated below.

Gold reserves held by the United States
[In millions of dollars]

Year	Amount	Year	Amount
1952.....	23,252	1956.....	22,058
1953.....	22,091	1957.....	22,857
1954.....	21,793	1958.....	20,582
1955.....	21,752		

The reasons for this deficit are, on the one hand, the increased exodus of capital to finance private investments abroad and, on the other hand, the rise in loans and military equipment supplies, combined with the U.S. economic aid program, the amount of which has increased from \$4,742 million in 1950 to \$8,449 million in 1958. To these factors must be added the relative rise in imports, partly due to greater purchases of

manufactures, especially from Japan and Western Europe. The value of American imports is:

	<i>In millions</i>
1951.....	\$10,921
1955.....	11,410
1956.....	12,645
1957.....	13,108
1958.....	12,913

Bearing these various factors in mind, the permanent deficit in the U.S. balance of payments and its steady loss of gold cannot be regarded as disturbing signs, and all the more so since there has been an unbroken influx of gold into the United States during postwar years, a situation which is now being corrected. Moreover, as noted above, the return of that gold is partially due to the investment of capital abroad, investments which, in coming years, will bring in fresh earnings of foreign exchange.

As a matter of fact, the United States is an important lender of capital to world economy, its holdings abroad amounting to \$58.9 billion, not counting the Treasury's stocks of gold. That sum of money, which compares with only \$20.8 billion of foreign holdings in the United States, constitutes a source of growing revenue to swell the credit side of the U.S. balance of payments, and testifies to the strong position of the American dollar.

This tendency to increase exports of private American capital and Government expenditure in foreign currency is a development which would be desirable in itself, since it provides a stimulus to economic activity throughout the world. The only thing is that care must be taken to see that these investments are well placed in the economic and social interests of beneficiary countries, and that Government aid represents true economic aid, with no strings of a military nature tied to it. These two conditions are being satisfied to a limited extent only, so that some remedy is needed, if the free world's position is to be strengthened.

Growing Competition From Abroad and Its Effects on Employment in the United States

For the American economy as a whole and for American labor in particular increasing imports of finished products present a special problem. Abroad there have grown up manufacturing establishments which are fully competitive with American products, even on their own domestic market, from the point of view of technical perfection, inventive skill, and quality.

So as to be competitive and attain the maximum profitability, modern firms in Europe and Japan are seeking to expand their sales on the world market, even for special products sold in relatively limited numbers. For these such a broad economic area as the United States is of particular interest. A further factor that weighs with them are the better conditions for payment, for their exports to developing countries mean taking great risks in some cases, and supplying goods on credit. How far they are more favorably placed as a result of having lower production costs than those in the United States is a matter which would have to be ascertained in each case individually. Whereas in some instances they may enjoy an advantage through lower wages, not fully outweighed by lower productivity, this is certainly not generally true. Other factors, such as higher material costs and capital charges, may also tip the scales against European industries. Cost of transport to the United States and distribution costs, which are higher in this market for exporters, must likewise be taken into account. However, it may be a point in favor of European exports that, in certain sectors, they are thrusting into a market on which

a handful of powerful corporations maintain arbitrary price levels, now threatened by these exports.

Among these exports, however, are now to be found products of subsidiary companies erected abroad through private American investments. In various cases such subsidiaries serve not only to open up new markets, but often import goods into the United States at considerably lower than domestic prices. In so doing, they do bring a threat to American production and to the jobs of labor employed in the industries affected. By the capital gains they make through their subsidiaries, however, the big corporations can escape some of the consequences. This kind of development is proceeding especially in light electrical engineering.

An instance of this investment policy by American companies is to be found in transistor radio production. International General Electric, a section of General Electric, has announced a new export program. The corporation has signed with the Tokyo Shibara Electric Co. Ltd. an agreement whereby the Japanese company, in which General Electric has a dominant interest, will undertake production of transistors, electric appliances, valves, radio and television sets, to be offered for sale on the markets of third countries with the trademark "General Electric, Made in Japan." Vacuum tubes and transistors which, 3 years ago, American companies were supplying to Japan, are now being purchased from Japan by those same companies.

Another instance is the Wright Sewing Machine Co., which has transferred some of its production to Japan and is now importing products bearing its own name from there.

Pressure of foreign competition in the U.S. market is most striking in the automobile industry. Here much of the competition is coming from European automobile factories which are independent of American capital, such as the state-owned West German Volkswagen works, the nationalized Renault works in France, Fiat in Italy, etc. The two first-named firms, in particular, account for a significant share of sharply increased European exports. In addition, however, British General Motors and the German Opel works, in which substantial American capital is invested, have a large share in the increased exports. The Opel works, wholly owned by the American General Motors Corp., in the financial year 1958 exported out of its enormous profits DM66.25 million as a cash dividend to the sole shareholder in Detroit, besides which it increased its share capital by DM40 million, which is equivalent again to a handsome increase in net worth.

The European motor industry's success on the American market is attributable to the demand for small cars. The price, which can be substantially lower for a smaller car, even if it has advantages of quality and other features, but still not mean unfair competition, is not the only deciding factor. Other aspects, such as practical shape of the car, more in keeping with the customer's taste, better qualities for easy handling and parking, and lower maintenance costs also weigh heavily. The extent to which these factors have been responsible for the success of European automobile exports to the United States will become evident as soon as the big American manufacturers put their own small cars on the market. Already high sales figures for the Rambler and the small Studebaker, even at the depth of the recession, show that these factors do play a major part. It is perfectly feasible that the big American auto corporations, which last year also

suffered a resounding setback with their direct exports, may with their new models not only achieve increased sales on the domestic market, but again become competitors to be reckoned with on the world market.

The importance of such factors as quality and suitability of products in competition may be illustrated by the results of a survey among employers in the German Federal Republic, regarding the reasons for their success with exports. Eighty-four percent of engineering firms quoted good quality as the reason. With 42 percent, price came a long way behind, followed by service to customers with 33 percent, advertising with 28 percent, and prompt delivery dates with 27 percent. Government export promotion schemes came last, with 5 percent.¹

As a good argument against higher tariffs, one may quote the example of Scandinavian countries which, although the lowest tariff countries in Europe, have built up the highest living standards on the continent.

These examples make it clear that protectionist arguments cannot be lightly cited, as is constantly done by industries in importing countries, but that accurate, objective inquiries are requisite in each individual case. First of all, there is a need to ascertain what will be the long-term, structural effects of imports. Here the primary subject of inquiry must be whether competition that is unfair on account of the labor standards in relation to productivity does actually represent a threat to the importing country's industry, as regards both its present and future employment opportunities, and future wage trends consonant with improvements in productivity to be achieved subsequently.

In their attitude to trade policy, American companies are extremely inconsistent, depending on their own individual interests. Whereas in light electrical engineering they pursue a policy of free imports, since they indemnify themselves through their foreign capital interests, in the heavy electrical equipment sector, on the other hand, they speak for protectionism, by demanding preferential treatment in the awarding of contracts, by virtue of Government authorities' verdicts, so as to be able to maintain their high prices without risking loss of business.

Greater sales of foreign products on the American market, especially if they lead to keener, but fair, competition, must be regarded as a positive factor. Such increased sales could put a stop to arbitrary price policies in certain monopolistic price sectors.

Where, however, competition is unfair, due to wages in the foreign firm being far too low in proportion to the level of productivity, or where the case concerns transfer abroad of a section of production in order to benefit by lower labor standards and possibly lower taxation there, then American labor is being placed at a disadvantage, which is not in the economic interests of the importing country and must therefore, in all justice, be put right through effective measures. Success in export trade due to low wages is of no benefit to labor in the exporting country either; on the contrary, it exposes those workers to constant pressure on wages. Nor does the transfer of production facilities elsewhere than any given company's country of origin benefit labor in developing territories. In such countries, labor standards continue to be kept low, regardless of modern means of production, for after all those low labor standards are the very factor which leads to transfer of facilities. Nor does it serve the best interests of the developing

¹ Percentages total more than 100, due to repetitions of some factors.

nation's economy as a whole, because, with exports of this nature, it can only create difficulties in the path of industrialized countries' economic development, without the country to which facilities are transferred being able to integrate itself into world trade by developing a market of its own.

Assimilation of Productivity as Between Individual Large Production Units in Different Countries

As a result of the far-flung international ramifications of big corporations, especially in various branches of the metal industry, there has come about with some products a certain uniformity in productivity advances in the various countries. Though this leveling up may perhaps not always apply as between countries' entire branches of industry, it certainly may be noted as between leading firms. Extensive new production units in Western Europe have been erected in recent years in keeping with the latest technical knowledge, so that they attain a standard of competitiveness above the average for the given country's industry. Such plants are being built in the developing territories as well. As this leads to productivity levels as between leading plants in particular branches of industry approximating, at high rates, more closely to one another, labor costs and fringe benefits in the various countries are coming to be a factor of growing importance, side by side with differences in background conditions, some of them determined by nature, such as in the supply of materials and energy. On the other hand, labor costs are dwindling in relative importance, as a result of steadily progressing rationalization and higher investment outlay.

Now the very plants which are trying to make higher productivity possible by greater sales of products, which must be offered on the export market, are the most modern, high-capacity establishments. If such plants attain a rate of productivity far higher than the average in their branch of industry and, even more, higher than that throughout the economy as a whole, they obtain a competitive advantage based on labor costs that are far too low in relation to this higher than average productivity. Such firms are in a position to grant labor standards that are exemplary by comparison with the social conditions prevailing in their country, for the latter are generally related to the national average level of productivity. Even so, these firms can still enjoy a substantial advantage in total labor costs and fringe benefits over socially more progressive countries, because, in terms of their productivity, labor's share of total business returns remains unduly low, since even model labor standards are always kept to a scale largely determined by general economic conditions.

This is a problem which does not concern the United States alone. The more progressive European countries face similar problems within an integrated European market and, to an even greater extent, in their trade relations with the developing countries.

Need for Guarantees to Insure Fair Labor Standards

The aim of free trade must be to stimulate countries' economies by the exchange of wealth between nations, and enable them to develop rapidly and achieve general prosperity. Efforts to bring about free trade, however, can succeed and broaden the world's markets only if purchasing power in advanced countries can be maintained and further improved, and is not undermined by competition based on lower labor standards which cannot be excused on the grounds of

other disadvantages suffered by any industry or a considerably lower level of productivity.

It is essential for equivalent social progress, improving the lot of the millions of people living in dire want, to go hand in hand with the relative increase in developing countries' productivity and the reinforcement of their economies. If productivity shows relative improvement in some branches only of developing nations' industry, appropriate steps must be taken to spread these economic benefits over such countries' populations in general.

If economically quite unjustifiably low labor standards in the developing countries threaten relatively high labor standards and job opportunities in the advanced nations, this will cause suffocation of purchasing power, which will do an ill service to the objective of economic and social improvement throughout the world.

The industrialized countries have their own grave problems. They must do their utmost, while making sure that their economies lose nothing of their dynamism, to bring about between the supply of goods produced, expansion of capacity, and growth of purchasing that proper balance necessary to maintain economic progress and a healthy state of trade. Should the developing countries oppose them with an economic competition not concerned with the expansion of those countries' own domestic markets through the social progress which could be achieved thanks to better means of production, then the free world would head for a serious economic crisis, with all its social and political consequences.

In order to steer clear of this danger, some guarantees must be created for the recognition and observance of fair labor standards. Such guarantees will be decisive in bringing about the prior conditions for healthy development of world economy, which must be achieved by closer economic cooperation, a freely growing world market, and the raising of all nations' living standards to a level consonant with human dignity.

II. Trade union action on economic problems of the free world, particularly in the field of trade policy

In the past, the IMF has kept the economic situation under constant review and has initiated an economic policy appropriate for the unions, as was done especially at the 1957 Congress and at a central committee meeting which took place in the midst of the American recession in 1958, and which called for the drafting of principles for an economic policy dedicated to full employment and social progress.

The IMF's Position as Defined Up Till the Present

At its Congress in 1957, the IMF directed attention to the vast and growing gap existing between living standards of the people in economically highly developed and underdeveloped countries. The IMF insisted on rapid and comprehensive aid to counter the basic reasons for poverty. Side by side with that aid, the trade unions in industrialized nations have a special obligation to give their support to the nascent unions in less favored countries. Democratic unions there must be guaranteed full trade union rights and their constructive social activity must be promoted. Contacts and close cooperation between all trade unions in the free world should be extended.

In a second resolution, the IMF Congress welcomed steps being taken toward economic integration in Europe and closer economic cooperation throughout the free world, subject to the democratic trade-union movement being given an effective voice in all bodies set up for that purpose. In particular, the IMF insisted that the liberali-

zation of trade shall not take place on the basis of unfair competition arising from inadequate wages and working conditions.

The necessity for continued and substantial economic progress was the main subject dealt with at the central committee's meeting last year. The IMF then stressed that, in view of the rapid technological progress and the greatly expanded volume of capital investment that has taken place in recent years, the maintenance of a dynamic balance between the ability of industry to produce and the ability of people to buy was vital.

Against the background of the difficult economic situation prevailing in 1958, the IMF, in its declaration of principles, again focused attention on the need for effective cooperation with the economically underdeveloped countries. As a prior condition for their independent development and their unbroken progress, markets for these countries' products must be enlarged and trade in raw materials placed on a stable basis.

For the future, trade expansion with social safeguards

As an individual aspect of these broad economic problems, including the need for aid to economically retarded countries, greater purchasing power for all peoples and expansion of trade, the IMF is now turning its attention to the specific problem of a larger volume of trade based on the acceptance of fair labor standards everywhere.

Expansion of trade entails the human problem of effective assistance to economic activities and workers affected by competition due to increased imports. If free trade is to act as a stimulus to general economic development, a greater volume of trade between the free nations must be accompanied by the progressive dovetailing of their production patterns, thus achieving a certain degree of international division of labor. To this end, negative measures of protectionism must be discarded. Instead, economies must be brought under pressure, with due regard for prevailing conditions, to render industries threatened by competition truly efficient, or such industries must be abandoned in favor of other more promising and more economic activities.

Subject to international fair labor standards being guaranteed and to firms and labor affected by increased imports being appropriately adjusted to fit into the new economic conditions, trade can be expanded, without hardship to any party concerned, to create new employment opportunities and better living everywhere.

III. Broader aims sought through the establishment of international fair labor standards

International fair labor standards are to:

- (a) encourage the progressive lowering of international trade barriers, while at the same time protecting workers by avoiding the danger that exploitation of workers in some countries will undermine labor standards in others;

- (b) help the trade union movement in all countries to raise wages and social conditions to levels compatible with advancing productivity in the particular industry and in keeping with the country's resources and state of development at large;

- (c) give the world's consumers the benefit, to which they are entitled, of the widest possible choice of goods, produced under conditions of healthy competition and with due regard for fair labor standards.

The main features of these aims of international fair labor standards are that no employer would be able to gain a competitive advantage, due to his ability to deny employees a fair share of the fruits of their labor, and such standards would be of benefit to both advanced and economically less developed countries alike.

On the one hand, international fair labor standards will guarantee that purchasing power keeps in balance with production capacities, thus maintaining the prosperity of industrially advanced countries; on the other hand, they will protect the employment of workers in countries where productivity is still low, bring them a share in productivity increases, and thereby generate economic growth with more and better jobs.

International fair labor standards along these lines would serve to promote the kind of competition that would make possible progressive and safe lowering of trade barriers.

(See appendix I for suggested agreement and detailed explanations of its clauses.)

IV. Problems involved in an agreement on international fair labor standards

The free trade union movement has repeatedly declared itself in favor of efforts to reduce trade barriers, as a means to greater prosperity for all. This objective stands high, not only in IMF but also in IOFTU policy. Among national trade unions, the European organizations are in the vanguard of forces actively urging intergration through a unified market in Europe, to be brought about against a background of world trade expansion. On the other side of the Atlantic, the AFL-CIO executive council only recently reaffirmed its position in favor of removal of barriers to trade among the free nations, in order to contribute to nations' economic progress and welfare. True to this line of thought, among the IMF's affiliates, the United Automobile Workers of America, the United Steelworkers, the Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers and the International Association of Machinists have refused to allow themselves to be used as a foil for employers' advocacy of protective tariffs. At the beginning of the recent recession in the United States, the AFL-CIO unions strongly supported the 4-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, which the U.S. Congress authorized last year.

Need for Accurate and Sufficient Information

Trade union members have always been deeply concerned that, as a protection for all labor, their fellow workers elsewhere should enjoy adequate standards, whereas the employers' tactics, on the other hand, have been to point to lower labor conditions abroad, for the purpose of resisting further social progress. The comparative data on wages and working conditions collected over the years by the IMF have served the purpose, among others, of preventing the unions from being misled by management's figures and allegations. It must be recognized, however, that comparisons limited merely to labor costs are not enough in themselves. It is equally important to analyze and compare other factors in the economy, such as productivity, material costs, capital charges, etc., if accurate conclusions are to be drawn.

While the unions are alive to the danger of accepting management's assertions about the competitive threat represented by lower wages in other countries, at the same time they cannot stand idly by and allow higher living standards and social safeguards in any economy to run the risk of being undermined by labor conditions elsewhere that are lower than those countries' industries could afford, in the light of their national resources and general state of development. Especially if we are to embark on an era of freer and expanded trade, this must be a subject of still greater concern to the trade union movement.

Arising out of these considerations, a primary conclusion which presents itself to the unions is, therefore, the need for accurate and sufficient information on labor

standards, with due regard for all the economic circumstances surrounding any industry. This in itself implies the existence of a very wide field of investigation, to make clear the magnitude of the problem involved in establishing International Fair Labor Standards.

Regard for Varying Stages of Development in Different Countries

The next stage, once full understanding of all aspects of the problem has been obtained, would be to enunciate a correct definition of international fair labor standards. Here the fact cannot be overlooked that trade goes on between nations in very different stages of development, from the technologically highly advanced industrial structure of a country such as the United States, or of countries, perhaps generally less highly industrialized, in Europe, right down to nations still on the threshold of industrialization.

We must arrive at a definition of international fair labor standards which is applicable to all cases and which can contribute to solving the various problems of the free world, as set out in the first chapter of this report, for, as we show there, our destinies will depend on the manner in which we bridge the gap between living standards, in these varying economic backgrounds.

First we will attempt to analyze the problem in the light of information available, illustrating the different conditions in which industry must develop in the United States and economically retarded countries.

Cost Structure in Two Industries in the United States and Central America

The Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations has undertaken a study of the cost structure in the ammonium nitrate and glass container industries in the United States and in Central America.

According to this study, wage rates appear to be similar in El Salvador, Costa Rica and Honduras; converted into U.S. dollars at the official rate of exchange, the hourly rates for the following categories of workers and the monthly rates for engineers are approximately: semiskilled and unskilled workers, 25 to 30 cents; skilled workers, 50 to 60 cents; mechanics, 70 cents; secretaries, \$1; engineers, \$500 to \$600 (per month).

In Guatemala, wages for workers in similar categories appear to be substantially higher, the difference being of the order of 30 to 50 percent.

If allowance is made for indirect payments and benefits in kind, it would appear that wage rates for manual workers in Central America, except Guatemala, are about one-sixth of those in the United States, and salaries of skilled and clerical workers and of professional staff are some one-half to one-third of corresponding rates. Taking into account the relative proportion of skilled and clerical workers and professional employees to manual labor, the average level of remuneration in Central America, except Guatemala, can be taken as approximately 25 percent of the United States level in the case of the nitrogenous fertilizer industry and 20 percent in the case of the manufacture of glass containers.

Labor costs are determined by both wage rates and productivity. Little direct information is available on the latter aspect. On the basis of related evidence, the productivity of labor in a Central American country was evaluated at somewhat less than two-thirds of that in the United States. Important aspects in assessing the productivity of labor are an inefficiency factor termed newness of equipment, due to the inexperience in labor in handling new machinery, as also the effect of climatic conditions.

Taking together the difference in wage rates and in productivity of labor, unit labor costs in Central America are of the order of 40 percent in the fertilizer industry and 32 percent in the glass container industry, measured against corresponding costs in the United States.

As to raw materials, most of these and other supplies have to be imported. No domestically produced fuel oil or natural gas is available. The price of imported heavy fuel oil in Central America is approximately 2.5 times higher than the price of the calorific equivalent in natural gas in the United States. In the case of other imported materials—and most of the materials and chemicals used in making the two items under consideration have to be imported—the price spread is considerably smaller, between 30 and 50 percent above U.S. prices. The cost of domestically produced raw materials is assumed to be the same or perhaps slightly higher. Poor quality and lack of uniformity in raw materials of domestic origin contribute, however, to higher costs of production.

As regards capital outlay, the cost of imported equipment delivered at the site will be between 30 and 40 percent higher than in the United States. On the other hand, according to information collected in the region, the domestic cost of installing equipment and constructing buildings would be approximately the same. The overall investment outlay in fixed capital is about 25 percent higher than in the United States.

The individual elements of costs relating to capital have the following characteristics.

The rate of depreciation is taken to be the same in Central America as in the United States, on the assumption that the lifetime of equipment and buildings is identical. Since the value of invested capital is estimated to be 25 percent higher in Central America than in the United States, the absolute cost of depreciation will also be 25 percent higher.

In regard to maintenance costs, labor costs in Central America have already been estimated at 32 to 40 percent and cost of imported equipment at 130 to 140 percent of U.S. figures. On the basis of the U.S. practice of allocating equal amounts for labor and spare parts costs, maintenance costs would appear to be 80 to 90 percent of the U.S. figures.

The total of the other two items, miscellaneous charges (taxes, insurance and so forth) and normal remuneration of capital, is estimated to be 40 percent higher than in the United States in relation to the value of invested capital, or 75 percent higher in absolute terms (allowing again for the fact that the value of invested capital is estimated to be 25 percent higher in Central America than in the United States.)

Combining the four cost elements in capital outlay and taking into account their relative share in total costs, capital costs in absolute terms will appear as 45 percent higher in the fertilizer industry and 35 percent higher in the glass container industry.

The summary given below of indexes for the three main components of costs in the Central American industries is most revealing:

Indexes of costs by main categories in 2 industries in Central America

[U.S. costs equals 100]

Cost components	Fertilizer industry	Glass container industry
Labor.....	40	32
Raw materials and supplies.....	200	150
Capital (all elements).....	145	135

The next tables compare production costs for different plant sizes in the two industries, as between the United States and Central America:

Estimated cost of production of ammonium nitrate, by capacity of plant

[U.S. dollars per short ton of ammonia content, at 1957 prices]

Capacity of plant (short tons of daily output)	Labor		Raw materials and supplies		Costs relating to capital		Total	
	United States	Central America	United States	Central America	United States	Central America	United States	Central America
	50	46.0	18.4	27.0	54.0	117.4	170.2	190.4
100	28.8	11.5	27.0	54.0	89.3	129.5	145.1	195.0
150	23.0	9.2	27.0	54.0	75.6	109.6	125.6	172.8
300	17.2	6.9	27.0	54.0	57.3	83.1	101.5	144.0

Estimated cost of production of beer bottles, by capacity of plant

[U.S. dollars per gross, packed, at 1957 prices]

Capacity of plant (number of bottle-molding machines)	Labor		Raw materials		Costs relating to Capital		Total	
	United States	Central America	United States	Central America	United States	Central America	United States	Central America
	1	3.09	0.99	2.40	3.60	3.02	4.07	8.51
2	2.31	0.74	2.40	3.60	2.54	3.43	7.25	7.77
4	1.93	0.62	2.40	3.60	2.13	2.88	6.46	7.10
6	1.80	0.58	2.40	3.60	1.93	2.60	6.13	6.78
12	1.67	0.54	2.40	3.60	1.62	2.19	5.69	6.33

This comparison indicates the following points: The share of labor costs in total production costs is substantially lower in Central America than in the United States; thus, because of the substantially lower wage rates prevailing in Central American countries, the share of labor in total costs in a fertilizer plant with a daily production of 150 tons would be only about 5 percent in Central America as compared with close to 20 percent in the United States. In the glass container industry, for a plant equipped with six molding machines, these figures would be 3 to 9 percent, as compared with close to 30 percent.

Total production costs in Central America compare much more favorably with those in the United States in the glass container industry, which is more labor-intensive than the fertilizer industry. The cost of production of glass containers is some 2 percent higher than in the United States for a plant of the smallest capacity (having one molding machine) and some 11 percent higher for a relatively large plant (having 12 molding machines). In the fertilizer industry the cost differential would be within the range of 27 to 42 percent, according to size. The rise in production costs with the reduction in size of plant appears to be generally more attenuated in Central America than in the United States.

Conclusions

These two case studies point to some fundamental differences in the starting point for industrial development as between already highly developed and less developed countries, as a result of which the factor of labor costs is not fully comparable in both types of countries. The latter must give first consideration to providing suitable employment for an inexperienced labor force, often with too high a proportion unemployed; then, too, they must adjust their economic planning to the scarcity and high cost of capital available and, in many instances, to disadvantages as regards raw material supplies and their transport, and in particular, energy which, although potentially plentiful, may still require development.

These handicaps lead the United Nations to recommend, as a conclusion drawn from

these studies, that "some industries—especially those which could make more intensive use of the relatively cheap labor resources—could be established in comparatively favorable conditions and would deserve special attention." Consequently, it is the opinion of the United Nations that a glass container industry, for instance, would be in a good position in this respect.

This brings us to a point on which we should perhaps search our consciences. Is it more important for less developed countries to provide higher paid jobs for a limited labor force, or should they not rather be given an opportunity, within justifiable limits, to take advantage of relatively cheap manpower to start industries which will absorb the maximum amount of labor, thus providing more jobs for populations which could in this way be given at least some kind of livelihood? Surely this is urgently necessary, in view of the continued growth of unemployment and underemployment in such countries, despite all efforts at industrialization in recent years.

The need to maximize employment opportunities and to use the available capital as sparingly as possible implies that, in less developed countries, consideration should be given to adapting the relative use of labor and capital in industry to the endowment in those factors. An attempt was made in the above studies to show that a lower level of mechanization than is customary in industrialized countries, besides generally corresponding to considerations of national economic policy, would permit a reduction of costs.

The problem of size of industrial plant is thus related to that of capital intensity, inasmuch as it involves consideration of the possible advantages of replacing some equipment by manpower; that is, that is of substituting technological processes of a lower level of mechanization for more capital-intensive ones. It was noted that some ancillary stages in the production process, such as handling of materials, permit such substitution without in any way affecting the efficiency of the process or the quality of the product. This would require a certain reorientation of present research in design by

producers of equipment; in fact, in many cases it would run contrary to the present tendency in design research, which aims largely at economy in the use of labor.

Similarly, it was mentioned that the life expectancy of equipment may be varied within fairly broad limits. Longer life means increased maintenance and repairs, and as these are relatively labor-consuming activities, it was suggested that in underdeveloped countries it would be economically desirable to prolong the life of equipment beyond the stage considered normal in the industrial countries. An extension of the lifetime of equipment through greater maintenance and repairs could lead to considerable savings in capital and accordingly affect the relative shares of capital and labor inputs in favor of the latter factor. On the other hand, lack of experience among maintenance staffs in underdeveloped countries tends rather to shorten the life of plant and machinery.

In any case, raw material and capital costs are primary considerations, to be taken into account to a much greater extent in underdeveloped countries than in economically advanced countries, and all the more so because, as these examples show, labor costs represent a far lower proportion of total costs than do raw material and capital costs.

It must also be borne in mind, when examining cases where labor costs make up a low share of total costs, that wages must be measured in terms of purchasing power and that in underdeveloped countries consumer wants are vastly different from those of consumers in highly developed industrial societies. Climatic conditions, too, can have an important effect in altering the pattern of living costs. Consumption patterns will of course develop as industrialization gradually proceeds, but it would be unwise, indeed impossible, to force the pace on either count. Precipitate development would lead only to inflation and would not solve unemployment problems.

The Problem of International Fair Labor Standards in the Light of Information Available in the Steel Industry

The foregoing United Nations case studies, used to analyze basic problems involved in an attempt to work out criteria for international fair labor standards, bring out specific problems of economically underdeveloped countries. Although these are cases outside the metal industry, the problems would be the same whatever the industry concerned, and any proposed agreement on international fair labor standards would need to be applicable to all forms of economic activity, with due allowance for special factors affecting individual products.

We now attempt to analyze the problem with specific reference to the iron and steel industry. The IMF's recent studies of wages and the financial position of the largest steel companies in the free world enable us to draw some important conclusions with regard to an industry in which U.S. employers are vociferously complaining about lower labor standards in other countries, which allegedly prevent them from granting further improvements to U.S. steel labor. Through the IMF's studies, information can be obtained that is pertinent to fair labor standards in relation to the industry's position in the United States, Europe, and economically underdeveloped countries.

Comparison of wages expressed in various forms

If we compare wages, not in terms of mere money, but in terms of earnings made by workers and wage costs to the industry, calculated at both official rates of exchange and in purchasing power parities, the IMF's data

bring us to the following indexes, measured against U.S. figures:

	Net hourly earnings based on—		Wage costs based on—	
	Official rates of exchange	Purchasing power parities ¹	Official rates of exchange	Purchasing power parities
United States.....	100	100	100	100
Great Britain.....	29	41	26	38
German Federal Republic.....	24	30	30	36
France.....	20	25	27	33
Japan.....	12	-----	13	-----

¹ Purchasing power parities used here are based on figures calculated by the Federal Statistical Office of the German Federal Republic.

These figures show that, in every instance but one, European wages move up in relation to U.S. wages, in any comparison based on other than net hourly earnings at official rates of exchange. The sole exception is wage costs in Great Britain based on official rates of exchange, because the British wage cost figure does not take social security benefits paid by the state and financed out of general taxation fully into account. The percentage of improvement in these countries' wage position is as follows in the next table:

	Percentage by which wages paid in European countries improve their relative position as against U.S. wages if the comparison is based, not on net hourly earnings at official rates of exchange, but on—		
	Net hourly earnings purchasing power parities	Wage costs	
		Official exchange rates	Purchasing power parities
Great Britain.....	+41½	-10	+31
Germany.....	+25	+25	+50
France.....	+25	+35	+65

It must of course be frankly admitted that such presentations of figures involve many factors that may be variously interpreted, but they do nevertheless give a reasonably reliable indication of the countries' relative position in regard to the various aspects of earnings and wage costs. Expressed as indices, in terms of wage costs calculated on the basis of purchasing power parities, European countries are better off by an average of 50 percent than if their workers' net hourly earnings at official rates of exchange are compared with earnings in the U.S. steel industry. In absolute money terms, the wage discrepancy between the United States and European countries is reduced by roughly one-fifth.

Comparisons of this kind again illustrate the need to consider, not nominal wages, but real wages and actual living standards. If two countries have comparable living standards, but nominal wages in one of them are lower than in the other, thus giving it an advantage in export trade, such a difference may be partly due to the exchange rate fixed for its currency. That rate will be determined by the strength of the currency and by considerations relating to the balance of payments and prices for goods imported and exported. Currency dumping by any country is a different matter and such practices should be exposed. Some countries may enjoy a certain advantage due to geographical influences on their consumption patterns, though these are difficult to assess. One the other hand, it is in these same countries that climatic influences will always have the effect of lowering productivity.

The Raw Materials Factor

The IMF's information on the steel industry throws light on other important aspects of the problem. Our study on the financial situation of the largest steel companies in the free world indicates that the proportion of firms' total revenue devoted to labor costs is 36.3 percent in the United States and 21.8 percent in Great Britain, whereas the proportion accounted for by material costs is 39.3 percent in the United States, compared with 54.6 percent in Great Britain.

Such a comparison makes it plain that material costs in Great Britain account for an additional 15.3 percent of turnover, while labor costs are only 14.5 percent lower in terms of turnover. This provides clear enough proof that certain wage differences between countries can be attributed, to a decisive extent, to natural conditions and to the advantages and disadvantages existing in nature in the location of individual firms or whole industries.

This is confirmed by a comparison of prices in the various countries for the most important raw materials used by the steel industry, for, according to United Nations statistics, in 1957 British coal was 200 percent dearer than American coal, German coal 190 percent dearer and Canadian coal 145 percent dearer. The reason is that, in spite of the much higher wages paid to miners in the United States, that country has much larger and more easily mined reserves of coal, compared with Europe, where coal has to be mined at great depths and under difficult conditions. Other important factors affecting the position are, of course, the ferrous content of ores, cost of electricity, supplies of scrap and cost of transport. In regard to practically all these factors, American firms are favorably placed.

Also extremely important is the fact that a difference in raw material prices affects the position much more than do differences in total labor costs, for raw materials account for half or even more of costs measured against total proceeds, whereas labor costs make up only one-quarter or, in most cases, even one-fifth only of total revenue, except in the United States, where they account for over one-third of turnover. In metal fabricating, the incidence of labor costs is greater than in the steel industry, but raw material and capital costs will always remain decisive elements.

It must be remembered, then, that advantages in raw materials and other elements contribute to determining the profitability of an industry. National average profitability rates for the steel industry are 7.4 percent in the German Federal Republic, 9.8 percent in Great Britain, and 12.4 percent in the United States. It is these profitability rates (net profits plus depreciation as a percentage of total revenue) which represent the margin out of which higher wages and salaries must come. Countries which have natural advantages can therefore afford to pay higher wages than countries which are less fortunate in this respect.

Conclusions

Our purpose in pointing out that these factors should be taken into account in any assessment of international fair labor standards is not that they should be invoked as an excuse for reducing wages in exporting countries, but to provide an argument for use in any importing country where, due to such natural advantages, a certain wage advance is justified. We would state clearly that it is a fallacy to think wages can be harmonized throughout the world, even if all countries attain the same rate of productivity. A case in point is the U.S. steel industry, where the differential in American wage costs in comparison with those abroad is not entirely due to higher productivity

alone, since other countries also possess very modern steelmaking plants, but is due also to advantages in raw material supplies.

Moreover, the American steel industry, despite its high wages, still shows a high rate of profitability and this, combined with the fact that its prices are, on the average, competitive, proves that U.S. steelworkers' wages could be higher still, thanks to the various advantages enjoyed by their industry.

At the same time, the postulate of international division of labor, based on natural advantages possessed by the different countries, also has its limits. It is clearly unrealistic to restrict any country to producing only those goods for which it is well equipped by nature, for this would lead to its economy being too little diversified and therefore unduly vulnerable to fluctuations in the sectors on which it has specialized. For this very reason, there is a call for diversification of many underdeveloped countries' economies, as a means to higher living standards for their peoples.

On the other hand, natural disadvantages may not be quoted as an excuse for unjustifiably low wages, as long as high profits are being made and a large volume of profits is being reinvested.

This aspect is illustrated by conditions prevailing in the Mexican steel industry. Here the 16.3 percent higher than American share going to material costs is more than outweighed by labor costs which, in terms of turnover, are 23.9 percent lower than in the United States, and wage costs are only one-sixth of those in the United States. A proof that wage costs are far lower than would be justified by disadvantages of location is that total labor costs, as a ratio of undistributed profits and depreciation, are only 0.8:1 in Mexico, as against 4.2:1 in the United States, and wages in Mexico are not even as much as three times higher than dividends paid, while in the United States they are 9½ times higher than dividends, and in Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, and France, they are from 14 to 16 times higher. This is an indication that in spite of the great investment needs of the Mexican steel industry, excessively large profits, in relation to wages paid, are taken out of the industry.

In determining whether the share going to labor is a fair share or not, consideration must be given, especially in underdeveloped countries, to the investment policy pursued, whether by private enterprises independently or at the Government's behest. In the largest Brazilian steel company, which is state-owned, almost 40 percent of the total revenue in 1957 was used for depreciation and reinvestment. Indeed, investments even extended to other economic sectors, since this money was used, for instance, to build a Simca automobile factory with state participation. Chile, too, shows a depreciation rate of over 10 percent of turnover. Here again, we face the problem of priorities as between investments to create necessary job opportunities, and higher wages for workers in a highly profitable industry. An additional complication would arise when, in such high-profit industries, wages are already above the national average, so that management and government both oppose wage increases on the grounds that they would further distort the national wage pattern.

To sum up, raw material costs and natural advantages must be taken into account as factors in assessing international fair labor standards and must be viewed in the light of profitability rates (the figure for both distributed and undistributed profits combined), and profits actually pocketed by owners. Also to be considered is whether the amount of undistributed profits is justified in relation to capital outlay and investment needs.

How Productivity Differentials Counterbalance Varying Wage Costs in Main Metal Manufacturing Sectors

Some wage-cost differentials

To spotlight further problems involved in arriving at international fair labor standards, we give below indexes of total wage costs, based on official exchange rates, for a number of countries, measured in terms of U.S. wage costs. These figures are derived from IMF studies; those for mechanical and electrical engineering refer to 1957, for shipbuilding to 1956, and for the automobile industry to 1955:

Indexes of total wage costs
(United States=100)

	Mechanical engineering	Electrical engineering	Automobile manufacturing	Shipbuilding
Austria.....	20	19	17	-----
Belgium.....	35	32	28	127
Denmark.....	34	30	28	30
France.....	35	33	30	35
German Federal Republic.....	26	23	22	23
Great Britain.....	33	28	30	29
Italy.....	25	23	19	22
Netherlands.....	23	22	18	19
Norway.....	36	34	28	30
Sweden.....	47	42	44	45
Switzerland.....	35	33	29	-----
Israel.....	39	36	-----	-----
Japan.....	11	11	-----	-----

¹ 40 ships repaired.

This table shows the European wage costs are generally equivalent to between one-quarter to one-third of U.S. wage costs. If purchasing power were taken into account, Austrian and Dutch wage costs, which are about one-fifth of those in the United States, would move up in relation to U.S. wage costs to a relatively greater extent than would those of other European countries.

If European wage costs are calculated on purchasing power parities, they may be regarded as varying between 35 to 50 percent of U.S. wage costs. Another important feature is that the differential between European and Japanese wage costs at official rates of exchange is at least as great as the gap between American and European wage costs.

More or less considerable differences exist, of course, from one sector to another. This is already evident from the differences prevailing between the various branches of the metal industry. If the gap between European and U.S. wage costs appears to be somewhat greater in the automobile industry, it must be pointed out that two leading European motor manufacturing countries, France and Great Britain, have all the same wage costs (at official rates of exchange) equal to some 30 percent of those in the United States, though Germany is further behind and Italy is at a relatively low level. However, these figures are for 1955 and it is likely that, in view of the boom in the European motor industry, these two latter countries have since improved their relative wage position. This is certainly true of Germany, where the reduction of working hours has brought some of the largest wage increases of recent years in Europe. The reason why wage cost differentials between the United States and Europe are generally greater in this sector than in others is that American auto workers' wages are substantially higher than those of their fellow workers in other metal fabricating sectors. Although the same is generally the case in Europe, the auto workers' lead is proportionately less marked.

The productivity factor

In establishing international fair labor standards, a primary factor to be taken into

account is the difference in productivity levels. Any agreement on fair labor standards must be designed to insure that the remuneration to labor will keep in step with advancing productivity as far as possible throughout the industry in which it is employed or, in the case of firms whose productivity is exceptionally high, there may be justification for wages to be tailored to conditions in the particular firm. In any event, the effort to bring wage costs into line with productivity cannot deter management from increasing productivity further, since higher wages encourage mechanization and greater output cannot fail to bring greater returns to capital. The spending power of higher wages geared to higher productivity will boost the entire economy and permit absorption of increased output.

Unfortunately, adequate information on productivity is seriously lacking. At this point, where we confine ourselves to indicating the size of the problem, but without quoting precise, up-to-date figures, such as would need to be collected if specific cases were dealt with under an International Fair Labor Standards Agreement, we can refer to some information available which conveys a general idea of the significance of existing gaps in productivity levels.

We therefore take advantage of a study which has just been issued. This is a comparison of national output and productivity in Great Britain and the United States, which was undertaken jointly by the OEEC and the Department of Applied Economics of the University of Cambridge.

This study, which deals mainly with 1950, as later precise information was not available, shows that average output per American worker in 1957 was 2.2 times greater than that of his British counterpart, compared with a factor of 2.1 for 1950. According to the experts, any alteration since 1950 has not altered the picture radically, any changes being rather in favor of the United States. Hence, data in the report may be considered as relevant for our present purposes.

Using a base of 100 to represent output per British worker, the average for all 44 categories of U.S. industries is 269.

As this difference in productivity is not fully matched by differences in wage rates

(as the ratio of average unit labor costs for the 44 U.S. industries which is 3.56:2.80, shows) the net cost (or value added) ratios show a considerable advantage in favor of Great Britain. The net cost element in this ratio is taken to mean capital, labor costs, and profit per unit of output, but does not include raw material costs. In other words, these three factors together give an average net cost ratio of 3.65:2.80 for the United States.

The total of capital and labor costs and profit per unit of output measures only a part of the final price. In general, basic raw materials are relatively cheaper in the United States, so that, because of lower material costs, many industries for which the United States shows processing costs relatively higher than those of Great Britain are, nevertheless, highly competitive. Thus British export industries, according to the experts, usually require net cost (i.e., processing) ratios to be in their favor, in order to offset higher material costs.

Twelve out of the 44 U.S. industries covered by the report show a productivity index between 150 and 210. The center group of 14 industries, with the U.S. productivity index ranging between 220 and 274, includes several sections where Great Britain and the United States compete in world markets—manufacture of electric motors and generators, tires, tubes, and tobacco among other products. But in the remaining 16 industries, including the production of paint, paper, and electrical household equipment, the United States holds a substantial advantage, despite the higher wage levels operating.

There is a general tendency for the United Kingdom to show up relatively best in those industries which are fairly old, established, and which have grown at a slow rate during the past few years—shipbuilding, linen and woolen textiles. These, however, are the industries most affected by competition from Japan. The United States, on the contrary, is often seen to greatest advantage in those industries which are growing most rapidly—automobiles, radios and chemicals.

We now present, in the form of indexes, the main conclusions of this comparison of national output and productivity, insofar as they are relevant to the subject of this report. In so doing, we confine our figures to branches of the metal industry.

Relative position as between Great Britain and the United States of wages, output per worker, unit labor costs, and net costs in selected branches of the metal industry in 1950

(Great Britain=100)

	U.S. wages	Output per U.S. worker	U.S. unit labor costs	U.S. net costs ¹
Shipbuilding and repairing.....	321	111	289	286
Tools and implements.....	372	190	196	204
Iron and steel foundries.....	331	202	164	142
Metalworking machinery.....	396	221	179	153
Generators, motors, transformers.....	356	239	149	166
Steel works and rolling mills.....	314	269	117	121
Wire drawing.....	342	339	101	111
Radio.....	339	400	85	104
Electrical household equipment.....	395	412	96	128
Agricultural machinery, except tractors.....	342	429	80	80
Automobiles, trucks, tractors.....	336	466	72	88
Metal cans.....	477	561	85	111

¹ Net costs include capital and labor costs together with profits per unit of output, but exclude raw material costs.

These most revealing statistics show that unit labor costs in the U.S. shipbuilding and repairing industry are almost three times higher than in Great Britain. This is due to the fact that the Americans' productivity advantage in this industry is very slight only, firstly because American output in 1950 was only 40 percent of British, and secondly, because British shipyards are older established and therefore certainly have some advantage in experience. This industry is no doubt a clear case where British wage costs are unfair in relation to those in the United

States. It should not be forgotten, however, that U.S. shipbuilding wages are not designed to be competitive on the world shipbuilding market, and are in fact maintained at a high level by Government subsidies, while employment for American shipyards is more or less guaranteed by Government restrictions on the purchase of foreign-built ships by American shipowners. At the same time, another aspect of this case is that British shipyards, like others in Europe, are forced to build ships for the world market, where they face such competition as that from Japan.

Two other sectors where there might be grounds for complaints of unfair labor standards in Great Britain, again in relation to American wages, are the tool and implement industry and metalworking machinery construction. Indeed, these are the sectors in which the Americans complain of stiff European competition through low prices. It is also a sector where, even in the United States, there are many medium-sized and smaller firms catering for special customer requirements. Thus the Americans cannot here enjoy advantages derived from mass production to the same extent as in other cases.

American employers have therefore resorted to various means of self-defense. Some, especially smaller producers with no export market, would like to have the protection of higher tariffs. Larger, export-oriented firms are less inclined to such a solution, because they fear retaliation against their export business. Other means of holding the market which some producers are employing include cost-cutting, standardizing parts and redesigning machines for greater simplicity and customer appeal.

Another important defense line of big firms is an attempt to establish new production units or acquire interests in firms abroad, in order to maintain and expand export markets. An example of this trend is the purchase of a 50-percent interest by Kearney and Trecker in a British company it had previously licensed to make its tools. According to U.S. employer sources, companies representing half of U.S. machine tool capacity have worked out some kind of foreign deal, and the proportion is expected to grow to 75 percent in a couple of years.

Some of these forms of employer defensive action can do considerable harm to American labor in this industry. It would thus seem, on the basis of available information, that some agreement on international fair labor standards would be applicable in this sector.

Another industry in which there have been many complaints of unfair labor standards abroad, and attempts in the United States to exclude imports, is the generators, motors and transformers sector. In this case U.S. unit labor costs are roughly 50 percent higher than British and their net costs, not counting raw materials, are two-thirds higher. Here also there would appear, on the face of it, to be some cause for the Americans' feeling that their labor standards are being undercut. At this point, the question of whether American labor is actually suffering as a result of foreign competition arises. The electric equipment makers concede that the volume of competing imports is small. In the last 7 years, installed capacity of foreign generating equipment came to about 370,000 kilowatts, or only about one four-hundredths of total U.S. capacity. Imports of all electrical products are at present running about \$100 million annually; the U.S. exports seven times more than it imports in this category.

Despite American manufacturers' denials that increased foreign competition has any bearing on the matter, recently announced price reductions, amounting in the case of General Electric to 2½ to 13 percent, which will be immediately followed by Westinghouse and the others, may undoubtedly be attributed to price pressure from abroad. In an industry such as this, where a few large producers entirely dominate the market, there is all the greater temptation for those few to make theirs an administered-price industry. Allegations of this kind would seem to be confirmed by complaints from local, Federal and State agencies that, in the electrical equipment industry, U.S. manufacturers submit identical prices in bids for contracts.

Any suggestion that there is a threat to the employment of American labor in this

sector as a result of foreign price competition loses force, in view of estimates that electric generating capacity in the United States is growing by 15 percent a year. The vitality of the market is proved by a recent Westinghouse announcement of \$25 million expansion in its generating equipment plants. In plant rearrangement it will use new tools and new production techniques. It was certainly most fortunate that some foreign competition was able to make its effect felt at a time when the market was expanding rapidly and when otherwise the manufacturers might have been greatly tempted to exploit the favorable trading conditions. This situation forced American productivity up and thereby created a need for new electrical goods manufacturing equipment, thus also providing additional employment opportunities for the machine construction industry.

In other sectors also, steel for instance, increased pressure of prices from abroad should have a salutary effect on such administered-price industries and should help to bring about price reductions, before which there can be no justification for complaints on the score of foreign competition.

As regards steelmaking and wire drawing, the slightly higher than British unit labor costs in the American steel industry, as already suggested, represent no handicap to the U.S. industry's competitive ability. This was recognized by the American authorities themselves when they dismissed four U.S. companies' complaints about foreign competition in the market for wire products and nails.

The table showing the relative position as between Great Britain and the United States makes it clear that U.S. industries have the greatest productivity advantage in durable consumer goods, where their productivity is from 4 to 4½ times more than that in Great Britain. This productivity is influenced by the fact that American output in these industries is many times greater than in Great Britain. For instance, in 1950, in electric household equipment and radios it was about 8 times the British output, and in automobile, truck and tractor manufacturing, output was 13 to 16 times greater than in Britain. The United States thus derives a considerable productivity advantage from its mass production, on a scale as yet unequalled anywhere else in the world. As the table shows, in all of these sectors the U.S. unit labor cost is lower than in Britain, so that these data suggest there could be no question here of unfair labor standards to the detriment of the United States.

The correlation between mass production and productivity which is so strikingly revealed here, will enable Europe to make good some of its leeway in productivity, as the European market broadens.

With regard to radio and household equipment manufacturing, it is interesting to note that the U.S. advantage in unit labor costs is more than outweighed, especially in the latter case, by the two additional factors, higher capital outlay and higher profits. European industries might thus be competitive, despite the great productivity advance enjoyed by the United States, in view of the fact that costs of raw materials do not affect the position as greatly as in less labor-intensive industries. In addition, where steel, the price of which varies relatively little throughout the world, is the main raw material used, the raw material cost factor will again be of minor importance. In high energy consuming industries, however, the United States enjoys a substantial advantage.

In the case of agricultural machinery and automobiles, the difference in unit labor costs for 1950 is one-fifth and more than one-quarter respectively. It may therefore be assumed that even today American unit

labor costs have not overtaken the British level and, in any case, have not exceeded it, especially as there were substantial wage increases, not only in the American, but also in the British industry during these years.

Although the experts maintain that the productivity differentials which existed in 1950 still remain largely unchanged, it is nonetheless possible in motor manufacturing, for instance, in view of the proportionately greater recent increase in British output, that the differential has been somewhat reduced. Even if, as the experts say, the gap in overall productivity in the United States and the British industries has not altered greatly, individual British firms may have achieved a striking advance as a result of installation of modern equipment, but here again American firms have made sustained efforts to keep their lead. This is indicated by the fact that net costs which, apart from profits, include capital expenditure for modernization and research, are shown in the table to be 22 percent higher in relation to British costs than are unit labor costs.

Collective Bargaining To Remedy Labor Standards in International Corporations

Our remarks here concerning the effect of productivity on unit labor costs relate more specifically to Great Britain. The lower productivity in Britain has a striking effect, as shown here, in raising unit labor costs in comparison with American costs. This is true of all the European countries, though it must be remembered that in their cases productivity will compare more favorably with Britain's in some cases, and in others again less favorably. In certain countries, such as Western Germany, particular industries or firms may, as a result of war destruction, have been completely rebuilt in keeping with the latest technical knowledge, so that their productivity is better able to stand comparison with that of the United States. In such cases, the lower wages paid in Europe, combined with a level of productivity not too far behind that in America, will lead to disparities in unit labor costs that might be considered to represent unfair labor standards.

One important conclusion presents itself. Apart from comparisons of industrywide productivity, it would be most useful to have productivity comparisons between principal firms in exporting and importing countries. It is possible, for instance, that plants of such firms as General Motors European subsidiaries have a productivity rate much nearer that of GM's American plants than would appear from industrywide statistics. Thus wages in a GM subsidiary plant might be substandard as compared with those of the firm's main producing units in the United States.

It is particularly in the case of such worldwide corporations as these that the trade unions should themselves, or with the help of independent economic institutes with which they have connections, undertake this type of productivity and wage comparisons, to obtain collective bargaining material. Sufficient information on output, number of employees, hours worked and wages of these firms is available to permit of such studies. Where data show that conditions throughout any industry would not justify complaints on the score of unfair labor standards, but it can be proved that unfair standards do nevertheless exist as between leading production units in the particular sector, it is up to the trade unions to correct such individual situations by collective bargaining.

Action through collective bargaining to remedy unfair labor standards as between leading firms which compete in each other's markets offers the advantage that other

aspects besides unit labor costs can receive much closer attention than would be the case if those unfair labor standards were the subject of negotiation under an international agreement, which would be mainly concerned with industrywide conditions. Important among these other aspects is the financial position of a particular firm, with special reference to its profits. The German company, Adam Opel, for instance, which is wholly owned by the American General Motors Corp., in 1958 recorded total profits, including profits brought forward from previous years, of DM248.4 million (\$65.9 million), a sum which exceeds the firm's original capital and reserves. It paid dividends of DM125 million (\$30 million), equal to 62.5 percent of original capital, and left a further DM124 million carryover of profits to the next year.

In the case of another German motor manufacturer, Daimler-Benz AG, profits before taxes amounted to DM300 million (\$71 million), which is equal to 72 percent of the original capital. On the strength of such profits, the company had no trouble in increasing dividends from 12 to 18 percent.

Such facts should receive full consideration in any assessment of firms' ability to increase labor's share, proportionate to productivity, thus reducing any differentials in unit labor costs which may exist.

Wages Related to Productivity of Individual Firms, Entire Industries or Nations as a Whole

One problem that cannot be overlooked in any attempt to equalize unit labor costs as between any two countries arises when the particular industry in one of those countries has a much higher level of productivity than the average throughout the economy, with the result that wages proportionate its productivity would be out of proportion to the general wage structure. This is generally the chief consideration in European wage patterns. The trade unions seek to share among all the Nation's workers the social gain accruing from overall productivity advance. This contrasts with the usual conception in the United States, where the general principle is for labor to take out in wages all that the industry can afford and is willing to pay. Plant-by-plant bargaining serves to implement this policy. It leads to large, prosperous enterprises setting the pace for wages throughout their industries. In European countries union policy favors rather industrywide levels, and wage demands are therefore adjusted to less profitable firms' ability to pay. This, especially in recent years, has given management ever greater opportunities to grant, as a paternalistic gesture, wage increases subject to no contractual guarantee.

Another handicap in some European countries is that it is more or less tacitly agreed that the highest wages should be paid in coal mining, an industry now generally involved in economic difficulties. If investigations connected with fair labor standards were to lead in Europe to greater pressure on high productivity enterprises in a strong financial position, this might inject more dynamism into bargaining policies, which would become more flexible and more consistent with the actual position of individual firms. Gains for workers in more advanced industries, by the very distortion of the wage structure to which they lead, would have an economically desirable effect in providing some leverage for negotiating general wage increases.

In addition, social benefits, such as shorter working hours, guaranteed incomes, longer vacations, equal pay for men and women, which the trade unions seek to obtain in high productivity industries first, but which they try to extend as soon as possible to workers in less prosperous industries, are

also important factors in improving general labor standards.

High Profits Should Finance Price Reductions as Well as Wage Increases

Where huge profits are being made, like those quoted for two German motor manufacturers, from a German point of view there should be a price reduction, in addition to an adjustment of wages to productivity. The same applies of course to the American automobile industry where, notwithstanding higher U.S. wages, a reduction in prices could well be borne by the industry and would have beneficial effects throughout the economy.

It has been estimated by experts that the selling price of leading makes of German cars, including the Volkswagen, Opel Rekord and Mercedes 180, could be reduced by 20 percent without in any way weakening those firms' financial position. Assuming that the present cost price of a standard Volkswagen is about DM2,500, this would mean that the selling price of DM4,600 (until 1955 DM5,400) could be cut by some DM920.

Unfortunately, the tendency is for firms, rather than reduce prices under pressure of international competition and thereby run the risk of curtailing their profits, to maintain price levels which give them a low breakeven point, even when operating at low capacity.

It is a fact that in European countries wages in the metal industry, especially the booming motor vehicle sector, are among the highest in their economies. This must certainly be borne in mind in any comparison of European and American unit labor costs. One important economic and even political problem, which we have outlined in the first chapter of this report, comes into the picture here. This is the need to avoid any action which would hinder expanding industries in the two industrialized continents, on whose continued expansion the development of the rest of the free world depends.

V. Feasibility of action under an agreement on international fair labor standards

Possible Source of Background Information for Action by Unions

It will be seen from the preceding section of our report that the process of investigation into cases of unfair labor standards and the drawing of correct conclusions based on those investigations is the key to the efficacy of the whole. Such inquiries, as already stressed, could provide trade unions with arguments for use in their collective bargaining.

Action which the proposed agreement on international fair labor standards could require governments to take should have two main purposes. One would be, where it is justified and necessary, to protect, by withdrawal of tariff concessions and special compensatory tariffs, the wages and jobs of workers with higher living standards. The other would be, by exposing unfair labor standards, and imposing the tariffs suggested, to give an impetus for the improvement, as fast and as far as possible, of living standards in countries shown to have inadequate standards. This would conceivably provide trade unions with a lever for progressive action.

Throughout this report we have laid the utmost stress on the furnishing of data, because the outcome of negotiations between countries would be based on the information supplied. Factfinding, even by a competent agency, will not in itself be equivalent to a decision on any case. As with economic affairs in general, action proceeding out of such information will depend on the interplay of forces as between management, commerce and labor; they will make their influence felt through their governments, with which the ultimate decision rests, in the light both of overall economic considera-

tions and reciprocal trade relations with other countries concerned in any particular case.

Unsuitability of Quotas

Our suggestions for action by governments include, for importing countries, the withdrawal of concessions already granted, their refusal to grant new concessions to exporters having unfair labor standards, the suspension of obligations, or the imposition of a compensatory tariff. For obvious reasons, there is no hint of quotas, a form of retaliatory action generally recognized as causing contraction of trade. Quotas are plainly indefensible as a form of economic action, all the more so because, once introduced, they are extremely difficult to abolish, chiefly due to their being imposed by administrative, not parliamentary action. Firstly, they serve merely to eliminate competition on any import market by a low-wage country, whilst a compensatory tariff would permit the exporter to try to maintain the volume of exports, but at a corrected price level. Secondly, by restricting an export market, quotas would tempt exporters to raise prices in that market where they are assured of sales for a limited quantity of products, and the added margin of unit profit would probably simply go into the pockets of manufacturers and traders.

Action Doubtful Where Retaliation Might Ensure

In recent years, a number of governments have enacted antidumping legislation, but have never been able to implement it for the following two reasons, which represent major weaknesses also in any agreement on fair labor standards, and could render it impossible of application. If trade unions in an importing country complain that a particular industry is being hurt by low prices due to unfair labor standards abroad, and finally induce their government to take the matter up with the exporting country, the latter may in the meantime have corrected its price level, thus putting a stop to further complaints from unions in the other country, even though the price correction may well be brought about through higher profits to employers, not better wages for workers, in the exporting country. In such cases, an investigation should still be called for. If this is no longer possible under the terms of the agreement itself, then trade unions should be able, for instance through the ILO, to expose such cases of exploitation of labor. Annual reviews of the state of labor standards would give at least some assurance that, once a case of unfair labor standards is exposed, the employers cannot correct prices to their own exclusive benefit.

The second weakness is that, even where there is justifiable cause for complaint, importing countries may hesitate to seek correction of unfair labor standards, or may withdraw their objections, where they feel that the exporting country is in a position to retort by restriction of imports of other products which it purchases from the would-be plaintiff country.

Besides this, no government is blameless and may similarly refrain from action on unfair labor standards elsewhere if it has reason to apprehend counteraccusations of state subsidies or other enticements to its own export industries. Norway, for instance, which enacted antidumping legislation in 1954, dealt with 15 complaints from its home industries, but took no action on any of them, although the conditions required by the law were satisfied in several, because it found action to be unpracticable.

Below we give a table which shows that the overwhelming majority of applications for enforcement of antidumping legislation or countervailing duties was rejected by the governments which had passed such legislation.

	Items affected by antidumping decrees in force	Number of rejected requests
Australia.....	9	101
Rhodesia and Nyasaland.....	3	4
South Africa.....	122	211
Sweden.....	1	9
United States.....	2	99
	Items affected by countervailing duties in force	
Belgium.....	3	10
South Africa.....	2	3
United States.....	12	62

¹ Plus 7 special duties.

² 1 item includes several textile products.

³ 1 item includes several metal products.

It is hardly to be expected that an international fair labor standards agreement would fare any better.

Fair Labor Standards and Communist Countries

A further problem which must not be overlooked is the difficulty of implementing an agreement on fair labor standards under the world political conditions now prevailing. The free nations would face great hazards in working out and bringing into operation any such agreement as long as some of the numerically and industrially powerful nations continue their present practices of offering goods at political prices, unrelated to the real cost of production. Basic data from such countries, requisite for implementation of an agreement, would be either lacking or untrustworthy. Nor could there be any prospect in those cases of forcing corrective measures, through trade union action, to insure fair labor standards. Already there have been numerous instances where Russia has delivered or undertaken to deliver goods to a particular market, but has later ceased such supplies or transferred them elsewhere, at the dictates of its political and economic aims.

Where such an agreement as that proposed would be impracticable for these political reasons, the free world would have to try to protect itself against price undercutting from the Eastern bloc by antidumping measures like those provided for in GATT and in the various countries' national legislation, although this too presents difficulties. To provide even this measure of protection, actual prices of goods from the Eastern bloc could, in the absence of proper data, be estimated only by analogy with other countries' export prices. Certain bilateral agreements between Communist and non-Communist countries have already been so designed as to provide protection against dumping.

Need for Realism in Proposed Agreement

It is important that an agreement on international fair labor standards be as realistic as possible and be conceived in such a way as to convince exporting and importing countries of its generally beneficial effects. It should of course also comply with practices established under GATT. One of these practices is that no complaint can be raised unless a country can prove that conditions elsewhere are causing or threatening material injury to its industry. Viewed realistically, too, unless factors such as the general state and resources of exporting nations' economies were specifically allowed for in its terms, no proposal for an agreement would receive the two-thirds majority required at GATT.

Other situations which might militate against implementation of an agreement on fair labor standards might conceivably arise when a lower standard country, for instance

in Europe, exports goods to the United States and thereby inflicts damage on the U.S. industry in question. In response to complaints, the European country might well point to its need to compete on the world market against an even lower standard industry, for instance, that of Japan. It would be plainly difficult to require the government of the European country to force its industry to try to draw level with American labor conditions in such triangular situations.

There are, however, other considerations which speak in favor of some instrument like an agreement on international fair labor standards. For instance, a number of countries have not yet extended to Japan the most favored nation clause, because they consider Japanese export prices as equivalent to dumping. Were a fair labor standards agreement of this nature in operation, products could be dealt with individually, taking all aspects into account, so that Japan could benefit in practice by most-favored-nation treatment in justified cases.

The existence of a fair labor standards agreement would, in the unions' eyes, be preferable to actions such as are now being taken under agreements between Japan and Western Germany and Canada, for instance, whereby Japan is voluntarily undertaking itself to restrict its exports of goods to which the importing country reacts in a particularly sensitive manner. Such self-imposed export restriction agreements are fundamentally only protectionism in another form, with the quotas imposed, not by the importing, but by the exporting country. Self-imposed export taxes would fall into the same category. It is significant that agreements of this nature at present apply chiefly to textile products, where the unfair labor standards factor looms especially large. While this type of action provides relatively easy protection for any importing country's industry, provided that indirect imports via third countries can be effectively controlled, it does nothing to encourage better labor standards in the exporting country, which thus eludes any of the pressure that might arise from a fair labor standards agreement.

Although it would probably be extremely difficult, in most cases, to take action under an agreement on international fair labor standards, even once it had found universal acceptance, such an instrument would have the merit of showing up in the international forum instances where action would be necessary. It would thus cause governments to search their consciences and would point the moral in particular situations, for it would set a standard by which no government would wish to fall too patently. By the mere fact of its existence, it could exercise a beneficial effect, even if it were not implemented to the letter.

On its own, however, an agreement on international fair labor standards would not be enough. Freer trade with proper social safeguards, accompanied by efforts to achieve better living standards everywhere, must come about as the result of manifold forms of action, which will be enumerated in the next section. Apart from any government action that may be required, advances in this field will lie largely in the hands of trade unions, which will have to serve as the motive force for progress.

VI. CHANNELS FOR ACTION TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL FAIR LABOR STANDARDS IN EXPANDING FREE TRADE

At the conclusion of this analysis of problems involved in the removal of trade barriers in such a way as to promote economic and social progress in all countries, we propose that the IMF initiate action on international fair labor standards through the various channels or by the means enumerated in this section.

In order to start the ball rolling, IMF affiliates, in cooperation with their national

trade union centers, should take the matter up with their governments. Yet under the International Sugar Agreement and the European Economic Community, governments have already admitted that there should be fair labor standards, but without setting them down in any clear definition or making any provision for action to insure their observance. Hence it would be proper for the trade unions, which are the organizations best fitted for such action, to put pressure on governments to adopt some more tangible conception of what fair labor standards should mean and how they should be put into effect.

Immediate action should be taken by the IMF itself, as well as through the ICFTU, its regional organization for Europe, and trade union representatives within the European Economic Community and the Coal and Steel Community to have basic inquiries and some studies with regard to international fair labor standards undertaken without delay. Action through governmental agencies may be summarized as follows:

In GATT

A proposal for a basic agreement on international fair labor standards might be submitted to GATT, as the overall international trade organization for the free countries. Such an agreement would lay down the principles of fair labor standards, methods of objective investigation and forms of progressive action by governments to encourage free trade, with the necessary social safeguards, and with the intent to raise living standards everywhere.

A small international office within GATT, or at the disposal of GATT, should be set up to undertake the case studies and periodic reviews which the agreement requires. (Detailed proposals for such an agreement are attached to this report.)

In Regional Economic Institutions

International organizations for regional economic cooperation or integration already established, such as OEEC, the European Economic Community, and the European Coal and Steel Community, or any such institutions for economic cooperation which may be set up in Europe or elsewhere in the free world as for instance, the impending South American free trade area, should incorporate the principles of this agreement in their treaties and implement them insofar as they are competent to do so.

Departments dealing with manpower and social problems which exist in these institutions should be instructed and properly equipped to undertake investigations required for factfinding on international fair labor standards.

The Organization for European Economic Cooperation, with the assistance of the European Productivity Agency, the Economic Commission for Europe, and the European Coal and Steel Community, should undertake studies of productivity levels in various branches of industry in their member countries, as also comparisons of unit labor costs. They should also try to assess as early as possible the probable repercussions of freer trade in their member countries.

In the United Nations Organization

International fair labor standards should be introduced as an item for consideration at the U.N. Economic and Social Council. The Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the U.N. should undertake basic studies, especially on the problem of which industries are to be set up in economically underdeveloped countries so that they can produce goods which can best find an outlet in an expanding world market and at the same time absorb the maximum amount of manpower under conditions consistent with international fair labor standards.

In the International Labor Organization

The principles of international fair labor standards should be enunciated by the ILO in the form of a convention or recommendation to be ratified by all member countries, so that in any country whose government has not been willing, upon the request of trade unions or employers, to lodge a complaint on account of unfair labor conditions, the trade unions and employers can make representations to the ILO and have that organization expose the matter.

The ILO should undertake basic studies on international fair labor standards.

The IMF should raise the subject of international fair labor standards at forthcoming sessions of the ILO Metal Trades and Iron and Steel Committees, in order to have the problem studied in the various branches of industry individually.

In International Commodity Agreements

Existing international commodity agreements, or any which may be set up in future, should require recognition of the principle of international fair labor standards and make provision for procedure to get such standards enforced in relation to the particular commodity for which they are responsible.

The International Sugar Agreement already contains a general commitment whereby "participating governments shall seek to maintain fair labor standards in the sugar industry," but does not set forth procedure to be followed.

In International Financial Institutes

The World Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, the investment and social funds of the EEC, and governments generally should grant loans, subject to the condition that types of production and services developed by such funds be operated in accordance with international fair labor standards.

To have an agreement on international fair labor standards recognized by the above-mentioned international institutions will, however, take time and may encounter numerous difficulties.

Need for Direct Trade-Union Action

The trade unions would be deceiving themselves if they were to leave the problem at this and imagine that governments, by international cooperation, will resolve what are fundamentally labor problems. Increasing wages to conform to fair standards has always been and will remain a trade-union problem, which the unions must solve through their strength, activity, knowledge of facts, and negotiating skill.

We would therefore stress the following forms of trade-union action. The unions should—

1. In accordance with such principles as those enunciated in the IMF's program of action, seek to obtain shorter working hours, guaranteed incomes, etc., and give active support to free trade unions in economically underdeveloped countries, to enable them to improve their poor living conditions and obtain a fair share in the product of their economies;

2. Make studies, either independently, for instance in the IMF's industrial departments, or through research and economic institutions with which they are connected, in the first stage to elucidate the whole problem of unfair labor standards and, at the second stage, to inquire into labor standards as between main exporting units in given sectors;

3. Apply results of their own or other institutions' studies in order to try, through collective bargaining, to bring about international fair labor conditions and, at a later stage when data is available through investigations conducted under an agreement on

international fair labor standards, use the results in trade-union work;

4. Pay special attention to international fair labor standards as between international corporations and their subsidiaries in the various countries, and assist each other in bargaining;

5. Induce all governments to ratify ILO conventions promptly or fulfill commitments they have given within the European Economic Community, for instance, with regard to equal pay for work of equal value for men and women, and other social objectives; and

6. Take active interest in their governments' trade negotiations, with the general objective of opposing negative protectionism and promoting higher labor standards everywhere.

In addition to advocating international fair labor standards, the IMF should, at the international level and through its affiliated organizations in the various countries, urge that everything possible is done to avoid hardship to workers displaced through more rational international trade patterns and to give them opportunities for retraining and employment with a sound future, which could be achieved through appropriate assistance to firms and whole communities requiring adaptation to changes in economic structure. (Detailed proposals for such a trade adjustment program are attached to this report.)

To help such transitions to be made smoothly, the unions should urge governments to analyze on an industry-by-industry and product-by-product basis the effects which freer trade might be expected to have on employment.

All these forms of action which the unions themselves can take, combined with appropriate intervention by governments and international institutions, can insure that expansion of trade between economies in which workers receive their fair share will bring general and broadly based prosperity.

APPENDIX I

PROPOSAL FOR AGREEMENT

1. The contracting parties recognize:

- (i) That all countries have a common interest in the achievement and maintenance of fair labor standards related to nations' productivity and economic growth, and thus in the improvement of wages and social conditions, as those circumstances may permit;

- (ii) That unfair labor conditions, particularly in production for export, may create difficulties in international trade which nullify or impair benefits accruing from the progressive reduction of tariffs and other barriers to free trade; and

- (iii) That, especially in view of the universal rapid advance of technology, the non-observance of international fair labor standards can have serious repercussions on the level of employment in socially advanced countries, generally hinder purchasing power from developing at the same rate as production capacity, and thus endanger prosperity everywhere.

2. Therefore, with reference to article XXIII of GATT, the contracting parties recognize that the exportation of goods produced under unfair labor standards and introduced into the commerce of another country creates special situations, which the parties must take into account in striving for the elimination of obstacles to free trade.

3. A special situation due to unfair labor standards is deemed to exist where such standards cause or threaten material injury to an industry in the territory of a contracting party, whether the importing country directly concerned or a third party with an important share in the particular export market, if:

- (i) total labor costs (including all forms of employer payments to or on behalf of

employees, whether in the form of direct wages, contractual fringe benefits or benefits required by legislation) incurred for employees engaged in production and manufacture of the item exported are below average standards prevailing in the country of origin as regards those branches of the economy concerned in the manufacture of the product in question;

- (ii) total labor costs prevailing in those economic branches producing the article for export are well below standards generally accepted in the exporting country;

- (iii) average unit labor costs in the various stages of production of the article exported are proved to be far below those prevailing in similar production sectors in the importing country, unless, in branches vital to the exporting country's economy, much higher costs for raw materials and supplies, capital charges, and investment needs offset lower wages, provided that profit margins are not excessive.

However, a special situation shall not be deemed to exist if lower wages in the exporting country, having regard to purchasing power, national consumption patterns, and social security services, provide a living standard comparable with that in the importing country.

4. The question of whether and to what extent a special situation due to unfair labor standards, as defined in section 3, does or does not exist shall be settled by consultation between the importing and exporting countries, and any third country whose interests on the importing country's market may be adversely affected. Results of such consultations shall be communicated to a competent international organization, such as GATT, or, in case of a dispute between countries belonging to a customs union or a free trade area, to organs of the body concerned. Should the parties fail to reach agreement, or in the absence of prior consultations, the plaintiff country shall bring the matter up before the most competent international organization (GATT, the six-country European Common Market, organs of any free trade area that may be established, which will have accepted in their treaties the principles enunciated in this document), whereupon the organization with which the complaint is lodged will initiate procedure through an appropriate organ, to make recommendations to the countries concerned within a period of 8 weeks. This period might be extended, subject to agreement by the parties, in which case the competent body would permit plaintiff countries to take measures to safeguard their position. Should the competent body fail, or not be equipped, to provide sufficient information, it should consult with the International Labor Organization, in order to ascertain whether or not there is a case of unfair labor standards.

5. The exporting country shall supply necessary information on total labor costs, or shall take position on data in the importing country's possession with reference to the labor conditions complained of. The exporting country must also show what is the economic situation in sectors producing the article exported, the structure of those sectors, the technological development of the principal exporting firms, cost of material, investment and fiscal charges, and profitability. Further factors to be taken into account are the quality of the article exported and the skill of workers involved.

The importing country which lodges a complaint under the terms of this agreement must, on the basis of valid data, prove that the exported article is causing or threatens material injury to its national production. If the complaint refers to damage inflicted on a third country having an important share in the market for that article in the importing country, it will rest

with that third country to furnish the proofs in question.

Where a complaint is lodged in virtue of section 3 (iii), the vital policies and economic and social conditions of the exporting and importing countries, and/or those of any third country which may be involved, shall be compared, insofar as these affect the sectors in question.

In international comparisons of wage and fringe benefits, the purchasing power and consumption patterns in the exporting and importing countries as also, where applicable, in third countries, shall be taken into account. Apart from official rates of exchange, purchasing power parities shall be utilized or, in the absence of these standards of measurement, other acceptable methods for comparing living standards shall be adopted.

6. If these investigation procedures and the ensuing negotiations demonstrate the existence of a special situation within the meaning of section 3, the importing country may take appropriate action and/or urge the exporting country, within a given length of time, to implement corrective measures with a view to establishing fair labor standards, in accordance with the terms of section 7. The same would apply if another exporting country with an important share of the market for the article concerned faces actual or potential substantial damage; it can ask importing countries to take such action on its behalf.

7. Appropriate action by a plaintiff country, where claims that unfair labor standards exist in the industry of any exporting country have been substantiated, as required by the foregoing clauses in this agreement, can consist of the withdrawal from the exporting country concerned of tariff concessions granted in the past, the refusal to apply to it new tariff concessions granted to other countries, or the suspension of other obligations.

Such action may be taken immediately or may be postponed, provided that the exporting country undertakes to redress, within a specified period of time and either at a single step or by progressive stages, the labor conditions complained of. Those conditions shall be the subject of annual review, in order to ascertain whether they are actually being corrected.

Where immediate protective measures are taken by the importing country, they shall be relaxed and ultimately withdrawn, as the exporting country proceeds step by step to improve its labor standards.

Where protective measures have been postponed, the importing country shall retain the right to apply them, should the exporting country fail to improve its labor standards, according to the specified timetable.

In cases where it is not possible for an importing country to take such protective measures, or where these would be insufficient to protect its industry in question from the harmful effects of unfair labor standards in the exporting country, that importing country may impose a special compensatory tariff, to be equal to the amount that would be added to the labor costs of the employers for production of the goods they sell for export, if they were to meet the required labor standards, having due regard for tariffs already in existence. The amount of the special compensatory tariff each year would be based on the difference between the actual wage level in the industry and the level that would be required for that year under the step-by-step program of wage adjustments mentioned above.

8. Revenue derived from the special compensatory tariff imposed by importing countries shall be paid into an international economic development fund (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), whose duty it would be to use such funds for

specified purposes, preferably for investment projects of a social nature or projects designed to build up the economic infrastructure of countries in process of development. A condition for such use of the funds would be that wages and social conditions in the services and production units so established be consistent with fair labor standards.

9. The contracting parties accept as implicit in this agreement recognition of the workers' right to freedom of association and an obligation to promote genuine collective bargaining, as a vital condition for the establishment of fair labor standards within each country.

10. The application of corrective measures to insure international fair labor standards may not hinder healthy expansion of any given production sector in the exporting country; rather should such standards promote its development, hand in hand with an improvement in living standards compatible with technological progress and the growth of that country's economy generally. These are the principles which should inspire negotiations under this agreement.

Accordingly, if the exporting country can prove that wages and social conditions have already been substantially improved in sectors that produce the article exported, or are expected to improve as a result of undertakings given in contracts, or if that country announces its readiness to encourage or bring about such improvements at an early date, these endeavors shall be duly taken into account and every possible effort shall be made to negotiate so as to restrict the application of protective measures.

The mechanics of an agreement on international fair labor standards and detailed problems involved

In this section we comment, paragraph by paragraph, on our proposal for an agreement on international fair labor standards.

Recognition of the Principle of Fair Labor Standards

First of all, it would be necessary for the nations to accept the principle that international trade competition based on substandard labor conditions is unfair and should be eliminated. Paragraph 1 of our proposed agreement would imply acceptance of such a principle. In the first place, contracting parties are called upon to recognize their common interest in the achievement and maintenance of fair labor standards related to productivity and the economic growth of a country, and thus in the improvement of wages and working conditions as these circumstances may permit.

In a second part of section 1, the reasons for that common interest are set forth, inasmuch as unfair labor conditions may create difficulties in international trade, which would nullify or impair benefits accruing from the progressive lowering of tariffs.

In a third part of the same paragraph, a further reason quoted for that common interest is that, especially on account of advancing technology, nonobservance of fair labor standards may have serious economic and social repercussions.

Unfair Labor Standards as a Special Situation Under Article XXIII of GATT

As a form of procedure for complaints about unfair labor standards, within the framework of existing international agencies, we propose that governments invoke article XXIII of GATT, which provides that in case of situations other than those specified by GATT (an infringement of fair labor standards would constitute such a situation), contracting parties could make representations of proposals to other members and bring the matter up within the machinery of GATT, the U.N. Economic and Social Council or any other competent international organization. GATT is the appropriate body for

mention here, since it takes precedence in matters of regulation of trade over such other international agencies as the OEEC or the European Economic Community, whose member governments are bound by their obligations to GATT. However, with only slight alterations, the agreement could be made applicable to other organizations as well as GATT.

Suggested Definition of International Fair Labor Standards

Three criteria for the determination of unfair labor standards are suggested. Labor standards in the exporting country would be deemed to be unfair if total labor costs were substantially below average standards prevailing in the particular industry or in the economy generally of the exporting country, or if average unit labor costs are proved to be far below those prevailing in similar production sectors in the importing country, subject always to the condition that those labor standards cause or threaten material injury to a plaintiff country.

The obligation on an importing country to prove allegations that it is being hurt by unfair competition by another, which is already an established practice in the GATT organization, would need to be incorporated into a fair labor standards agreement, if there is to be any prospect of its acceptance.

This provides some measure of assurance to exporting countries that all aspects of the case receive due consideration, such as their supplying a particular class of goods to meet the needs of a market for which the importing country itself does not adequately cater, while at the same time it gives an opportunity for importing countries to prove that an imported article, perhaps of inferior quality, is displacing products of their own industries.

Paragraph 3 (i) and (ii)

These first two standards, we believe, can hardly meet with any objection. It is without doubt as much in the interests of labor in the exporting country as of labor in the importing country that substandard conditions in both the individual industry and the national wage structure be eliminated at the earliest possible date.

The second criterion would lead to pressure for better wages in low-standard industries, thus helping to reduce the differential between them and the country's more progressive, pace-setting industries.

Paragraph 3 (iii)

In this third criterion, the remuneration to labor is measured in terms of the industry's productivity. Any comparison should therefore be based on unit labor costs; i.e., total average hourly labor costs multiplied by man-hours required to produce one unit.

An agreement on international fair labor standards should be designed to preserve any natural advantages, such as closer access to raw materials, that an industry in one country might enjoy over another country, but it should aim at eliminating unnatural advantages based upon exploitation of labor. To such aims, however, there are economic and social limits, which are illustrated in section IV of this report. As the steel industry, for instance, is vital to the economy both of European countries and Japan, its prices must be competitive, so that it can survive against the U.S. industry, with its better natural advantages. Hence it must be given a fair chance, even though higher raw material costs inevitably react on the relative position of components in its price structure, despite the existence of a high level of productivity and well organized, active trade unions in the industry.

A further handicap to some countries, mainly economically underdeveloped nations, are higher charges on investment capital and greater investment needs for the establishment or expansion of industry and

the higher costs such countries face in creating the necessary infrastructure.

These various factors must be taken into account in determining whether wages in any exporting country are unfairly low in the light of its economic background, subject of course to the condition that an appropriate share of the proceeds is actually put into development work, and not into employers' pockets.

Any branch of industry which is not vital to a country's economy and faces natural handicaps as regards supplies should not be permitted, under an agreement on fair labor standards, to survive on the basis of low wages.

Since it is manifestly difficult to compare wages in terms of mere money, and official rates of exchange are often far from reflecting accurately the purchasing power of any given currency, some attempt should be made to compare wages in terms of actual living standards and the degree of social security provided.

Procedure for Determining Whether or Not Unfair Labor Standards Exist

Paragraph 4

This paragraph sets forth procedure for a country to follow in lodging a complaint on the grounds of unfair labor standards in any exporting country. The suggested procedure is along the same lines as that laid down in the GATT treaty, in cases where any contracting party feels that its advantages under GATT are being nullified or prejudiced, or the aims of the agreement are being defeated (art. XXIII). The present suggestions are limited to bringing up before GATT complaints of infringement of fair labor standards as defined in this model agreement. In section VI we have suggested other means by which trade unions can seek to have unfair labor standards denounced and redressed.

This paragraph sets out two forms of procedure; either a complaint on a bilateral or multilateral basis, leading to consultations between the governments concerned without involving GATT at the outset, subject, however, to an obligation on those governments to communicate the results to GATT; or, in case of failure of the countries concerned to reach agreement or if the matter is considered of general interest, an approach can be made to GATT, which would have to undertake an inquiry and make recommendations. A time limit of 8 weeks is set for these inquiries, in order to prevent unduly protracted procedure.

In the event that GATT is unable to obtain sufficient information, the matter could be referred to the International Labor Organization for factfinding. As a matter of fact, under article XXIII GATT is already entitled to consult the ILO, a course of action which it would normally adopt. If questions relating to wages or productivity are raised, the ILO's relation to GATT would be similar to that of an expert giving evidence before a court. In order to insure continuity in any particular case, it would be preferable for the decision to remain with GATT, which would take into account other elements than wages and productivity. On the other hand, in order to preserve for the ILO the functions which are proper to it, this paragraph states that, where necessary, the ILO shall be consulted on matters within its jurisdiction.

Reference is made in section VI to the possibility of the ILO taking some direct action.

Complaints along these procedural lines could be raised, in place of GATT, with any other competent international organization, such as OEEC or the European Economic Community, which have their own manpower and social departments, capable of making the necessary investigations.

Paragraph 5—Furnishing of information

A crucial feature in the determination of whether or not unfair labor standards exist is the availability of adequate and truly comparable data from the various countries concerned. Therefore we spell out in this suggested agreement the obligation of exporting and importing countries to supply such data. If any agreement on fair labor standards is to be practicable, it should include, as an appendix to this paragraph 5, specific details as to industry coverage, the exact type of information to be used, and the methods of measuring and comparing such factors as output, manpower input and average hourly labor costs. Also, the international agency competent to determine what are fair labor standards would need to have at its disposal a staff of experts to decide these extremely intricate questions.

Below we cite some of the factors vital for an adequate statistical background, in order to show that, although very complicated, these problems can be coped with by scientific methods of investigation.

One specific problem is industry coverage. Industry definitions should be wide enough to cover as much as possible of the total production process for any article under consideration, without classifying in one industry commodities which are produced under significantly different conditions or for entirely different uses. The three-digit industry classifications adopted by the Economic and Social Council of the U.N. would probably prove satisfactory in most cases. The commodity lists of GATT might also help.

It is self-evident that output would have to be measured in terms of units produced, not in monetary terms. Those units would have to be expressed in terms of comparable sizes and quantities, but a major difficulty would still be to compare units produced in terms of quality. This clearly leaves open a wide field for subjective judgments.

In measuring manpower input, of course not only actual production employment would need to be taken into account, but also technical and research services, etc., especially as, the higher the state of technological development, the higher is the proportion represented by the latter. A further factor to be borne in mind is the degree of concentration in industry as between different countries. Calculation of labor input would have to make full allowance for work performed by subcontractors, who may not be classified within the industry under consideration. The criteria used in defining industry coverage would be applicable here.

Average hourly labor costs would be taken to mean all payments made by the employer, either directly to the employee or on his behalf. They would therefore include straight-time hourly wages, shift and overtime premiums, incentive payments, employer contributions to social insurance (insurance against illness, old age, accident, disability, maternity, unemployment, etc.), whether required by law or by contract, vacation and holiday pay, other leave of absence with pay, family allowances paid by the employer, payments in kind and bonuses. All these elements of remuneration to labor in any particular firm or whole industry under consideration, divided by the respective total man-hours worked, would constitute average hourly labor costs. Difficulties arise in regard to Britain and the Scandinavian countries, for instance, where social security is largely financed out of general taxation.

In order to compare average hourly labor costs in two countries using different currencies, it would be necessary to express the rate of labor costs in one country in terms of the other's currency. The exchange rate used for this purpose would be the rate prevailing at the time of the actual trans-

action and recognized by the International Monetary Fund.

In section 5 consideration is also given to international comparisons of purchasing power and consumption patterns in exporting and importing countries and, where applicable, in third countries. Such comparisons may be effected through purchasing power parities, which could be established for that particular purpose, and would need to be kept constantly up to date, so as to reflect divergent trends in living costs in the various countries. The European Coal and Steel Community has worked out such purchasing power parities and has proved their suitability for purposes of making this kind of comparison.

Experts with the international factfinding agency responsible for working out data on unfair labor standards should be able to devise appropriate solutions for problems stated here, in order to provide some measure of comparable data as a basis for substantiating or disproving charges of unfair labor standards. Equally difficult problems have been solved by various national statistical agencies, and some fragmentary international studies have been made.

The factfinding agency should have the advice of a consultative tripartite body, with experts representative of governments, employers and trade unions. Bodies so constituted are to be found in various countries, for the purpose of advising official agencies which work out cost-of-living indexes, etc.

Types of Action Open to Plaintiff Countries With a View to Introduction of Fair Labor Standards in Exporting Countries (Par. 6)

In virtue of this paragraph, the contracting parties would accept the importing country's right to take appropriate action and/or to urge the exporting country to implement corrective measures with a view to establishing fair labor standards.

This section specifies that the same right would apply to any other exporting country with an important share of the market in the importing country; such third countries might call on the importing country to take action on their behalf.

Paragraph 7

This paragraph is so phrased as to lay principal stress on action to improve unfair labor standards wherever they are shown to exist, and less stress on retaliatory or protective measures by importing countries whose industries are suffering injury. Thus it reinforces the underlying purpose of the agreement, which is to create the conditions for the expansion of free and fair trade. In accordance with this general aim, provision is made for exporting countries to be allowed some time in which to bring their conditions up to standard. Annual reviews will enable the parties concerned to ascertain what progress is being made.

The problem is of course highly complex. While an exporting country may be called on to reduce the differential between its own labor standards and those prevailing in the importing country, the latter's standards may continue to improve, in addition to which differences in the rate of productivity growth would further alter the countries' relative position. Annual reviews would help to show the effect of these various factors on differences in unit labor costs. To illustrate the working of the agreement, we assume the following case as an example.

The relative initial position of unit labor costs in two countries might be 100 in the importing country and 80 in the exporting country. The importing country may have asked the other to rectify its labor costs within a period of 5 years, which would mean that the exporting country would have to make good an average leeway of four points each year. If, after 2 years, the exporting

country has advanced by only two points, the importing country might either withdraw certain tariff concessions in regard to that country, suspend other obligations, or levy special compensatory tariffs or, if it had taken such retaliatory measures from the outset, it would not relax them, as it would do if the exporting country had actually improved its relative position by 8 points within 2 years. At the time of each annual review, consideration would of course also be given to the various other factors, such as national resources and relative development of purchasing power.

In this example, we have assumed that unfair labor standards existed as defined under section 3(iii). Where infringement of fair labor standards occurs within the meaning of section 3 (i) or (ii); i.e., if wage costs are substandard in relation to the exporting country's own wage structure, it would seem that the importing country should take more severe action to force the exporter to remedy the position as quickly as possible. However, by calling for remedial action step by step, the agreement provides a safeguard against sudden disruption of the internal price structure in the country complained of.

The countermeasures provided under section 7 do permit the importing country, as circumstances require, to take more drastic action. These various types of possible action are the following:

First, the importing country may withdraw from the exporting country concerned tariff concessions granted in the past, may refuse to apply to it new tariff concessions granted to other countries, or may suspend other obligations; in practice this means that the importing country would not apply to the exporter in question the most favored nation clause under GATT.

Second, the importing country may levy a special compensatory tariff. The latter measure would be taken in case unfair labor standards exist with regard to products on which no concessions have been made so far or are envisaged by the importing country, because its national industry is already conscious of a threat from abroad. This type of action might therefore be frequently resorted to. The compensatory tariff could be adjusted in amount at every stage, so as to be equivalent to the differential between fair and unfair labor standards in the export industry concerned, but avoiding any undue accumulation of this tariff on top of those already in existence.

Another possible form of action would be an export tax, which the importing country would require the exporter nation to levy itself on the producer in question. This would offer the advantage, especially in the case of an economically underdeveloped country, that its own government would collect penalties levied on account of unfair labor standards and the country's exchange position as a whole would benefit by the higher price charged for the goods. Proceeds from export taxes could be applied for improving general social standards and services in exporting countries. Another advantage is that the employers might be willing to increase the wages paid, instead of paying the tax to the government. At first sight, it might appear that this type of remedial action is preferable to the others. However, it suffers from the defect that there is little likelihood of its being put into practice. Even once figures proving the inadequacy of labor conditions have been established, the government of the exporting country might cast doubts upon their reliability, and might in any case not be prepared to penalize its own export trade.

Moreover, export taxes on employers on account of unfair labor standards would be impracticable, if not levied uniformly, but only on goods to be shipped to plaintiff countries. Since the differential between labor

standards in the exporting and a number of importing countries would vary in each case, the amount of the tax would have to differ accordingly. To check up, already in the production stage, on the destination of goods would involve too much redtape and would be ineffective. Finally, where trade is between underdeveloped countries, wages which are unfair for industrialized nations would no longer be unfair in terms of standards prevailing in another underdeveloped importing country, which would be only too happy to obtain needed goods as cheaply as possible. For all these reasons, there is no likelihood whatever of any proposal for export taxes of this kind being accepted by the two-thirds majority required at GATT.

Use of Revenue from Compensatory Tariffs— Paragraph 8

In this paragraph we suggest appropriate uses for revenue derived from compensatory tariffs. The proposed applications for such revenue adhere to our principle that importing countries should not benefit by extra revenue from tariffs, but that the whole emphasis should be on the remedying of substandard conditions in exporting countries.

We propose that importing countries pay revenue derived from special compensatory tariffs into an international economic development fund, to promote development subject to specified conditions. The purposes to which such funds would be applied should be preferably investment projects of a social nature or projects designed to build up the economic infrastructure of developing countries. A condition for their use would be that wages and social conditions in the services and production units so established be consistent with fair labor standards.

This proposal has the advantage of leading to redistribution of funds to quarters where the need is greatest, for proceeds of special compensatory tariffs would go, not necessarily to the exporting country directly concerned, but also to other nations for whose development the international fund has a duty to cater. It would mean, for instance, that the compensatory tariff which the United States might levy on goods from a European country would be channeled for the benefit, not of an industrialized country, but of an underdeveloped nation, which would thus receive aid for the purchase of equipment from industrialized countries. The last condition specified, namely, that wages and social conditions in the services and production units established with these funds be consistent with fair labor standards, is of course a vital feature.

Workers' Right to Freedom of Association and Genuine Collective Bargaining (Par. 9)

Since the trade unions are the proper bodies to serve as the motive force for the establishment of fair labor standards in any country, it would be only right for an agreement on international fair labor standards to include an obligation on governments to guarantee workers' freedom of association and to promote genuine collective bargaining. With regard to Communist countries, we have explained elsewhere that this agreement could not be applied in any case, and antidumping measures would be the only instrument that could be used in trade with such countries.

The Primary Aim—Healthy Expansion With Improved Living Standards (Par. 10)

This paragraph sums up again the principles which should inspire negotiations under the agreement. On no account may any corrective measure taken under the agreement hinder healthy expansion in any production sector which can be competitive while at the same time giving its workers fair labor standards, nor in any sector which, though it suffers from disadvantages, is vital

to an economy and must subsist, but not at the expense of the labor employed in it. The main emphasis lies on development of industries in line with improved living standards, compatible with technological progress and the growth of countries' economies generally.

Two recommendations in keeping with these principles are made. Firstly, importing countries able to prove that unfair labor standards elsewhere are threatening their industries should take due account of recent efforts, or anticipated efforts, in exporting countries to improve wages and social conditions in the industry concerned. Secondly, contracting parties should do their utmost to negotiate so as to refrain as far as possible from protective measures, provided that there is a show of goodwill on the exporting country's part to bring about proper improvements at an early date.

The whole agreement is therefore designed to promote higher living standards everywhere, as a basis for a greater volume of free and fair trade among prosperous nations.

Proposed trade adjustment program

Despite the existence of fair labor standards, more rational international trade patterns may hit some industries hard, through the impact of increased imports resulting from tariff reductions. If increased trade and a continued gradual reduction of tariff barriers are in the national interest, then it must also be in the national interest to help the firms, communities and workers adversely affected to adjust themselves to the increased imports with a minimum of hardship. This is the basic purpose of a trade adjustment program which the American trade unions are putting forward.

The objective of this proposal is not to subsidize the affected groups or to compensate them for injury. Instead, the aim is to help them to become adjusted to increased imports either by assisting them to make more effective and efficient use of their present facilities or by development of new lines of production which would offer business opportunities to firms and communities, and employment opportunities to workers.

The trade adjustment program, which is envisaged simply as an additional form of action in existing escape clause procedures, would mean that, after a Tariff Commission finding of injury or threat of injury resulting from increased imports, the provisions of this program could be invoked instead of raising tariff duties.

The program recommends specific action on behalf of workers, industrial enterprises and communities. It recommends:

For Workers

1. Increased supplementary unemployment compensation benefits.
2. Earlier (at the age of 60) retirement for recipients of old-age pensions under U.S. social security law.
3. Retraining for new job opportunities.
4. If necessary, transportation for entire families to new areas of employment.

For Industrial Enterprises

1. Loans through the Small Business Administration for the adjustment of such business enterprises and communities to economic conditions resulting from the trade policies of the United States.

2. Appropriate departments and agencies of Government will supply "technical information, market research, or any other form of information and advice which might be of assistance in the development of more efficient methods of production and the development of new lines of production."

3. Accelerated amortization would be permitted to business, industrial enterprises necessary for " * * * the development of new or different lines of production by an eligible business enterprise or a more balanced economy in an eligible community."

Communities or industrial development corporations within the communities may apply under the program for:

1. Loans which are available to communities and industrial development corporations on the same basis as they are available to business enterprises,

2. Technical information, market research and any other form of information and advice, which are available to the community on the same basis as to industrial enterprises, as long as such information is designed to develop a more balanced and diversified economy in the community.

We quote the program set out above as an example of the type of measures which would offer a useful means for supplementing measures to facilitate adjustments in a particular country affected by structural changes due to the development of international trade. It embodies social safeguards which the IMF should advocate for implementation in conjunction with the enforcing of international fair labor standards.

PROPOSED SECRETARY OF URBAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am astonished at the crude attempt of the President to inject a race issue into what is essentially a matter of public policy. I refer to the unusual, perhaps unprecedented, announcement at the Presidential press conference yesterday of the name of the man who would be appointed Secretary of Urban Affairs in the even such a post were created.

There are honest differences among us as to the merits of the proposal to create the proposed new Department. Such an agency, if created, will be with us for a long time. Its effects, good or bad, will be felt long after the first Secretary has departed the governmental scene. The question of who will be appointed to that office has no relationship whatsoever to the question of whether it is wise public policy to create the new Department.

Yet, the President, at a press conference at which the major news development was his announced intention to press strongly for the new Department, saw fit to announce his intention to appoint Robert Weaver, a distinguished Negro, to a post which does not yet exist.

This is a raw effort to enlist the justifiable pride of American Negroes in Mr. Weaver on the administration's side in a legislative controversy. It is a callous attempt to use American Negroes in an effort to confuse the real issues.

The President, as a candidate for election, deplored attempts to have him name his Cabinet officers before he was in the position to appoint them. Yet, it is clear he is not in a position to appoint Mr. Weaver as Secretary of a department that does not yet exist at this time. Furthermore, the President, as a candidate, said on October 17, 1960:

I am not going to promise a Cabinet post or any other post to any race or ethnic group. That is racism at its worst.

The President has now, by the obvious timing of his announcement, promised

a nonexistent Cabinet post to a large racial group. I leave it to him to define what kind of racism that represents.

I received yesterday a telegram from the president of the New York State NAACP and as part of my remarks I would like to include that telegram and also my reply to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DOCTOR REED'S WIRE

Representative JOHN W. BYRNES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Very disturbed to read press report that Republican policy committee will oppose Urban Affairs Cabinet post. Such a decision will be interpreted as Republican opposition to a possible Negro Cabinet appointment. Urge immediate reconsideration.

Dr. EUGENE REED,
President, New York NAACP.

REPRESENTATIVE BYRNES' REPLY

Dr. EUGENE REED,
President, New York NAACP:

Your wire of yesterday suggested that the recent action of the House Republican policy committee opposing creation of a Department of Urban Affairs will be interpreted as Republican opposition to a possible Negro Cabinet appointment.

It is clear from your wire that attempts will be made to inject the race issue into what is essentially a question of public policy. Any such attempt will be of disservice to the Negroes of America because it constitutes nothing more nor less than an effort to use them for political advantage.

The question of a man's appointment to a Cabinet post should be based solely upon his qualifications; his race, creed, or color should not enter into the matter. By the same token, the question of the creation of a new Cabinet post should hinge entirely upon the merits of the proposal; the race, color, or creed of the possible appointee to the post has no bearing upon the basic issues involved. As I deplore any attempt to defeat the Urban Affairs proposal on the basis that a Negro will be appointed to the post, likewise I deplore every attempt to advance it on the same grounds.

The action of the Republican policy committee was confined entirely to the merits of the proposal. It opposes the new department as a dangerous attempt to centralize more power in the Federal Government at the expense of the individual States. The committee's concern was with broad public policy, not with the narrow question of political appointment.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with surprise to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] concerning the President's press conference. It seems to me, if anyone is injecting an extraneous issue, it is the gentleman from Wisconsin. The question which we must determine is whether or not it is important in 1962 to have a department of the Federal

Government concerned with urban matters and urban problems. I submit that it is important. I am the author of a bill for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, today two-thirds of the American people are living in our cities, and it is high time we had a department to study comprehensively the many and complex problems with reference to urban matters. What could be more logical than the appointment to head such an agency of a man who has had under his jurisdiction the entire housing program of our Nation. The appointment of Robert Weaver would be an excellent appointment and one to be commended.

WHAT THE FREE WORLD NEEDS: A EUROPEAN PAYMENTS BALANCING PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SANTANGELO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, back in 1947 there occurred a mighty and unselfish effort to solve cooperatively the economic problems of the free world. With its industry and agriculture at a standstill, with its trade disrupted, with its international payments frozen, the ancient states of Western Europe sat down in Paris in the Committee for European Economic Cooperation to plan for their recovery. Out of their deliberations emerged the European recovery program.

Today, the miracle of Western Europe's recovery is there for all to see.

Cities have been rebuilt and are burgeoning, harbors are filled with ships, streets and roads are jammed with shiny new automobiles. Shop windows display a wealth of consumer goods including home appliances, once a near monopoly of prosperous American families. Wages and salaries are hitting new peaks, and there are more jobs than jobseekers in many of these countries.

The figures confirm impressions. Since 1953, industrial production has risen 87 percent in France; 98 percent in Germany; 111 percent in Italy; about 40 percent in Belgium; and 59 percent in the Netherlands. Even in the relatively slower growing Sweden and United Kingdom, industrial output has gone up 35 and 31 percent, respectively. These figures compare with an increase of 25 percent for the United States.

The Common Market countries—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands—have more than doubled their exports since 1953. In 1961, these countries exported goods worth \$29.7 billion compared with our own exports of \$20 billion. In fact, the shoe is now on the other foot. Large U.S. surpluses in the late forties—Europe's dollar shortage—have given way to large U.S. deficits, averaging more than \$3 billion for each of the last 4 years—the dollar glut.

U.S. gold reserves fell \$4.5 billion from 1953 to 1961, while our dollar liabilities to foreigners rose more than \$9 billion.

Western Europe, meanwhile, was increasing its reserves of gold and foreign exchange by about \$14 billion, or almost exactly the amount of the U.S. loss.

In 1961 we lost another \$800 million in gold, and our gold stock is down below \$17 billion, of which more than \$12 billion is pledged as the gold cover for our currency. Short-term debts owed by the United States already exceed \$18 billion.

Plainly, our incurring endless deficits year after year can only serve to weaken the world's key currency, the dollar.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the countries of Western Europe once again to convene an emergency session, as they did in 1947. But this time, the task will not be to evolve a European recovery program. Rather, what is needed is a determination by the European countries to work out a European payments balancing program. Such a program could eliminate at one and the same time America's persistent payments deficits and Europe's persistent payments surpluses.

Before spelling out this proposal, I should like to remind Members of the nature of our contribution to Europe in the last 15 years; of the new responsibilities for the free world that have been thrust upon Europe; of Europe's failure to meet those responsibilities in such diverse fields as trade, foreign aid, military defense, and international payments; and of this country's largely unsuccessful efforts to inspire the countries of Europe one by one to do their part. Then let us see whether a cooperative effort—the old 1947 approval—may not be what is needed.

WHAT WE DID FOR EUROPE

Except in the polite exchanges of diplomacy, Europeans rarely mention the massive transfer of real and financial resources from this country to Western Europe through the Marshall plan and similar programs.

Western Europe, other than Greece and Turkey, still has to its credit net assistance of \$39.5 billion from the United States. Nearly half of the \$85 billion we have given or lent to the world since the end of World War II was transferred to what has become an area second only to the United States in economic strength in the Western World. Our assistance was massive and thorough, mainly because we could not see how our mutual strength could be maintained and increased without a better balance between the economies of the United States and its closest allies. Locking up the world's supply of gold at Fort Knox and doling out dollars in amounts which would have to be spent quickly in purchases here appealed neither to sense nor to sentiment.

But aid as such does not tell the whole story. Our objective was not merely to restore Europe to what it was before, but to help build sister economies with which we could have truly interdependent, mutually strengthening, economic and political relations. It was consistent with this objective to encourage closer cooperation among the European countries and to view a former enemy as a welcome

friend. It was consistent to allow quotas on dollar imports, restrictions on money flow to the United States, and even the accumulation of financial reserves in the process. When the cold war intensified and it became necessary to rearm, we not only provided men and material resources from this country, but we tried to spend as much money as possible in Europe, even to paying for the use of roads by our military vehicles. As our aid to other areas of the world increased, we encouraged many of these recipients to spend their aid money in Europe.

Our program was pushed along by a genuine feeling of kinship. But we were not motivated by sentiment alone. We had—and still have—the conviction that "capitalism is one country" would be a foolish and untenable aim. We strove to create equals with whom we could trade on equal terms, share our strength to aid poorer nations, and contribute jointly to a better defense of the expanding frontiers of the free world.

This era of United States-European relations is now over. Europe is strong and growing stronger at a pace substantially faster than our own. It, therefore, faces a whole complex of responsibilities that for many years the United States faced alone.

EUROPE'S NEW FREE WORLD RESPONSIBILITIES

The United States does not expect gratitude for past favors from Europe, nor does it need to ask for aid out of weakness. What the United States and the rest of the free world do expect are a sense of responsibility and a sense of common purpose on the part of the European countries.

What is good for Europe cannot be the sole criterion today any more than narrow self-interest could have been the proper criterion for postwar U.S. policy. The boundaries of the free world do not end at the European Continent. They go beyond the shores of the North Atlantic. Other oceans and other lands lie within the dominion of the free world community.

Since this is so, any major economic or political decision taken in Europe, as well as in the United States, must be measured in terms of the welfare of the larger community. The obligations of newly affluent Europe, like those of the United States, are to maintain an adequate common defense, to give meaningful aid to developing nations, and to see to it that the growth of one is not at the expense of the other or of the community at large.

Since World War II, the United States has steadfastly traveled away from narrow nationalism and isolationism in its major actions affecting other countries. Europe has renounced colonialism and has traveled toward erasing national economic boundaries on the Continent. These are huge steps forward. They have been approved and applauded by the United States.

But it must be said candidly that Europe does not yet have a world view. Its sense of responsibility has not grown in pace with its prosperity and growing power. Its actions in certain major

policy areas are not reassuring and, persisted in, may diminish or nullify U.S. efforts in the free world community.

WHAT EUROPE COULD DO AND HAS NOT DONE

The measure by which prosperous Western Europe still fails to live up to its responsibilities is readily seen in the U.S. balance of payments with continental Europe. During the third quarter of 1961, we were in deficit to Europe by \$1.5 billion, which, continued for a year, would mean an annual loss to Europe of \$6 billion.

The deficit was not due to our inability to sell goods to European customers. Indeed, we had a merchandise trade surplus—an excess of U.S. exports to Europe over imports—of \$532 million in these 3 months. But this favorable balance failed by a huge margin to cover \$2 billion in other payments to Europe, mainly because of large tourist expenditures, private capital investment, money transfers to Americans living in Europe, troop pay and other defense expenditures, and short-term capital movement.

These figures are for the most recently available quarter. They may overstate the extent of the current dollar outflow to Europe. But there is no question that the balance is tipped toward Europe by a substantial margin. For four quarters ending September 30, 1961, our deficit to Europe amounted to \$2.5 billion, despite the fact that our trade surplus in this 12-month period was nearly \$2.9 billion.

It would be in the national interests of the principal European countries to correct this serious situation—to bring payments on both sides of the Atlantic into balance. A continuing deficit in the U.S. balance of payments, large gold losses, and a piling up of short-term claims on the United States, shake confidence in the dollar and directly affect European dollar monetary reserves.

There are many constructive steps Europe could take. First, they could substantially lower their tariff walls so as to buy more goods and services from the United States. They could also open their markets to Japanese exports. Japan's extra earnings would tend to be spent in the United States for more food, raw materials, machinery and other goods. Second, they could greatly enlarge foreign aid expenditures on an untied basis, and try to channel purchases to the United States. Third, they could, directly or indirectly, pay much more for the defense of Europe. Fourth, to protect the dollar while all these adjustments were being made, the more prosperous European countries could join in an adequate international credit agreement.

We must look at the facts. Today, and for the last 6 months, our payments deficit has been running at the rate of \$3 billion a year—as bad as it ever was.

Yet we have done about everything that we can do by ourselves—at least, everything nondestructive—to cut down on our deficit. We have done our best to expand our exports. We have had no inflation at home. We have cut down duty-free purchases by American tourists from \$500 to \$100. We are slowing down growth at home in order to pre-

vent short-term capital from being lured abroad by higher interest rates.

We have done what we can. The rest is up to Europe. But Europe has not been willing to accept its responsibility. Let us look at the record in four important areas:

1. TRADE

By greatly increasing imports from the United States, Europe could go far to balance dollar inflows from tourist spending, U.S. military expenditures, capital investments, and other sources. This would require the abandonment of remaining quotas on dollar imports and substantial tariff reductions by the European countries without asking for compensatory reductions by the United States.

Instead, by forming a customs union, the six countries of the Common Market—Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg—have gained tariff advantages over the United States. The advantages come from the fact that member countries of the union will gradually reduce their tariffs to each other while working toward a common set of duties toward the outside world. These built-in advantages—discriminations against outsiders—cannot fail to affect U.S. exports adversely. Moreover, since there is every likelihood that the customs union will soon expand to include the United Kingdom and the remaining European countries, Western Europe will have combined to place obstacles to an expansion of imports from the United States just when more imports were needed.

One way to have a customs union and to minimize discrimination would be by agreeing on a set of common tariffs with a substantially lower incidence than those now levied by the individual countries. This did not happen. The Common Market tariffs are arithmetic averages of member country rates or higher.

Another way would be to offer very large reductions in the common tariff in exchange for much smaller reductions by other countries. This also has not happened. In the negotiations just concluded in Geneva, it is reported that the Common Market countries have offered 20-percent reductions on a majority, but not all, of their nonagricultural duties. Even with this reduction, U.S. exports will tend to go down and not to go up, as the Common Market reduces the internal tariff to zero and establishes the common external tariff. Moreover, since the Common Market exacted some reductions in U.S. tariffs during the negotiations, U.S. imports from Europe may go up while U.S. exports are declining, thus further increasing Europe's payments surpluses.

Besides insisting on tariff protection at levels that disregard the imbalance of payments, Europe in other ways avoids increasing imports.

Germany, with over-full employment and confronted with the need to import labor from other countries, persists in protecting a high-cost, inefficient domestic coal industry and in limiting annual coal imports from the United States to 5 million metric tons. Its domestic consumption is more than 110 million tons

annually. An expansion in coal exports of 10 million tons per year could mean an increase in U.S. efforts of \$100 million.

Germany, which exports \$6 million of certain kinds of leather to the United States, holds down imports of similar leather from the United States to \$50,000 per year.

The Common Market countries want more tariff protection on wheat, feed grains, and other agricultural commodities important to U.S. trade. The argument among the countries now turns on how high that protection should be. Again, this attempt to increase agricultural production through higher tariffs comes when labor shortages in European industry are multiplying, and a shift out of inefficient agriculture to industry would be advantageous.

Five countries in Europe—the United Kingdom, France, Austria, Belgium, and the Netherlands—refuse to grant most-favored-nation treatment to imports from Japan. As a result, Japan's exports to all of western Europe come to about \$500 million per year, largely on a tied, bilateral basis, compared to about \$1 billion to the United States. If Japan could sell more freely in Europe, it would be able to spend more in the United States for food, raw cotton, and other products of which we are the dominant supplier.

2. FOREIGN AID

Until very recently, Europe's bilateral foreign aid expenditures consisted almost entirely of grants or loans to colonies, former colonies closely tied to the mother country's economy, or export credits and guarantees. Almost none of the aid was given in a way which could result in purchases outside the aid country, and so did nothing to correct payments imbalances. Moreover, there is considerable question whether aid to a colony is any different from national expenditure to promote development in a country's own territory.

France gives about \$800 million annually in overseas aid, an impressive 1½ percent of GNP, but a substantial part of this consists of grants and loans to Algeria, still an integral part of France. The rest of the French aid program goes mostly to African countries which have only recently won their independence from France.

Until 1960, Germany gave virtually no foreign aid, unless reparations and indemnities to Israel are counted. In 1960, it began a program of long-term development loans. In 1961, Germany took steps to permit increased aid by enlarging development loan commitment authority by about \$1.5 billion. It remains to be seen how rapidly these funds are disbursed, to what extent loan recipients are permitted to buy outside Germany and whether new authorizations will be made as the present financing is used up.

British aid at first glance appears to bear about the same relationship to gross national product as that made available by the United States, namely, about one-half of 1 percent. However, British aid goes almost entirely to its colonies and to the Commonwealth, with the requirement that the money must be spent in Great Britain.

Italy's aid has consisted largely of reparations to Yugoslavia and Ethiopia, grants to Italian Somaliland (newly independent), and exporter credits.

Apart from the new program in Germany, there appears to be little prospect for foreign aid of the kind which would help the U.S. balance of payments.

3. MILITARY EXPENDITURES

The United States spends about \$3 billion per year outside this country for defense. Nearly half of this is spent for the defense of Western Europe. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, we spent more than a billion dollars in Germany, France, and Italy. Three of the countries which have gained most in reserves from us in recent years.

To reverse this flow, the countries which are in current surplus payments positions could increase their troop support in NATO, making it less necessary for this country to send troops from the United States; pay for local base operating expenses, such as pay for civilian personnel, land rental costs, construction, and locally purchased goods and services; and purchase their own equipment and materials from the United States. This does not seem an unreasonable suggestion, since the NATO member countries as a group spend about half as much as the United States for defense in relation to GNP. In 1960, NATO member countries defense expenditures were 5.4 percent of GNP, while that of the United States was 9.3 percent. The ratio of defense expenditures to GNP for France was 6.8 percent; Germany, 4.3 percent; Italy, 3.7 percent; and United Kingdom, 7 percent.

It is now reported that German arms purchased in the United States will be increased. But this alone will be nowhere near sufficient to offset U.S. military spending in Europe.

4. STANDBY CREDIT AGREEMENT

An adequate international credit arrangement is needed so that ample potential support for the dollar would be available while payments adjustments were worked out between the United States and Europe.

A new credit agreement was proposed by the International Monetary Fund and the United States. The credit agreement which was recently adopted, subject to the ratification of the 10 participating countries, was that of the French Government, and it constitutes only a first step toward what is necessary.

The IMF has ample lending resources in dollars and sterling, but not in the currencies of the other leading industrial countries. A new agreement, therefore, was sought to permit the IMF to have standby borrowing authority for more French francs, Dutch guilders, German marks, and other hard currencies.

While the agreement actually worked out provides \$4 billion in nondollar currencies, this supplementary credit reserve is not assured because each country is to be its own judge on whether it can loan its currency when it is asked. If, for example, the United States should apply, and Germany, France, and Italy were each of the opinion that its current

or prospective needs made it impossible to lend any money, less than \$2 billion in nondollar borrowing authority would be left.

An adequate agreement would have made it possible, under appropriate standards and procedures agreed to in advance, for credit to be quickly available when needed. This was the recommendation of the Joint Economic Committee Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments. To date, the European countries have not agreed. As someone said, Europe appears willing to give "all aid short of money."

THE OLD WORLD TO THE RESCUE

The main reason why our hard-core deficit continues at \$2 to \$3 billion a year is the unwillingness of our European friends and allies to face up to their responsibilities.

Part of the fault may lie with the way we have gone about enlisting the support of the Europeans. Largely, we have proceeded by approaching one country at a time. This leaves it to the leaders of each country to evade their responsibility because each can think of a hundred reasons why it can do no more.

One country, for example, which has never had it so good, has been putting us off on the basis that our payments deficit is just a temporary U.S. problem, and that it will correct itself automatically. Another foreign office propounds the view that America's deficits are the results of our alleged fiscal and monetary irresponsibility, and that if we will only live right all will be well with our balance of payments.

Other Europeans point out that the average American's income is still much higher than the European's, a point of view which ignores the balance-of-payments aspect of our problem.

The European recovery program of 1947 was a success because all the countries got together and agreed what should be the share in the program of each one. Europe's response to the balance-of-payments problem of the sixties must equally be a joint operation.

The heads of state and their deputies should sit down together in 1962, as they did in 1947. Whether they do this through the medium of NATO (though this lacks such countries as Sweden, Switzerland, and Austria), or the OECD or by themselves, is not important. What is important is that they do it.

The United States should be there as a friendly observer.

The goal should be to eliminate the \$2 billion to \$3 billion annual U.S. deficit and the \$2 billion to \$3 billion annual European surplus. It should be up to the Europeans whether this is done by picking up more of the defense burden, by furnishing more untied foreign aid, by reducing trade barriers, or by some combination of these.

Let the Europeans make these decisions, as they did in 1947. The important thing is that the answer be one that disposes of the \$2 billion to \$3 billion imbalance.

I am confident that our European friends do not want the balance redressed by such methods as our retreating into higher tariffs, or in having con-

trols over American tourists or American capital exports, or by our shirking our obligations for military defense or for foreign aid. But it is for the Europeans to tell us that they do not want any of these reactionary solutions by providing us with forward-looking solutions of their own.

This is Europe's greatest opportunity since 1947. We who welcome the leadership of a revitalized Europe can hope that the opportunity will not be missed.

POLITICS IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] on yesterday called attention to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture was asking the Extension Service to enter the political arena to help shape future farm policies and programs. This is a bold-faced attempt to turn a nonpartisan educational agency into a medium for dissemination of political propaganda. I am also reliably informed that ASC committeemen are being told that they will be expected to support the administration's farm proposals or resign.

I now find that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is also getting into the political picture. According to a news story which appeared on the front page of the Des Moines Register of January 20, 1962, the new State director of FCIC for Iowa, Justin C. Dee, has made it very plain that FCIC agents in Iowa are expected to help promote the administration's farm programs, and that they are not to talk against such programs. At a recent meeting of Iowa FCIC agents, Mr. Dee is quoted to have said as follows:

You FCIC agents as representatives of the Department of Agriculture, can encourage farmers to participate in farm programs when you are contacting them about crop insurance. You are expected to help promote the programs enacted by the Congress. I do not want to hear any reports where you are talking against these programs, irrespective of which USDA agency is administering the program.

It is becoming more apparent each day that we are dealing with one of the most ruthless political machines in the history of this country. The Kennedy administration now seems to be engaged in using the Department of Agriculture for political purposes. This type of operation most assuredly will be resented by the farmers of America who do not want to be the political pawns of any administration.

THE COMMUNIST FORCE

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, it is of the utmost importance that Americans who wish to learn more about the Communist force that seeks to destroy our way of life know that valuable reference material exists.

There are many books and pamphlets published on the subject, but they all do not measure up to the standard of reliability that is demanded by the very nature of the conflict.

To provide a helpful guide to our citizens on reading in this field I am placing the following bibliography in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Because a book or other publication does not appear on this list is not an indication it is unreliable. A considerable number of good works are omitted because the list would otherwise become too unwieldy.

I believe this is the first comprehensive bibliography of this type placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since the then Senator Richard M. Nixon inserted "Bibliography on World Communism," prepared by the American Legion in 1952.

The list that follows was prepared by Karl Baarslag, former director, Countersubversive Activities Commission, American Legion, for the All American Conference to Combat Communism, and was published by the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, a member of the conference, in pamphlet form with an introduction. Copies may be obtained from the Catholic War Veterans, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Books marked with an asterisk are especially recommended by the compilers for high school and public libraries. I have added two titles at the end because of their importance, "Cold War and Liberation" and "Congress and the American Tradition."

I wish to include two speeches I made in the Congress dealing with the enemy. "The National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee," given on May 3, 1961, is an exposé of that Communist front which today is one of the most active in the country. The second, given on June 12, 1961, "H.J. Res. 444—The Victory Resolution," includes two sections of documentation; first, "Declarations of Hostile Intent by the World Communist Movement," and second, "Findings, Resolutions, and Condemnations of the World Communist Movement in U.S. Law, Presidential Proclamations, and Treaties Binding on the United States."

[Titles preceded by an asterisk (*) are especially recommended for high school and public libraries]

BOOKS

"Black Book on Red China." Hunter, Bookmaller, 1958, \$2: An authority on Chinese communism gathered firsthand reports at Hong Kong from refugees on what life is like under the Communists. Excellent source material on the Communist destruction of Christian churches and persecution of religions behind the Bamboo Curtain.

"Brainwashing in Red China." Hunter, Vanguard, \$3.75: Hunter was the first American to bring back the whole horrible story of Communist mass brainwashing to make their victims actually believe that white is black and that criminality is really "building a new and better world." Important.

"Child of the Revolution." Leonhard. Regnery, 1958, \$6.50: The son of a poor German Communist family is brought up by the Soviet secret police to become a trained and cynical apparatchik and Russian. An absorbing adventure story with keen psychological insights.

"Century of Conflict." Possony. Regnery, \$7.50: Probably the single most important book on this list. Should be in every library in the land. Public, high school, and college. The whole range of Communists' tactics and every facet of the whole complex pattern of Communist plans for world conquest.

"Communism and Christ." Lowry. Morehouse-Gorham. A minister who gave up his pulpit to devote his full time to furthering education on communism, writes what is one of the best general summaries on the basic antagonism separating two worlds—Christianity and communism.

"Communism and Christianity." D'Arcy. Devin-Adair, 1957: A Catholic priest considers the fundamental moral problem posed by communism and the task of all Christians in defending their common faith against it.

"Communism in Our World." Caldwell. John Day, 1956, \$2.75: A small but excellent little book written especially for 12 to 16 age group. Just what is communism is graphically explained by an expert in simple English. Should be in every school library.

"The Fallacy of Communism." Saar. Meador, Boston, 1956: An Estonian refugee only in the country a few years sums up in simple English the basic fallacies and hidden dangers of communism. An elementary treatise excellent for 12 to 16 age group.

"Democracy Versus Communism." Colgrove. Van Nostrand, 1957: The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education commissioned Dr. Colgrove, a recognized anti-Communist scholar, to prepare a special textbook for school use. A few minor defects but in the main still one of the best works available explaining to students the basic differences and values between democracy and communism.

"Guide to Anti-Communist Action." Bouscaren. Regnery, 1959: A distinguished political scientist and nationally known authority on communism draws up a blueprint for intelligent and effective counter-subversive action.

HIGHLY RECOMMENDED

"The Freeman's Library." Hazlitt. Van Nostrand: A bibliography of the world's outstanding literature on human freedom and individual liberty. Some 550 classics from Aristotle to Rebecca West are listed and described. Should be in every library.

"I Led Three Lives." Herbert Philbrick. Grosset & Dunlap, Inc., \$1.49: Philbrick's own story of how he found himself being used in a communist youth movement, reported to the FBI and was instructed to remain and serve his country as an undercover agent. The thrilling story of his life as a Communist—FBI undercover agent—a respectable businessman.

"I Was a Slave in Russia." Noble. Devin-Adair, 1959: An American boy, born in Detroit, is trapped in Nazi Germany at the end of World War II. Accused by the Soviet secret police of the usual phony charge of espionage, young Noble is sentenced to 9 years in Soviet slave labor camps. One of the few Americans ever to survive to tell his incredible story to the West. Exciting reading.

"I Was a Spy." Miller. Bobbs Merrill, 1960: Unfortunately a badly misnamed but otherwise excellent book by a housewife

who penetrated the Communist Party as undercover agent for the FBI. Fascinating and yet instructive story. Girls will enjoy this book immensely. Authentic—revealing.

"Lost Illusion" (paperback). Utley. Regnery, 1960, \$1.25: The heartwarming autobiography of an idealistic young English girl who fell for communism in college, married a Russian, bore a son in the land of the Soviets only to see her husband vanish into the night in tow of the dread GPU never to be seen again. A paperback reprint of a book first published in 1948.

"In the Name of Conscience." Khokhlov. McKay, 1959, \$4.50: A trained and disciplined Soviet secret police officer is assigned to murder a leading German anti-Communist. His wife, a Christian, sacrifices her own life and that of their infant son to urge him to defect to the West and tell all about the total immorality of the Soviet leadership. One of the truly great books of our time. Belongs next to Whittaker Chamber's monumental "Witness."

"Masters of Deceit." J. Edgar Hoover. Holt, 1958, \$5: The Director of the FBI tells the whole story of communism in America, how Communists operate, and how best to protect oneself against their machinations and trickery. One of the most important books on this subject to appear in a long time.

"Primer on Communism." Cronyn. Dutton, 1957: A paperback which answers 200 questions on communism. Highly recommended for school and classroom use in grade and high schools. Life under communism as taken directly from Soviet sources.

"Our Secret Allies." Lyons. Duell, Sloan, Pearce: The famous writer on communism, Eugene Lyons, whose "Assignment in Utopia" first ripped the propaganda veil off the hideous face of communism makes a strong case for the people of Russia as offering the Achilles heel through which the whole rotten structure of communism can some day be toppled to the ground. A most important work.

"The Naked Communist." Skousen. Ensign Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, 1958: Probably one of the best all around handbooks on the whole subject of communism. Excellent for teaching and textbook use. Easily readable, large type, no tedious quotations from Marxist sources. Highly recommended.

"The Hidden Russia." Krasnov. Holt & Co., 1960: The grandson of a Czarist general and famous writer is trapped by the Russians in Yugoslavia at the end of the war. His father and grandfather were hanged by the Soviets while he spent 10 years in Soviet horror camps. Finally released a few years ago he lived just long enough to write this most remarkable and worthwhile book before dying last year in South America. Not for queasy stomachs.

"The Continuing Struggle." Walker. Athene Press, 1958: A scholarly yet highly readable treatise on Red China by one of America's leading authorities. Makes a most effective source of authentic material on whether or not we should recognize Red China. Will demolish pro-Communists and other apologists for Mao Tse-tung who argue "but after all the Communists do exercise effective control over mainland China." A most important work.

"The Story of Mary Liu." Hunter. Farrar, Strauss & Cudahy, 1957: The deeply moving story of a Chinese Christian girl whose faith enabled her to triumph over both a terrible physical handicap and the diabolic persecution of the Communists bent on eradicating every vestige of Christianity in China. Excellent book for girls.

"The Techniques of Communism." Budenz. Regnery, 1954: The former editor of the Daily Worker who in 1945 left the Communist conspiracy to return to the religion of his youth compiles what is still one of the

best handbooks on Communist operating methods. Highly readable—very important.

"The Web of Subversion." Burnham. John Day, 1954: One of our leading authorities on communism summarizes in a compact and fast-reading book the entire sickening story of Communist espionage and infiltration into our Government started way back in 1934 by an obscure and almost unknown party functionary, Harold Ware. One of the best books available in a field now adequately covered by a considerable library.

"You Can Trust the Communists." Schwarz. Prentice-Hall, 1960: The famous Australian physician turned anti-Communist lecturer produces his first book on the subject. Takes you inside the Communist mind as very few other books ever have been able to do. One of the most important books published since "Witness."

"Witness." Chambers. Random House, 1952: Still one of the truly great autobiographies of this century. A latter-day Dante writing with brilliance takes you on a personally conducted tour to the lower depths and inferno of underground communism. No amount of reading in communism can be considered complete without "Witness." An absolute "must" for those who find it hard to understand "why anyone should want to become a Communist."

IMPORTANT RECENT BUT ADVANCED BOOKS

The following titles should be found on the shelves of any important college library. While not necessarily too abstruse or "heavy" most of them do presuppose some basic preparatory reading. These titles have been used at the National War College seminars for Reserve officers and represent the consensus of a group of outstanding authorities who arranged the curriculums and compiled the recommended reading lists.

"Protracted Conflict." Kintner, Cottrell, Strausz-Hupe. Harper, New York, 1959: A companion volume to "Century of Conflict." One of the 10 most important books ever written on the cold war.

"American Strategy for the Nuclear Age." Neff and Hahn. Anchor, New York, 1960: Another volume of the "10 most important books" in this field. A symposium on all aspects of the crisis of our time by 30 or more of the country's top experts. Very, very important.

"Neither War Nor Peace." Seton-Watson. Praeger, 1960, \$7.50 (see page 4): A penetrating analysis of the titanic problem of survival posed for the West by world communism.

"Imperial Communism." Bouscaren. Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1953: A highly readable summary for student level on all aspects of world communism.

"The Soviet Secret Police." Wolin & Slusser. Praeger, 1957: Probably one of the best compendiums available on the secret state within a state—the Soviet secret police and its farflung network covering the world and reaching into every crack and crevice of Western society. The side of communism which most Communists do not know anything about.

"Soviet Espionage." Dallin. Yale University Press, 1955. Not quite up to Slusser and Wolin but nevertheless a highly readable general history of the main activity of the Soviet secret police all over the world—espionage and terror.

"Peaceful Coexistence." Kulski. Regnery, 1959: Another of the 10 most important books on communism written by a great scholar and renowned authority on the Soviets. Very important to any comprehensive understanding of just what Khrushchev is trying to put over with his "peaceful coexistence" confidence game.

"Communist China and Asia." Barnett, Harper, 1960: A detailed appraisal of the challenge posed to this country by the rapidly rising Communist state of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. Very important.

"The Language of Communism." Hodgkinson. Pitman, New York, 1954: A British expert compiles a very important glossary of Communist idiom, "Aesopian language," and "newspeak." A codebook as it were without which the beginner has the greatest difficulty penetrating Communist obscurantist lingo.

"In Every War But One." Kinkead. Norton, 1959: A deeply disturbing analysis of why so many American POW's in Korea succumbed to Communist brainwashing and became "progressives."

"Shanghai Conspiracy." Willoughby. Dutton: The amazing story of the greatest spy in all history, Dr. Richard Sorge, written by Gen. MacArthur's former chief of intelligence. Absorbing.

"For the Skeptic." Munson. Bookmailer, New York: A very valuable digest of the highlights of some 22,000 pages of congressional reports and hearings on all aspects of Communist espionage, subversion, and infiltration of the Government at policymaking levels.

"America Faces World Communism." Bouscaren. Vantage: Excellently prepared work on the Communist problem facing this country by one of our outstanding experts.

"Key to Peace." Manion. Heritage Foundation: A positive answer to communism written by one of the great constitutionalists, Dean Clarence Manion. Distributed nationwide to the schools by the American Legion.

"Wedemeyer Reports." Wedemeyer. Holt: Firsthand account and memoirs of a great American soldier whose report on China and Korea was suppressed for several years. Should be in every library. Very important book.

"Tito—Moscow's Trojan Horse." Draskovich. Regnery: A Yugoslav diplomat and authority on communism debunks the myth that Tito is some sort of decent humane Communist whom we can lure away from Moscow. Excellent historical reference work.

"The Conscience of the Revolution." Daniels. Harvard University Press: Another brandnew and very important book. The little known story of opposition within the monolithic state of the U.S.S.R.

Other titles—Fiction

"Nineteen Eighty-four." Orwell. Harcourt: Also reprinted in paperbacks. A former British Communist and brilliant satirist describes what life will be like under the universal Communist state. One of the most important books available to those seeking an insight into Communist mentality.

"A Ride to Panmunjom." Thorin. Regnery: A young Navy pilot falls into Communist hands during the Korean war. First-hand and first-class account of Communist brainwashing by one who learned how to beat it out of his own resources and character. Written as a novel, it is practically an autobiography.

"The Fall of a Titan." Gouzenko. Norton: The Soviet code clerk who defected in Montreal in 1945 to make the first revelations of Soviet mass espionage against the United States in time of war writes a powerful, first-rate novel on the Communist system.

Other titles—Nonfiction

"Beyond Containment." Chamberlin. Regnery, 1953: Still one of the best primers on Communist power manipulation. Chapter VI extremely valuable because of its masterly exposé of 10 basic fallacies about communism still held by many leading Americans.

"A Concise History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." Reshetar. Praeger, 1960: Fills a longfelt need for a detailed and objective history of the Communist Party of

Russia. Based almost entirely on official Soviet documents with Communist mythology and hokum carefully filtered out.

"How Communists Negotiate." Joy. MacMillan, 1955: An American admiral learns the hard way across the negotiation table just how Communists operate. A very important book, particularly for those old-fashioned Americans who still believe that men of good will can settle their differences no matter how far apart they may be, "if they will only get together and talk things over."

"Red Star Over Cuba." Weyl. Devin-Adair, 1960: A former Communist in the same underground cell as Alger Hiss documents the incredible story of State Department bungling over Fidel Castro. Weyl proves that Castro was a trusted Communist as far back as 1949. Very important book. New, 50-cent paperback has chapter on the tragic Cuban invasion.

Government reports

(Most of the following titles can still be secured directly from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.)

"The Communist Conspiracy," basic Communist documents in five volumes, 1956, \$5.60.

"Handbook for Americans," the Communist Party, how it works: Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 30 cents.

"Congressional Investigations of Communism," a summary index of all publications, 1918-55, \$1.25.

"Crimes of Khrushchev," four parts, House Committee on Un-American Activities, 70 cents.

"The Great Pretense," a symposium on the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Russia, 45 cents.

"Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," HCUA, 1957, 45 cents.

"Language as a Communist Weapon," Possony. HCUA, 1959, 20 cents.

"Patterns of Communist Espionage," HCUA, 1959, 25 cents.

"The Shameful Years," 30 years of Soviet espionage in the United States, HCUA, 1951, 25 cents.

"Soviet Total War," two volumes, a symposium by some 120 authorities on all aspects of the Communist threat, HCUA, 1956, \$2.75. (An invaluable compendium which should be in every library.)

"The New Role of National Legislative Bodies in the Communist Conspiracy," HCUA, 1961, 20 cents.

PAMPHLETS

"Communism, America's Mortal Enemy," Dr. Fred Schwarz. "Tactics and Methods of Communism," Dr. J. B. Matthews. "How the Communists Control Thoughts and Attitudes," Herbert Philbrick. "Communist Indoctrination," Maj. William Mayer. (All four may be secured for a dollar from the National Education Program, Searcy, Ark.)

"Communism—A Disease," Dr. Fred Schwarz, 10 cents. (Dallas Freedom Forum, Post Office Box 7351, Dallas, Tex.)

PERIODICALS

"Counterattack," 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., \$24 per year.

"Freedoms Facts," All-American Conference, 917 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., \$3 per year.

"Communist Line Bulletin," Institute for Community Education, Rose and Oak Streets, Flushing, N.Y., \$3 per year.

"For God and Freedom," The Christian-form, 1030 Perry St., N.E., Washington 17, D.C.

"The Firing Line," American Legion, Post Office Box 1055, Indianapolis, Ind., \$3 per year.

"The Tablet," 1 Hanson Place, Brooklyn, N.Y., \$4 per year.

HIGHLY RECOMMENDED

"A Forward Strategy." Strausz-Hupe, Possony. Harper, 1961, \$5.95: A companion volume to the very important "Protracted Conflict" published in 1959. Undoubtedly the single most important book to a full understanding of the present world crisis. A complete blueprint on how to reverse the long trend of reverses and defeats suffered by the West at the hands of advancing world communism.

"Brainwashing from Pavlov to Powers." Hunter. The Bookmailer, New York: Latest work by an acknowledged authority on a diabolic new "science"—brainwashing. Indispensable to any understanding of why Communists and most of their work still continue to baffle and befuddle the so-called best brains on our side.

"The Soviet Design for a World State." Goodman. Columbia University Press, 1960, \$6.75: Probably one of the best college level textbooks available on aspects of Soviet power techniques. Should be in every college library.

"American Might and Soviet Myth." Campaigne. Regnery, 1960, \$3.95: Some plain hard facts to dispel the present pessimistic and defeatist attitude assumed by so many of our leaders vis-a-vis the Soviets. Should be in all high school libraries.

"The Edge of War." Atkinson. Regnery, 1960, \$6: One of our leading scholars of Communist power techniques reduces to laymen's language the problems facing us today and what we must do to avert ultimate disaster.

"The Challenge of Coexistence." Kovner. Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., \$3.25: A timely and important book explaining just what Khrushchev and the Communists have in mind when they insist that we have no other alternative but a global nuclear holocaust if we do not accept what they call "peaceful coexistence." For high school and college libraries.

"The Moulding of Communists." Meyer. Harcourt Brace, 1960, \$5: A most important work by one of our outstanding authorities setting forth just how a strange new human type, the dedicated hard-core Communist, is drop-forged in the ideological steel mills of communism. Recommended for college libraries but its terminology is a bit tough for high school level and the average reader.

ALSO RECOMMENDED

"Ten Years of Storm." Chow Ching-wen. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, \$6: Another very important contribution to the now well-filled library of documentation on Red China. Indispensable to anyone preparing to argue against recognition of Communist China. Suitable for both high school and college use.

"The Communist Persuasion." Winance. P. J. Kennedy, \$4.50: A Catholic priest learns first hand through torture and unbelievable degradation just what the Chinese Communists mean by "brain cleansing of bourgeois errors." Highly readable.

"American Communism and Soviet Russia." Draper. Viking, \$8.50: The best of the series financed by the Fund for the Republic on all aspects of communism in American life.

"Khrushchev, the Making of a Dictator." Palocz-Horvath. Atlantic, Little-Brown, \$4.95: The well-known Hungarian writer makes a worthwhile contribution to the otherwise well-hidden biography of Stalin's successor to the Soviet purple. Well written.

"Cold War and Liberation." John F. O'Connor. Vantage, New York, \$7.50: Completely indexed and referenced, this is one of the most valuable books to appear in recent years. It traces the failures of the free world's policies in regard to the World Com-

Communist Movement from its takeover of Russia to the present and draws important conclusions from those failures.

"Congress and the American Tradition." Burnham. Regnery: A clinical study of the gradual erosion of the constitutional powers of Congress and the importance of Congress to the maintenance of our unique American political system as a bulwark against the Communist onslaught.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Moley has presented a very penetrating analysis of back-door Federal aid to education in the January 29, 1962, issue of Newsweek magazine. This excellent article points out that H.R. 132 should receive the close inspection of every Member of the House.

We are currently arming the Federal bureaucrats with many wedges to massively inject themselves into every State and local school district. Unless adequate safeguards are presented to this bill we will give one more tool to those who want a monolithic national educational policy.

PERSPECTIVE: SCHOOL AID IN NEW DRESS (By Raymond Moley)

There is now pending in the House Rules Committee a bill (H.R. 132) to make channels available and to provide Federal subsidies for educational television. This legislation passed the Senate last year almost without notice and with little or no comment. But while the Federal money involved is relatively small, as the bill becomes better known it promises the same controversial issues which ended in the defeat of President Kennedy's omnibus Federal-aid-for-schools proposal last September.

The radio-TV spectrum is a relatively scarce and strictly limited natural resource controlled by the Federal Communications Commission. The FCC has reserved 268 channels for educational purposes. Only 54 are in use at the present time. The argument is that State and local public agencies must have subsidies from the Federal Government to avail themselves of these channels because it is costly to provide the technical and other facilities to use them effectively.

The bill would authorize total appropriations of \$25,520,000 to be used in matching funds provided by:

"(a) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within [the State],

"(b) the State educational television agency,

"(c) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or

"(d) a nonprofit community educational television organization."

TOOL FOR CONTROL

The restriction of Federal grants to public schools would exclude private schools of all sorts, just as was true of the lost Federal aid plan of 1961. Because of discrimination, the groundwork is thus provided for another

strong protest from churches supporting their own schools.

A much more serious aspect of this proposal is the immense tool which such an educational facility would provide for Federal control of the content of education by the Federal bureaucracy. In this case by the U.S. Office of Education. It invites brainwashing of children, students, and the public by a Federal bureaucracy.

The same bit of hypocritical semantics barring control by the U.S. Commissioner of Education is present in this bill that has been in all Federal-aid-to-education bills in the past. But just as was the case in last year's bill, actual control will be contrived to put the materials devised by an educational elite in Washington into whatever is called education.

ENDLESS POSSIBILITIES

The U.S. Office of Education, quite unwisely from its point of view, could not wait until the bill might pass in the House unnoticed as it did in the Senate, but issued a report by one of its perennial panels which revealed how, under the National Defense Education Act, it would plunge into the business of telling States and local agencies what to teach. The report says that a "nationwide talent search and training program" is needed, etc. And everyone knows that whatever is "nationwide" is the USOE.

Under the provisions of the bill it is easy to see that as the federally subsidized channels are used by the Commissioner of Education will be the dictator as to who shall get these limited resources. And when the channels are all used, there will be none left for private schools. There is also a gadget for further Federal control in that the Commissioner of Education would plan and encourage interstate groupings of the users of the channels.

Ultimately, there would be monolithic control of a vast means of educating the American people. The possibilities are endless.

Finally, there is no need for Federal subsidies. Private institutions, including foundations, have the money and the willingness to help local agencies make use of these channels.

No one questions the immense advantage of using radio and television in education. One gifted teacher could supplement the efforts of hundreds of average classroom instructors. But the channels available should be allocated without discrimination, without Federal subsidies, and with no possibility of monolithic control. Control of educational facilities should remain where it is, at the State and local level.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] may address the House today for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTRIGUE IN THE CONGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] is recognized.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 1961, under a like condition, I requested permission to address the House on the question of developments I felt were upcoming in the Congo. I concluded that address with words urg-

ing this body to launch an investigation into the policies of the United Nations and the United States in the Congo. I concluded with these words, "This cannot wait until next year. The time to act is now." Only a few days after that address, the Congo literally exploded into violence, bloodshed and tragedy. We did not act in the last session. While we had left our Chamber here and gone back to our various districts, my staff and I continued with a deep interest in the developments in the Congo. That interest and research continues to this day. I would prefer to have the opportunity to stand before my colleagues in the House with words of praise and commendation for positive action, for real accomplishments—but I cannot do that because the facts speak otherwise. It is important at this stage, as many areas of public opinion are being barraged with the idea that a successful coalition is imminent in the Congo, that we look at some of the facts and the backgrounds of the individuals involved. It is important to refer back to the address I made, again on September 12, wherein I named two individuals in particular in the Central Congo Government. One was Antoine Gizenga, and the other Christophe Gbenye. In recent days we have seen many headlines directed toward the man named Gizenga. There seems to be a line being perpetrated that action in recent days aimed toward bringing Gizenga into custody proves the inherent strong anti-Communist position of the Central Congolese Government.

I would direct to your attention the second name, Mr. Gbenye. Who is this man? What is his background? What is his role in the existing Central Congo Government? Before independence was achieved in the Congo, in meetings with the Belgians, the now currently recognized Soviet stooge Patrice Lumumba suggested three proposed cabinets. While others appeared in various posts in these cabinets, one man appeared in the same spot in all three recommended lists. This man was Christophe Gbenye, and the post was the Interior Minister's slot in every case.

Those who are familiar with the takeover tactics of the Soviets are well aware that almost without exception the position which they seek in attempted coalition governments is the post of the Interior Secretary. The reason is very clear, tragically clear: The Interior Secretary controls the internal police. Antoine Gizenga was not even included on one of these lists. Gbenye was the one man whose name was included in all these lists, not Gizenga, Gbenye was the one that Lumumba, the pro-Soviet stooge, held firm on in this key position, always insisting on his being in this point of control. Again I repeat the fact that the internal police would be under Gbenye's control as Lumumba's Interior Minister.

When Lumumba passed from the scene and Gizenga set up his regime in Stanleyville, who was the Minister of the Interior? The same Christophe Gbenye. Strangely enough, when the United Nations and this means the United States,

because our representatives actively worked with them, and our tax money paid for it—when the U.N. set up the central government at Leopoldville last August, who was to get this same position? Christophe Gbenye. Christophe Gbenye is found in the same key position. He became Premier Adoula's Interior Minister. There it is, in ABCD order. This alphabetical ABCD of the Communist takeover includes the entrenching of a trusted agent in top control of the armed men who soon can take the road of terror and arrests to begin the elimination of internal opposition.

But knowing Lumumba's stooging for the Soviets, taking their money with which to bribe his way to victory—something pointed out by Stewart Alsop in his fine articles in the Saturday Evening Post on Africa last year, I am sure the Soviets would not let Lumumba put just anybody into the Interior Minister's seat.

The distinguished gentleman from Connecticut in the other body, Senator Dodd, Democrat, said in the Senate last September that Gbenye was trained in Communist Czechoslovakia.

Let us look for a moment at this man Adoula, now Prime Minister of the central government. At the so-called neutralist conference in Belgrade he stated: "We will follow the policies of the late Patrice Lumumba."

Again, may I point out that Lumumba was the Soviet man.

Does this offer the U.N. and the United States much hope in view of Lumumba's pro-Soviet policies? Does Gbenye's being Adoula's Interior Minister offer us less reason for concern?

How strong is Adoula in his own government, even assuming he wants to work with the free world and against Soviet interests in the Congo? It is clearly demonstrated by recent events that Adoula cannot control the Parliament or Congolese troops.

What has been the relationship between Adoula, Gizenga, and Gbenye? There may be a lot of confusion here in the public mind because of the lack of background on these three men.

Our attention has been concentrated on Gizenga, and the illusion created that there has been a strong successful move toward freedom in the Congo.

Let me reiterate. Christophe Gbenye was a member of Patrice Lumumba's political party. This is Gbenye, the man who is now Interior Secretary. Antoine Gizenga was the founder of a rival Congolese party. When Lumumba was killed, Gizenga claimed the mantle of power since he had been No. 2 to Lumumba in a coalition government. But Lumumbists controlled the Parliament, and Gbenye, not Gizenga, was in Lumumba's party.

In recent months Gbenye has tried to establish himself as the true successor within Lumumba's own party; in other words, as Lumumba's political successor. This is most important. Thus, the votes in Adoula's Parliament that censured Gizenga for isolating himself in Stanleyville cannot necessarily be construed as votes for Prime Minister Adoula against Gizenga. It is much

more wise to consider them as Gbenye-controlled-voted against Gizenga.

While Adoula once worked with Lumumba in 1958, by July 1959, he had split off from him and joined a moderate secessionist wing of Lumumba's movement. By the time of independence in June 1961, Adoula was completely out of Lumumba's party, having joined the Parti de l'Unité Nationale Africaine headed by Jean Bolikango. Last August he was chosen as a compromise Premier who fitted in between the faction of President Kasavubu and the forces of Antoine Gizenga. Consequently, it would seem likely that the Lumumbists in Parliament owe much more loyalty to Gbenye, the Interior Minister, who has remained a loyal Lumumbist, than to the party-jumping Adoula who first opposed Lumumba within the party, then joined an opposition party.

Hence, I say again it would be most unwise to assume that the overwhelming votes recently cast against Gizenga are votes for Adoula and his policies. Far more likely they are votes controlled by Gbenye.

Now, let us go back to Mr. Adoula. What do we know of Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula? According to the U.N. supporting Africa Report of July 1961, published by the respected African-American Institute, "Adoula is an outspoken anticlerical Socialist who is far closer ideologically to Gizenga than he is to the conservative, Catholic viewpoint of Prime Minister Ileo—he got much of his early political education from mentors in the Belgian Socialist Party, and his Marxism is not that of Eastern Europe."

Joseph Ileo was the Prime Minister whom Adoula replaced when the U.N. set up the new coalition Government of the Congo last August. Antoine Gizenga, of course, is the notorious pro-Soviet Vice Premier of that U.N.-sponsored Government, who since its establishment withdrew to Stanleyville, and recently has been brought back to Leopoldville under censure of the Central Government.

What else do we know about Adoula? He has been characterized as a very capable man. The very able gentleman from Connecticut in the other body, the most outspoken critic of this administration's Congo policy, has said of Adoula, after meeting him, "I am convinced, from certain of his statements, that he is strongly anti-Communist."

Now, I have the highest regard for the gentleman in the other body, and I am truly grateful for his magnificent work in this area, and I would go further and say he deserves the eternal gratitude of all Americans and freedom fighters everywhere. However, on this matter of Adoula I am constrained to differ to a degree. I am, like the gentleman from Connecticut in the other body, hopeful that Tshombe and Adoula can work out a just peace in the Congo, but I see no evidence to show that Adoula is making any compromise, nor is our State Department. The pressure is still all on Tshombe and Katanga.

Some of Adoula's deeds are these. He accepted Gbenye as his Interior Minister. Historically, by this fact alone, I

cannot evaluate this deed as the act of an enlightened anti-Communist. He could be anti-Communist, but he is a Socialist, and Socialists all over the world are notoriously susceptible to Communist persuasion to work with them in coalition governments. At any rate, Adoula was willing to become Prime Minister with Gbenye as his Interior Minister.

Now, contrast this with the position of the truly anti-Communist Lao Prince Boun Oum. The one thing holding up President Kennedy's efforts to set up what he calls a truly neutral Laos is the firm resistance on the part of this wise prince against the incredible pressures of the American diplomat Averell Harriman, and Soviet Union's Georgi Pushkin, an incongruous alliance, to let a so-called neutral be Interior Minister and another the Defense Minister. President Kennedy even brazenly suspended for a time our economic aid to Laos as part of this pressure.

My colleagues should remember that such compromises on the part of the esteemed Jan Masaryk lost him and the free world the entire country of Czechoslovakia. It fell to the Communists without a shot being fired because Communists were allowed to take over the key ministries in the Government, most importantly, the post of Interior Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, certainly Cyrille Adoula is not ignorant of the power of the Minister of Interior and the Minister of Defense, for he himself held the joint position of Minister of Interior and Defense in the Congo Central Government before being elevated to the post he now holds.

What else do we know about Adoula? For a period of months after General Mobutu stepped into the picture and restored some order in the chaos of Lumumba's first days in office, the representatives of the Soviet bloc, at Mobutu's orders, were kicked out and stayed out of Leopoldville. Now there is the action of a clearly strong anti-Communist. But what happened? These Soviet bloc envoys found a welcome in Stanleyville under the canopy of the Gizenga-Gbenye regime, and there stayed until late in September 1961, Adoula welcomed them back.

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula, identified as, and I quote, "an outspoken anticlerical Socialist," allowed them to come back to Leopoldville. Is there anyone who does not know the machinations of the Soviets in Africa, and the hand they have played in the Congo as they manipulated Lumumba and Gizenga? Is not Adoula's welcoming them back to the seat of government in Leopoldville a strong indication not only that the Soviet hand is still stirring deep in the Congolese political pot, but that Cyrille Adoula is not strong enough to handle the Communists in the same way Mobutu did, to show clearly that he wants nothing to do with them?

Or, on the other hand, if Adoula did not really want to recognize the Soviet bloc, but others like Gbenye pressured him to do so, then he is proven to have a weak hold indeed over the regime which he heads.

Mr. Speaker, along this line it is highly important to note that there was a strong indication of Adoula's shakiness right after the outrageous massacre of the 13 Italian airmen at Kindu. In the light of our State Department's attempts to have us believe things are progressing nicely now that Adoula and Tshombe are talking, let us not forget that Adoula could fall from power at any minute, and it could be done in a seemingly democratic manner, should Gbenye and the Lumumbists loyal to him in the Parliament decide to simply vote Adoula out of office. The setup is all there, ready made.

After the Kindu massacre, the New York Times correspondent, David Halberstam, reported from Leopoldville on November 25 an important development. The U.N. and Adoula had announced intentions of disarming—remember this—the 2,000 Congolese soldiers at Kindu in an effort to locate the guilty soldiers and prevent further outrages. Let me state that right now as I am speaking here, those guilty troops are still unpunished, and actually continue to pillage, rape, and murder innocent people in the Congo. Reporter Halberstam reported that the U.N. had dropped its plan and supported a proposal by Adoula to move the guilty soldiers to another city, probably Leopoldville, for punishment.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I request permission to insert in the RECORD the article to which I have referred.

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

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

U.N. DROPS PLAN TO DISARM CONGOLESE AT MURDER SITE

(By David Halberstam)

LEOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, November 25—The United Nations gave up today its plan to disarm the 2,000 Congolese troops at Kindu in a hunt for the killers of 13 Italian airmen. Instead, the United Nations announced that it would support a plan of the Congolese Government to move the guilty soldiers to another city, probably Leopoldville, for punishment.

The United Nations decision, made public here today, was contained in a letter from Dr. Sture C. Linner, United Nations representative here, to Premier Cyrille Adoula of the Central Congolese Government.

In effect, it marked a change in United Nations policy for two reasons.

PLAN CALLED IMPRACTICAL

First, the feeling was growing here that the United Nations' plan was tactically impractical, since it might lead to widespread bloodshed between Congolese troops and United Nations personnel.

Second, the move represented a gesture to domestic Congolese politics. If the United Nations had handled the case and punished the guilty, it was said, the already shaky Adoula government would be made extremely susceptible to pressure from the left.

There would also be charges, it was said, that the United Nations was punishing an entire garrison of brave Congolese soldiers who would thus be prevented from fighting the real Congolese enemy in secessionist Katanga Province.

It was believed that if the United Nations insisted on disarming the soldiers around Kindu, Premier Adoula might face a vote of censure in the Congolese Parliament.

In his letter, Dr. Linner conceded that it would be "inopportune" to attempt to disarm the Kindu garrison.

Both the United Nations and Premier Adoula retreated from earlier statements when Mr. Adoula met strong opposition in Parliament on the plan to disarm the garrison. Thus, on Thursday, Mr. Adoula sent Dr. Linner a letter that called the United Nations plan to seal off the area "impractical." The Premier insisted that the Congolese Government was capable of bringing the guilty men to justice.

After the airmen were captured and slain November 11, the United Nations announced that it would take "energetic action" whether the Congolese Government cooperated or not.

SOLDIERS HEAD FOR KATANGA

Feeling is growing in most quarters here that with each passing day it will be increasingly difficult to find the guilty soldiers. They are known to have headed for the Katanga border. If necessary, they will shed their uniforms and head for the bush, it is believed.

Mr. Adoula has told Dr. Linner that the central Congolese Government is convinced that approximately 200 men from 2 units are responsible for the crime.

Dr. Linner agreed to Mr. Adoula's proposals after lengthy communications with U Thant, Acting United Nations Secretary General in New York. But he renewed the United Nations proposal for a joint United Nations-Congolese commission to investigate the case.

Mr. Adoula has said the commission is unnecessary. The United Nations has appointed its five members to the commission, but so far the Congolese have appointed none. It is believed no Congolese wants to serve.

At Kindu, the United Nations has found itself ensnared in a command conflict between the Malaysians and Ethiopians in its force. Its contingent there is also considered too small to complete a sealing-off operation.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from this report that Cyrille Adoula is the leader of the so-called Central Government of the Congo in name only. He obviously does not have the support he must have if he is to have things his way. His proposal to disarm the soldiers responsible for the killing of the Italians was beaten down in his own Parliament. Adoula knuckled under to this pressure. But let us note the New York Times report again on one point. Its exact words were:

If the United Nations had handled the case and punished the guilty, it was said, the already shaky Adoula government would be made extremely susceptible to pressure from the left.

Mr. Speaker, this is the government the United States is depending upon in the Congo. We have tried to support utter weakness by destroying solid strength. Logic would have called for our envoys to convince Tshombe that the strength of his forces was needed in the Central Government Parliament to help Adoula resist this leftist pressure. Instead, we sent in troops and jet planes with blazing guns and rockets to mow down the forces of the one man that we now say Adoula needs most.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how, upon close inspection, we can buy such a line from our State Department. Does our State Department really want a Tshombe-Adoula agreement? If this is the case, it would seem logical to invite

Tshombe to visit the United States at the same time Adoula comes here, in the next few weeks. But our State Department has evidently not even considered making such an invitation to Tshombe, the visa of whose representative the Department canceled so brazenly without cause last year.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the State Department wants to completely remove Tshombe from the scene. Now, this could be wrong, but evidence indicates otherwise. The State Department continues to press for a Central Government with no powers left to the provincial governments as far as I can determine.

As an example, we have hardly heard a word about it in the press, but the Central Government has arrested another provincial leader and stripped him of his powers. This is Albert Kalonji, the leader of the South Kasai peoples.

Mr. Speaker, on January 13 the Brazzaville radio in the Republic of the Congo, carried this report:

The representatives of the South Kasai peoples have taken action to secure the release of their leader, Albert Kalonji, who has been interned since December 28. We remind you that 400 Baluba tribal chiefs who came to Leopoldville to demonstrate their sympathy for Kalonji were also arrested by the Leopoldville authorities.

My colleagues might question as I do the reasons for this arrest. But they might question it even further, as I do, when they realize that Moscow's attitude is anti-Kalonji as well as anti-Tshombe. In a broadcast to Europe on January 15, 1962, Moscow radio said, and I quote:

LEOPOLDVILLE.—The command of the U.N. Forces in the Congo, busy as it is with intrigues and provocations against the national patriotic forces in Oriental Province, is endlessly tolerant of the actions of the separatists in the provinces of Katanga and Kasai. Enjoying absolute impunity, the armed thugs of the Kasai puppet, Kalonji, continue their outrages.

Now, I do not stand here to take a position for or against Kalonji. I do not think, however, that we can miss the implications of Moscow's position. Moscow clearly does not like Kalonji. In the doubletalk about the U.N. intriguing against Gizenga in Oriental Province, the Moscow propagandists lie about the U.N. tolerating separatists in Katanga and Kasai.

We know the bloodshed was in U.N. action against Katanga, not in Stanleyville against Gizenga.

And we know that the Central Government has arrested Kalonji, leader of Kasai and 400 of his tribal chiefs.

It is interesting to note that the moderate wing of Lumumbists that Adoula once joined was led by Albert Kalonji.

Kalonji has in the past led a secessionist movement in South Kasai Province. But he made his peace with the Central Congo Government months before Adoula was named Premier.

My point is simply this, Mr. Speaker. Why has the government of Adoula—which cannot or will not punish murderers in the ranks of its army—waged war against Katanga and now moves with a

heavy hand against Kasai—when both of these provinces' leaders have been under attack by Moscow?

As I said in my speech last September 12 on this floor, Cyrille Adoula told the neutralist conference in Belgrade last year that he would follow the policies of the late Patrice Lumumba.

The other points I have made about developments under Adoula should all cause us great concern. We are a long way from peace in the Congo. We have compounded tragedy upon tragedy, mis-assessment upon misassessment. What tomorrow? History screams at us to study and learn the techniques used in Czechoslovakia and in other areas. Why are we acting the way we are in Laos under the illusion of a coalition government which cannot and will not work except to turn it over to the Communists?

Why do we pursue these policies in the Congo? How long, oh how long shall we continue to be deceived?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, Thursday, January 25, 1962, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, January 30.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes on Thursday, February 1.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DENT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAHILL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. OSMERS.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BEERMANN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HECHLER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. MACDONALD.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present

to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8847. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 26, 1962, at 12 o'clock.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1598. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the 11th Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1599. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the first semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars as of June 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 87-195; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1600. A letter from the Acting Assistant Director of Lands and Minerals, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to all compensatory royalty agreements affecting oil and gas deposits in unleased Government lands which were entered into during calendar year 1961 under authority of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 226(g)), pursuant to the requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1601. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the 63d National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Little Rock, Ark., September 17-21, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 527. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 8900, a bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 9895. A bill to provide for grants to States and local governments for the purpose of constructing needed public works and improvements in areas of unemployment; and to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9896. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary schoolchildren in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9897. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to enable the Federal National Mortgage Association to provide special assistance in the financing of fallout shelters constructed with FHA-insured loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9898. A bill to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Bridgeport, Conn., by the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9899. A bill to provide that the permanent membership of the House of Representatives shall be 438 Members in the 88th Congress and each Congress thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9900. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 9901. A bill to amend sections 302 and 409 of the Sugar Act of 1948 to permit certain past production of sugarbeets to be taken into account by the Secretary of Agriculture in making certain determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 9902. A bill to waive the limitations and restrictions of section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Fayetteville, Ark., by the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9903. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9904. A bill to amend section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 9905. A bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9906. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Arts Agency in the U.S. Office of Education to aid in the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9907. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to establish a Communications Satellite Authority to provide for the unified public control and operation of the space communications pro-

gram of the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.J. Res. 608. Joint resolution designating the airport constructed at Chantilly, Va., under the act of September 7, 1950, as the "Dulles International Airport"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. Res. 526. Resolution naming the office buildings of the House of Representatives the "Joseph G. Cannon Office Building," the "Nicholas Longworth Office Building," and the "Sam Rayburn Office Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Con-

gress of the United States to limit contributions to the United Nations by the United States in proportion to its pro rata share based upon population, and to prohibit the United States from making any further loans by participating in the issuance or buying of any bonds issued by the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 9908. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko (Kuba) Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9909. A bill for the relief of Stavros Tserpes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 9910. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Paca; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9911. A bill for the relief of Lucy P. T. Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 9912. A bill for the relief of Hideme Kawabata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9913. A bill for the relief of Amelia and Eugeniusz Ciereszko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 9914. A bill for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9915. A bill for the relief of Umberto Brezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

President Speaks on Rightwing Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the Wall Street Journal of January 25 several interesting remarks made by President Kennedy at his January 24 press conference in response to a question concerning rightwing groups. I think the President's remarks bear repeating for the benefit of all Members of the House.

Every American wants to be sure that we are properly united in our effort not only to resist the Communist conspiracy but to go on the offensive for the concepts of freedom that we so fiercely hold in this country. Evidently, the President recognizes the merit in contributions that rightwing organizations are making in our country through their patriotic and anti-Communist activities.

Under unanimous consent I include that portion of the article in the Wall Street Journal relative to this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE RADICAL RIGHT

Question. Mr. President, considering that the one ingredient in all these radical right organizations seems to be anti-Communist or possibly superpatriotism, would it be feasible or useful for you, or even for the Republican leaders, to appeal to these people to stop tilting at windmills and to make a common cause against the enemy? My question really is: Do you think there is any merit in this idea?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I did attempt in my speech at Seattle, and my speech in Los Angeles, and in other speeches, to indicate what I consider to be the challenges the United States faces, and I would hope that—there have been others who have done the same thing, and I think we should keep that up. And I am hopeful that we can turn the energies of all patriotic Americans to the great problems that we face at home and abroad. The problems are extremely serious. I share their concern about the cause

for freedom. I do think we ought to look at what the challenges are with some precision and not concern ourselves on occasions with matters such as character integrity of the Chief Justice or other matters which are really not in question.

Let's Repudiate Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal about extremism these days. Of course, not too much about socialism, communism, welfarism or any of the extremes which would basically alter our heritage but rather about those who are anti-Communist, pro-Constitution and pro-American. There are some extremists in our society. We all agree. The guns of the left have been turned on conservatives rather than extremists, however.

Some groups, such as the ADA, have even gone to the point where they have started to ask us to repudiate any group which in their opinion might be "extremist" in nature. The majority party's leadership at a recent \$100 plate dinner in Washington announced that they would make "extremism" an issue in this election.

Some groups have delved into the past and obtained letters that some so-called extremist might have written years ago and have left no stone unturned to hang this tag on those of a different political persuasion.

Mr. Speaker, in looking through the old files of the Democratic Digest, official publication of the Democratic Party, I find this article on page 28 of the March 1936 issue:

AMERICAN GUILLOTINE

The original guillotine which decapitated King Louis XVI, loyal friend of the American Colonies when they needed a friend,

was sold in France on St. Valentine's Day for \$167.

With American liberties at stake it might not be inappropriate to buy that guillotine and set it up in front of the new judicial temple which frowns across the park that separates it from the Capitol.

Shades of the "impeach Earl Warren" movement, Mr. Speaker. It would seem that those who merely want to impeach a Supreme Court Justice—or even the Chief Justice—are rank moderates. Of course, we must remember that this was in conjunction with the all-out attack on the Supreme Court of the thirties following the NRA decision.

I assure you that if you read the issues of the Democratic Digest you will agree that there is nothing jocular or facetious about the presentation of the article, "American Guillotine." Of course, this was extremism of the left and as everyone knows, that is not the dangerous kind. Yes, let us all go forward and repudiate extremism.

Question of Tariff and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, knowing full well the question of tariffs and trade is going to be debated with little or no consideration as to the economics of the problem, I would like to present facts covering at least one industry in Pennsylvania, which is the second largest shoe manufacturing State in the Union.

I know by this morning's papers that Adlai Stevenson, our Ambassador to the U.N., in an address last night at Bloomington, Ill., set aside all consideration of the economics and pleaded for consideration of this important question on the basis of a moral issue with the emphasis that it is a moral issue to Americans only.

The President has just given his economic message. He predicts good times—reduced unemployment, balanced budget. He asked for social reforms in education, unemployment compensation, antidiscrimination, retraining programs for workers displaced by imports, Youth Employment Opportunities and Training Act, tax reforms, closing loopholes, expense accounts, and so forth. Further, he has asked for faster depreciation writeoffs for automation to make our industry competitive with imports, \$3 billion for Latin America, alliance for progress, \$100 million for U.N. bonds. On the U.N. bonds, the President explained that it would save the United States 33 1/3 percent on its commitments to the U.N. for Congo action, and so forth, if we bought bonds which were payable by all the nations who now refuse to pay any special assessments. If the proposal does this, it has a very good chance of passage.

In the main, I favor the proposals of the President. However, as Representatives in Congress represent all types of districts—farming, mining, agriculture, manufacturing—a close study will have to be made after the bills have been introduced and reported by committees.

All in all, it promises to be a very busy and eventful year here on the banks of the Potomac. Coupled with elections at home and the heavy legislative calendar, the Members will be crowded for time to really study all the bills introduced.

It appears that the trade program will be the hottest issue this session. Although all the heavyweights of press, radio, TV, banking, government, politics, big business, some of our top labor leaders, plus the legislative leadership, are for the President's trade program, it will not pass in the form proposed by Mr. Ball, Mr. Herter, or any other advocate of the original proposal.

This is true because right now, before the bill has been finalized, I make these predictions as against what was proposed and supported by the trade advisers to the President. They proposed joining with the Common Market. The President has agreed not to ask for this. However, the promoters will be back again. They will have to come back with the Common Market issue to cover up the failure of the tariff cutting program if the President uses the powers given him.

They proposed no peril point or escape clause hearings. It will be a miracle if this passes. They proposed no congressional power over any tariff cuts made by the State Department acting for the President. This will have a rocky road and my prediction is that Congress will not give up all its prerogatives on trade policies.

To correct an impression given by some erroneous reporting from Washington, I want to make clear that my Committee on Impact of Imports on American Employment will run until all its work is done, no matter how long the reporting and printing, and so forth, takes. The only hearings that may still be held will be when we get more specific information from various departments, lobbyists, foreign trade associations, and so forth, on

how many Americans get jobs from exports.

The only official report to date is the one put out by the United States-Japanese Trade Council, showing how many jobs are created in the United States by the Japanese purchases. They claim the creation of 190,000 jobs in the United States.

They do not say how many jobs are displaced by all the Japanese-made goods that fill almost all the stores in town. If they can measure how many they create, how about how many they take away? Of course, the figures are used without too much sense. For instance, they say they buy \$32 million—plus worth from Mississippi and create 11,000 plus jobs. They then say they buy \$60 million worth from Pennsylvania and create 4,820 jobs. It looks a little off base to say that—at minimum wage levels—two-thirds of the purchase price of the goods from Mississippi represents wages.

Even if 50 percent of the selling price is labor, Pennsylvania workers would have to get \$6 an hour while Mississippi workers would earn about 70 cents. It is a little hard to believe.

One thing you can be sure of and even the most rabid freetrader must admit that the money loss to the American wage earner is \$3 for every item—from the Common Market—imported containing \$1 worth of foreign labor. The formula is simple. We pay an average, with fringe benefits, of \$2.96 an hour while the eight major European countries pay an average of 85 cents an hour, fringes and all.

If an article costing \$2 to an importer contains \$1 of foreign labor this means 3 times 1 or \$3 is denied an American worker for the same labor contract. By this kind of "trade" we lose \$3 million in wages plus salaries on every \$2 million worth of products imported from the Common Market and about \$6 million on every \$2 million imported from Japan and Hong Kong. As a minimum, we must export three times as much as we import in the area of high-labor content products. This is particularly serious when we note the change in the character of our exports as against the imports.

In the last 10 years, the ratio of manufactured goods to nonmanufactures has completely reversed:

In 1950, we imported 37 percent manufactured goods; 53 percent other goods.

In 1960, we imported 61 percent manufactured goods; 39 percent other goods.

As each nation increases its industrial capacity, this trend will accelerate unless high cost areas by some measure, customs, or otherwise, gives its products an equal opportunity competitively in the marketplace. This is even more damaging in the imports of consumer goods where labor and management costs amount to 50 percent or better of the cost of a product. This being true, how can any advocate of a no-tariff policy argue that we are importing less than we export without measuring exports and imports on the volume of goods, costs of imported goods as compared to our costs, the displacement of

income in the form of wages and salaries, plus the impact of this differential upon the economy of the community in income losses to service industries, professionals, tax revenues, and local, county, State, and Federal governments?

You will note that I have tried to stay within the impact upon our wage economy since my study has been confined to that area of interest in our trade policies. When it comes to the problems of our international diplomacy, I admit I have rather strong opinions but will refrain from detailing my opinion other than to make a few observations that show the difficulty in determining trade policies based upon international relations.

The science of economics proves that the economy within an industrial complex rests upon the five pillars of economic reason. They are: First, investment; second, production; third, payrolls; fourth, consumption; and fifth, profits.

One depends upon the other and each supports the others in this formula. With one or more of the pillars growing at a more rapid rate of one or more failing to maintain its equal growth, the economy becomes unbalanced and the national welfare in all of its many phases becomes jeopardized. On the other hand, a most inexact science is the science of diplomatic relations between nations.

In this science its operation is affected by the wisp of the human deportment, national aspiration, and political revolutions. When the communities' economic necessities are subjected to the play of diplomacy, the welfare of the community shifts with the winds generated by conditions over which the five pillars of economic stability exercise a minor influence. I respect certain needs of our diplomacy and accept the effects upon our economy.

My complaint is that we lack something in our national life when we fail to repudiate the costs of the diplomatic considerations embodied in our trade policies. Let us not sell the public a trade policy based on nonexistent economic advantage. Rather, let us show the public the cost to the economy of the Nation for the benefits to be derived from diplomatic considerations as they affect the trade policies.

Some of us who oppose any further depreciation of our economic stability may very well become supporters of the trade proposals if we know what we are buying with self-inflicted unemployment and economic recessions. The present statistics of our trade volumes are not to be considered as anything but a temporary status. There are forces at work in this year of our Lord that are neither natural, normal, nor permanent.

In a later presentation I shall make known these influences and these interests. In closing this phase of my remarks, let me assure you that there is a solution to this age-old problem. This solution will give consideration to the diplomatic, the military, and the economic requirements of our Nation. This solution will give consideration to international public relations, the creation

and maintenance of international good will between peoples as well as nations, the welfare and requirements of the free world in its struggle with ideologies that deprive peoples and nations of their liberties, their freedoms, and above all, their abilities to better their economic well-being.

It can be done and must be if we are to survive, to prosper, and fulfill the hope held out, not alone to our peoples, but all the peoples of the earth for a better way of life.

At this point, I will review a few statistics affecting your industry which proves my contention that in the field of industrial economies we are in a losing game in foreign trade.

The fact is that the advocates of our new trade policies admit this very fact when they exempt from the powers to cut tariffs without regard to the economies of the industries affected, the agricultural industry and the textile industry.

The shoe industry is one of the examples of the dangers involved in a non-economic tariff policy. The following figures show three specific statistics that are a matter of record:

Total imports by period years (all footwear except certain specials and rubber boots)

1954.....	\$6,247,000
1957 (year after 4-year extension).....	16,378,000
1960.....	121,478,000

Imports of slippers (housewear) effect of wage differentials by countries

	1954	1957	1960
From—			
Japan.....	\$12,368	\$72,600	\$2,015,000
Canada.....	1,388,000	365,900	203,000
All countries.....	1,500,000	818,000	2,828,000

You will note that as Japan's capacity to export expanded and Canada's wage levels were raised, Canada lost its export trade to the United States.

Exports from the United States

1954.....	\$4,053,000
1957.....	3,542,000
1960.....	2,266,000

These are examples of the most inflexible rule of commerce and trade both internally as well as externally. Production will flow to lowest cost production areas and sales will flow to the highest income areas.

In closing, let me assure you this is a most serious problem and will require all our energies to find a solution.

A Matter of Life and Death in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest human frailties is the failure to appreciate the value of something until it is rare—or more often—until it has vanished.

Today Americans are making a valiant effort to preserve their own vanishing

wilderness, many people are alert to the danger, Congress is working on legislation, and much progress is being made.

Unfortunately another great continent, with the most wonderful animal population of all, is in imminent danger of losing this irreplaceable heritage, perhaps even in the next decade.

Most people, even in Africa, are unaware of the fact that the great herds of zebra, giraffes, lions, and the rest of the fascinating animal life on the Dark Continent are disappearing so rapidly. This fact was substantiated when the German team, Bernhard and Michael Grzimek, performed the incredible task of counting the animals in the great Serengeti National Park.

The search for an all-Africa conservation policy would provide an opportunity for the new African nations to work together peacefully for a goal in which all have a common interest.

The Secretary of Interior, Hon. Stewart L. Udall, has written an excellent article entitled "A Matter of Life and Death in Africa," which was printed in the September issue of the National Parks magazine. In it, he vividly expresses the urgency of this situation, the reasons why we in the United States should be concerned, and what can be done to help the Africans avert this disaster.

Because I feel that this is a matter of great importance I have asked leave to include Secretary Udall's remarks and the editorial comment thereon in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A MATTER OF LIFE OR DEATH IN AFRICA

(By Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior)

(NOTE.—Somewhere last night, a lion arose from his dinner, and mane rippling, strode into the red night sky. A hyena barked once, barked more softly, and then sighed silently as the evening's cool touched the earth under him. A hippopotamus' gray folded eyelids closed in nocturnal oblivion, and even the ubiquitous cuckoo made no sound. The teeming life of the veldt spent last night as it has millions of nights before, in motionless slumber among the grasses.)

We men never cease to be awed by the natural world, by animals living untouched by the booms and bricks, the speeches and straws of our own civilizations. Many of us have never seen the great grasslands of the African Continent; but we want to, and should we never realize the opportunity, we hope our sons and daughters will one day "stand silently as the setting sun makes the veldt red with fire."

Perhaps we remember our own continent as our grandparents have described it to us, unfenced and with buffalo, antelope, and timber wolf living where God and evolution had placed them. Settlers were too quick to think that earth was made for them alone rather than for all creation; and, too late, we their descendants realize that we will never know those irreplaceable forms of life.

The wilderness and wildlife resources of the world are part of mankind's natural heritage. They belong to no man, neither to keep nor destroy, but are life's gift to all. Too often men, in their ignorance, have made a wasteland of the planet that Astronaut Alan Shepard looked down upon in awe not long ago to exclaim: "It is beautiful"

Nowhere in the world is the future of wildlands and wildlife more uncertain than in continental Africa. Africa's great plains of mammals are no less fragile, no more ever-

lasting, than were ours of a hundred years ago. Africa's population is exploding as is the rest of the world's, and more people means ever more land necessary for homes and crops. People often appreciate something of value only when it has become rare—and more often and sadly, when it has vanished.

Africa is far away, its natural resources known only sketchily, and often inaccurately, by the rest of the world. Even those working most closely with African resources find staffs too small and research too incomplete to be accurate. For example, it had long been assumed that the vast Serengeti National Park in Tanganyika held more than a million head of thriving wild mammals: lions and cheetahs, Thomson gazelles and kudus, wildebeest and giraffes. Not until Bernhard and Michael Grzimek flew their little zebra-striped plane back and forth in 500-yard strips over the entire vast park, painstakingly counting every animal head, did the world learn that the abundant million is, in fact, only 365,000.

Might this also be true of the wildlife of the Congo? And what about all the other countless herds south of the Sahara? Do they exist in unlimited abundance? Do they exist at all?

Even the establishment of a national park does not assure protection of the natural resources within it. Often, as recently in the case of Serengeti, long after the park has been established it is discovered that the official boundaries do not encompass the annual migratory paths of the animals. There is no way to tell a zebra where it should migrate. It searches for succulent grasses, and goes where they may be found. Outside the park boundaries it is subject to numerous forms of predation, and as long as the boundaries do not cover the mammal's natural paths it can never be assured protection.

Even within the parks and reserves, wildlife cannot be guaranteed safety. It has been said that game preserves "look impressive on maps, and the plans and brochures describing them are a splendid sedative for allaying the fears of European and American naturalist organizations." Authorities usually live too far from the areas they administer and are too few to begin to control the widespread poaching that occurs in the dew of the dawn. The volumes of official regulations governing the preserved areas have never been disseminated nor enforced among the Africans who wander throughout these areas. They scarcely know the regulations, and they most certainly do not understand them.

Africans near the reserves know they can receive a few pence on the black market for elephant ivory, hooves for wastebaskets, and zebra tails for fly swatters; so they cruelly snare and slaughter for illegal recompense. Then perhaps a wealthy white Westerner drives his station wagon of trophy hides and heads through a native village, having gutted the landscape, while at the same time other whites are telling the same Africans that hunting is forbidden. The paradoxes are many, and do not earn respect for white regulations, worthy though they may be.

Western contact, at most, has brought the African an awareness of economic gain, and has little communicated itself in the realm of nonmaterial values. The African has no developed ethic toward the mammals with which he has so long shared the horizon. Poachers can be arrested and forced to pay fines, but punishment seldom helps them comprehend the reason for preserved areas.

It is important that Westerners understand the problems pressing upon the world's rich heritage of African wild lands and wild life. But it is even more important that the people of the continent itself understand the intrinsic values that can so quickly be lost through ignorance or thoughtlessness. We

do little for our fellow men if we do not help them become wise before making the mistakes we have made.

Recent events of colonial upheavals, self-determination of African nations, and all the problems and vicissitudes of administrations in their infancy have left little time for cognizance of conservation needs. Yet this very fact has made obvious the opportunity to begin conserving now, and not lose whatever has been gained through the worthy efforts of the devoted few who have established the present parks and reserves in Africa. New countries have all the more reason to develop and manage their cultural assets. Their mark in history is already being made. What would our impression of Greece be if her ancients had not left the Parthenon for posterity? Would the world not howl now if Athenians tried to tear down the ancient treasure to make room for a new cattle pasture or housing development?

Although wildlife conservation is a matter of ethics and great esthetic appreciation to some, to the present day African it is a matter of practical necessity. The African is struggling to achieve a degree of material development comparable to that of the Western World, but he is generations late in beginning. At this stage he has little time for sentimental values, but these can be preserved as the contemporary African meets his vital economic needs.

It would be a tragic economic as well as cultural waste, if American leadership did not recognize the potentials of its great land reserves. The roving mammals are an unprecedented tourist attraction, which, under careful and proper management, can draw vitally needed revenue. Africans need food, and disease-resistant, protein-producing, indigenous mammals are a far more practical source of this necessary food than imported domestic cattle that are not adequately adapted to the environment.

Africans need the opportunity to learn the reasons and techniques of sound multipurpose wild-land management. Not only are technical experts needed in quantity, but political leadership of the countries, and the people themselves, are manifestly in need of conservation understanding.

Americans should provide Africans with conservation education opportunities and scholarships here, as well as trained faculties and technical experts in Africa. We have given technical assistance and educational opportunities to Africans for direct economic development, but America has much more to give than just the knowledge of how to create dollars. If Americans lament that their "image" abroad is too materialistic, and continue to miss the opportunity to help Africans understand and preserve their wildlife heritage, they can only blame themselves.

Right now there are more than 3,000 Africans, potential social and political leaders of the emerging nations, studying in American colleges and universities. Ten of them were recently selected for a pilot program, sponsored by the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, Inc., the Afro-American Institute, and the National Park Service, to travel to Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks in order to have a study experience of what the national parks are, and what they mean to the American people. Our parks are one of the finest manifestations of the values of democracy, and these young leaders are having the opportunity to work closely with the ranger staffs and to know the daily routine of national park interpretation and protection. None of these students is now planning a career in park management, but they will be educated citizens, making decisions in their countries, and will at least have some understanding of park values.

This is only one step. Many more need to be taken to insure that future generations

may one day "stand silently as the setting sun makes the veld red with fire."

EDITORIAL COMMENT: NEW APPROACH TO A CRITICAL PROBLEM

In an article appearing in this issue of National Parks magazine, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall points up the grave threat which now hovers over many of the great mammal species of Africa—the elephant, the white rhinoceros, the mountain gorilla, the zebra, the giraffe, and many other fabled representatives of a once-rich African faunal life. Secretary Udall discusses how a beginning has been made, albeit on a small scale, in driving home the need for a sound multipurpose wildlife management program in Africa while there is still wildlife left to manage.

A further approach to the problem of preserving at least a representation of many endangered large animal species of Africa has recently been made in the formation of a group, headed by U.S. Tax Court Judge Russell E. Train, of Washington, D.C., which will attempt to raise money to send African students to American colleges for the purpose of studying conservation. Only thus, the group feels, can the indifference and the apathy of many Africans toward a vanishing part of their natural heritage—and indeed, toward a substantial source of desperately needed tourist money—be overcome.

The African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, as the recently formed group is known, hopes to obtain financial support throughout the United States. It has already made its first grant—to Perez Malande Olindo, 22-year-old native of Kenya, East Africa, one of the great game areas of the African Continent. Olindo will study biology and wildlife conservation at Central Missouri State College.

For the large mammals of Africa, the hour is late; a fact that was recognized by Judge Train when he noted that the odds on the success of such an African conservation program were terribly long. Nevertheless, it seems quite clear that a program of this kind represents the last chance for survival for many of the large African mammals, so important both esthetically and scientifically. Every sensitive person, whether conservationist by title or not, will hope that the new organization's work will prosper.

P. M. T.

Historical Sites—Preserve Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note to my colleagues a marked increase in the efforts of citizens groups to preserve historical sites. After years of crying in the wilderness, preservationists are beginning to be heard. The excerpts from two newspaper releases confirm this:

Savannah (Ga.) News, December 28, 1961:

Plans for special legislation to create a historic zone in downtown Savannah to preserve the heart of the city were disclosed yesterday by Mayor Malcolm Maclean.

The proposal for legislation, reviving the long-discussed plan, was submitted to the mayor by the Historic Zoning Committee of the Trustees of Historic Savannah Foundation, Inc.

St. Paul, Minn., as quoted from the Little Rock (Ark.) Arkansas-Democrat, January 4, 1962:

As a safeguard against possible destruction of landmarks in urban renewal projects and in construction of industrial plants, expressways and parking lots, St. Paul, Minn., has a committee making a survey of historic sites.

I wish to recommend the reading of the latest issue of Historic Preservation, the quarterly of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Historical sites and urban renewal is the general theme of this issue. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is quoted as stating:

New York is not alone in suffering from the ills of the supermetropolis. In varying degrees, megapolis poisoning has become a national syndrome. The cure does not lie merely in prescribing more operations on the face of America. Let us be content to look at our age. * * * The time has come to provide machinery in our laws for the automatic preservation of such historic sites when they fall into the surplus or unneeded category; that provision be made, not for their sale, but for their addition to our great system of national parks and memorials, or their transfer to independent groups or patriotic organizations which have an interest in their preservation for time and generations to come.

Articles in the newspapers this past week have taken note of the fact that the Liberty Bell is being repaired but it will not be rung again. A number of factors, including the touching of the bell by millions of visitors to Independence Hall, have combined to silence the ringing of the bell whose famous inscription reads:

Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto the inhabitants thereof.

We must make every effort to preserve the great symbols of America's heritage. I believe that it is no more progress, in the American sense, to destroy a previous monument erected to American freedom, than it is to chip away at the foundations of our Constitution. It is with these thoughts in mind that I include a speech entitled "Historical Sites—Preserve Them," which was delivered by me at the Boston College Economic and Educator's Seminar:

HISTORICAL SITES—PRESERVE THEM

What we are basically concerned with here today is the preservation of the American tradition.

The problem before us is the perpetual emphasis in the American tradition by keeping before our people the massive, historic relics of our past.

This means buildings rich in historic sentiment and inspiration.

This means battlefields that tell the story of sacrifice and hold up examples of patriotism and honor to our youth.

It means, above all, an attitude of mind that keeps these monuments and mementos of our past in reverence and esteem.

In our respect for the grandeur and the glory of our past rests our survival for the future.

The project is, of course, a national project.

But history and geography have come together to make certain areas of our country especially rich and abundant in mementos of the American tradition.

Boston and its environs is one of these areas.

In our State we have a sensitivity and an awareness that makes us keenly and particu-

larly conscious of the character, the stamina, the independence, the rugged patriotism that gave us birth as a nation. It is this awareness that we want to share with the whole country and indeed with the whole world.

With this in view I put all the resources of my office as the Massachusetts Congressman from the Eighth District behind Federal legislation to keep alive in our people the magnificent image of their past. And it is with this motivation that I sought to make so plain and clear the portrait of America before the world, that our enemies would find it doubly difficult to distort the true meaning of our country before the people of all countries.

As I see it, a major weapon in this incredible cold war—especially in the contest for the minds of men—is the preservation of the visual and inspiring evidences of our history as revealed in the ennobling architecture and places of our history.

Thus it was that I introduced three major pieces of Federal legislation to give effect and meaning for this purpose.

I hope with all my heart that my purpose is your purpose.

What are these measures?

The measures rather mundanely are called H.R. 5983, H.R. 5984, and H.R. 5985.

Taken in their totality the bills of course are national in their scope. The Congress of the United States—which must decide upon their passage—is representative of our whole country.

Yet I do not seek to deny that their benefits may be said to be, in some outstanding respects, local. And for that I do not apologize.

I point out that while Boston is one of the major beneficiaries of these bills—and the areas around Boston—my bills do ample justice to other areas, edifices and places that should receive Federal attention in order that the ruthless hand of so-called progress may not reduce to rubble and oblivion our great national landmarks, wherever they may be.

The idea is to perform a national service for the American people and for freedom everywhere at a moment in history charged with crisis. The idea is to make the American people themselves conscious of their immense contribution—in free institutions—to the civilization of the West. The idea is to thwart the propaganda that defaces the picture of our country before the world. The idea is to prevent visual, living, documented proof, some of it in brick and stone, in hill and squares and heights and halls—in churches and statehouses—in homes and military sites, that freedom was for the American people always the inner soul of their being.

Not only would our own countrymen see and learn and understand from these truths expressed in stone and mortar, and locale, but visitors by the millions from abroad, would come to know the elementary truths of our tradition.

That is and remains my principal purpose.

Thus specifically there is the bill designated as H.R. 5983 introduced in this 1st session of the 87th Congress. This is the bill that seeks to provide for the preservation of buildings in the Nation's Capital which are of historic and cultural importance. Through this bill we shall see preserved some of the influence of George Washington in shaping the architectural destinies of our National Capital. The Founding Fathers lived and thought and planned on the grand scale. And the structures this bill seeks to keep for posterity give proof of a grandeur of mind that explains the beauty of our Capital.

That's bill No. 1.

Bill No. 2 is H.R. 5984. In this bill I aim to amend the Historic Sites Act of 1935.

This bill seeks to provide for the preservation of buildings of regional or local historical or cultural significance. It too, as in all kindred legislation, has some other provisions. Counties and cities throughout the country will be asked, by the Secretary of the Interior, to furnish him with a list of historic sites, buildings, and objects which possess value as commemorating or illustrating the history of such county, city, town, or surrounding area. Certain agencies, private as well as governmental, are asked to participate in making determinations as to the historic or cultural value of the sites and places itemized. After public hearings the adjudication will be made in accordance with the 1935 act.

The bill declares—I quote: "It is the sense of the Congress that such list should be consulted with respect to all projects throughout their planning stages, and to the maximum extent practicable, all sites, buildings, and objects contained therein should be preserved."

Bill No. 3 in this three-sided legislative effort, is H.R. 5985.

This, too, is simple, brief, direct—and, it seems to me—effective.

This bill amends the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide for the preservation of federally owned buildings which are of historical, architectural, or cultural significance.

All this bill does is check the thoughtlessness that relegates distinguished Federal buildings—that have historic meaning—to the crudities of the building wrecker. It covers Federal real property in all the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The bill protects historically desirable properties in any of these areas from being declared surplus property or otherwise sold or knocked down or discarded, until the Federal Administrator under the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, shall have taken into consideration their historical, or architectural significance.

That's the status of this legislation as I speak.

I wonder if you will agree with me that what this legislation seeks to do: The preservation of the American heritage, is in fact a prodigious educational endeavor. We are not collecting museum pieces. We are not consolidating the Nation's real estate holdings. We are not providing entertainment and picnic grounds.

We are, ladies and gentlemen, preserving American history.

I believe it is no more progress, in the American sense, to destroy a precious monument erected to American freedom, than it is to chip away at the foundations of the Constitution of the United States.

There is no statistic to me so frightening, so dramatically appalling than the statistic that came to me the other day.

This is the statistic that one-fourth of the historically important buildings in existence in the United States in 1941 have been destroyed. What lends an unbelievable sense of indignation to this fact is that this destruction was done designedly by programs and projects financed either in whole or in part by the Federal Government.

This, it seems to me, is a form of cultural suicide.

For even an enemy in war to burn the Capitol of the United States and put the White House to the torch has been counted as infamy by many generations. Yet lesser symbols are as precious in the making of a nation and their destruction by our own hands an offense against ourselves.

We would never take choice instruments of our freedom, the documents we cherish and that 10,000 people see every day in the Capitol of the United States, and actually, by bureaucratic order, with deliberation, throw them into the fire.

The legislation that I introduced and that I have been talking about will prevent such mistakes.

John Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard, now our Ambassador to India, speaking more as an educator than an economist, made a comment in the article in the New York Times magazine, in October of 1960, that I find especially to the point. Professor Galbraith summed up one of the points of view in Adam Smith's work "Wealth of Nations." I quote: " * * * the building and maintenance of 'public institutions' and 'public works,' as a function of the State, was surpassed in importance only by provision for the common defense and the administration of justice. Thus, he ranked immediately after the warriors and lawgivers the builders and architects of his time."

If I had to choose the two places in the United States which should serve more especially as examples of the fervor to preserve our American heritage, the two places are—in my judgment—the city of Boston and its historic environs and the Capitol itself. If we in Washington and we in this State and city hold our unique and irreplaceable relics sacred and holy and forever free from demolition, we shall have set an example the rest of the country will rightly follow. But it is up to us here at the very center of these previous reservoirs of our past to create and emphasize a trend, a respect, a sense of history, that may then become the symbol of a national will.

We must not permit the cold and unimaginative eye of the historically blind to determine the destiny of our great historic monuments. Suppose some people, insensitive to the significance of a historic scene, had wiped out our old statehouse, or Faneuil Hall, or the Old North Church, in the name of progress? What a tremendous spiritual and yet, at the same time, economic loss our State of Massachusetts would have suffered.

It is up to us, and now is the time to speak up.

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 already arms the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, with the power to use his office to the ends I have been discussing. The legislation I have introduced merely strengthens his hand. The effect of this legislation of 1935 is extremely pronounced. The current celebration of the Civil War Centennial is made possible in no small part by the work of the National Park Service in preserving high points in the Civil War as war memorials. This is not only educational and extremely worthwhile, but it is not without its intelligently motivated, if wisely handled, economic side. The vicinity of historic sites is one of the most effective processes—visual, graphic, memorable—for studying history. It must be by its very nature 10 times more effective than history studied from a book, however valuable that may be. For if, as a wise Chinese said, one picture is worth a thousand words, how much more impact does the preservation of a historic site have on an open mind rather than a wordy description of the history of the preserved place?

It is my information, predicated upon data furnished me by chambers of commerce, that some \$9 billion will be spent by tourists viewing historic scenes of the American Civil War during this centennial celebration.

Nine billion dollars.

Here is a primarily educational enterprise, saturated with historical significance, that provides as a byproduct this highly beneficial and desirable economic good.

All of this seems to me a lucrative and alluring device, apart from the standpoint of the national prestige, for reversing the flow of gold, and returning it or keeping it inside our own shores. There is within our cities and our outer areas so much to be seen, to

be recalled, to be remembered, to be revered. The scene of the Boston Massacre just outside the Town House on that memorable day in March 1770, should be a mecca for tourists. This house is probably the most important public building in American history prior to the Declaration of Independence. In saying that, I am quoting from the "Final Report of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission to the Congress of the United States." I could make similar appraisals of Faneuil Hall, of North Square, of the Christ Church, or the Old North Church, of the military significance of Dorchester Heights and Bunker Hill. Nor are we less concerned about the Shirley-Eustis House or Shirley Place, and the Old Corner Bookstore, or Thomas Crease House. Here is the luster and brilliance of the past. You here need not be reminded of the Old South Meeting House and the Lexington-Concord Battle Road. The latter was made the subject of a special report by the Boston National Historic Sites Commission. And the Congress has since authorized, as you all know, the Minuteman National Historical Park in the towns of Lexington, Lincoln, and Concord. These are impressive results and we are all proud of them.

But much more needs yet to be done.

The report I have just quoted mentions historic properties of particular importance and survival value that lie on the fringe of the city of Boston, or in neighboring cities and towns—within a radius of some 12 miles of Boston proper. Some of these precious properties need the strong financial arm of the Federal authority for their maintenance and preservation.

A notable example of a privately achieved restoration that deserves high praise is that of the ancient iron works in Saugus, Mass. This dates back to the 17th century. The modern iron industry made this possible through the efforts of the American Iron and Steel Institute of New York. This industrial manifestation of history is significant because it was here in Saugus three centuries ago that "the successful, sustained, and integrated production of cast and wrought iron was first achieved within the limits of the United States."

It happens that my effort as a Representative from Massachusetts is on the Federal level. This is the most important of all fields for the preservation of every form of America. A national pattern of preservation and a national staff and system and standards will in the end prove most efficient and economical. But I plead as much for every facet of government and private endeavor, State and local, to pitch in for the promulgation by this method of all the glories and grandeurs of American history.

That's our central objective: the preservation of the American tradition.

Role of Milk in the American Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition met here in Washington.

Constructively, the conference reviewed and evaluated—as well as attempted to deal with—some of the difficult problems involved in the major role of milk in the diet of American people.

Among other discussions, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, delivered a thought-provoking address on major problems in this field.

Last year, the Nation produced about 125 billion pounds of milk. Of this amount, the output of Wisconsin, the No. 1 milk-producing State, was about 18 billion pounds.

Despite a 2-billion-pound increase in production over the previous year, however, there was a 2½-percent decrease in the consumption of milk.

According to predictions, the output will be higher for 1962—possibly amounting to 127 billion pounds nationally, unless realistic creative actions are taken to increase consumption, as well as to find other constructive utilization for milk, we can expect even greater surpluses.

Believing that Secretary Freeman's remarks deserve the consideration of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the RECORD.

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

ROLE OF MILK IN THE AMERICAN DIET

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman prepared for delivery at the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, Inter-Departmental Auditorium, Constitution Ave., Washington, D.C., January 23, 1962, 9:30 a.m.)

Abraham Lincoln, in recommending the Department of Agriculture be established, said it would be the department of the people. His words of 100 years ago were never more true than they are today. We are meeting here at a conference called to discuss a question in which the interest of all the people—the farmer, consumer, businessman, and worker—are closely entwined.

It is a question which began to be heard last spring when, for the first time, it was noticed that milk consumption on an overall basis was declining nationwide. By the end of the year, the trend was clearly established. The consumer had used about 3 billion pounds less of milk than in 1960.

And like all basic changes in our complex society, this one affects all the people—the farmer, consumer, businessman and worker. It is important that we know why this happened and what its effect will be.

The dairy industry in the past decade has seen many changes, but the magnitude of this particular development was totally unexpected. Let us then stand back a step and take a careful look at what is taking place in the dairy industry and what it means.

Like all other farming occupations, dairying has undergone a quiet, but dramatic, revolution in the productive capacity of the individual farmer.

During the 5 years between 1954 and 1959, for example, 4 out of every 10 dairy farms ceased to operate as milk producers. Those farmers who remained in dairying, however, added one cow on the average for every three already in the herd. And, every one of those milk cows produced in 1959 a gallon and a half of milk for every gallon and a quarter in 1954.

Until 1961, the increase in population generally consumed the increase.

What has happened in the dairy industry is being repeated, of course, in the production of virtually every farm commodity. It has meant that while 32 out of every 100 farmers left agriculture during the decade of the 1950's, output per hour of farmwork has tripled.

As a result, with fewer people and fewer acres in production, the American farmer—spurred on by the new developments in technology and the discoveries of science—can actually produce more food and fiber than ever before.

The end is not even within sight. A study made recently by agricultural experts here in the Department predicts that by 1980, American agriculture will be able to meet all its commitments at home and abroad with 50 million fewer acres than are being cultivated today.

I believe most people would concede that under such conditions as have existed and will exist, the farmer is being subjected to unique economic pressures.

But in dairying, a third force has been added. Instead of a steady, gradual increase in consumption to be expected with a growing population, the total volume of milk and dairy products used by Americans has decreased this past year.

This development has implications far beyond the immediate economic effect on agriculture, on those who handle milk and dairy products and those who look to the dairy farmer as a market for production machinery and material.

Its most serious implication may well be in the long-term effect it can have on the health and vigor of the people and the Nation.

If there are times when it may appear that the Department is overly concerned with the economic prospects of the farmer, let it be understood that our responsibility is to the whole population, with strong emphasis on the problems of the farmers.

I am concerned when a new—and unexpected—development arises which will affect a complex industry. If this development brings a change which will benefit the Nation but requires an adjustment, then we should seek ways to make the adjustment with as little disruption and dislocation as possible.

If, however, a development occurs for reasons which are not clearly established or for which there is no broad agreement scientifically, then I am concerned lest we force adjustments which we will later regret.

I am particularly concerned when anything as basic as nutritional health could be placed in potential jeopardy.

I am sure these are some of the questions which also trouble you, and I hope that through this conference today we can begin to explore them and to direct wider public attention to them.

Let me outline in brief some of the specific areas of concern:

First, we have become extremely weight conscious in this country in recent years. If the drop in milk consumption is related to this question, we ought to be greatly concerned. Weight control involves the extent to which we use our muscles as well as the amount of food we eat. Food alone should not be expected to carry the entire burden. Insofar as we reduce calorie intake, it should be of foods important chiefly for calories—not of foods that carry indispensable proteins, minerals, and vitamins. The American people should not make wrong changes in their dietary habits to prevent or cure obesity.

Nutritional authorities tell us that we need to know much more than we do today about the place of butter and other kinds of fat in meeting the nutritional needs of people. They also tell us that there should be no drastic modification in diets until nutritional research can point the way with more certainty and in more detail. We know that extremes in amount used of any one kind of food may lead to trouble. Moderation and variety are two words to remember in thinking about the relationship of diet and long-term well-being.

Unquestionably, there are many people who, on competent medical advice, must certainly follow special diets. But there are countless others—both young and old—who now do not receive adequate nutrition, particularly those essential building blocks of life for which milk is the best and most convenient source. Infants and growing children especially need milk and dairy products in their diet because of the large amounts of calcium and high-quality protein required to keep up with the growth needs.

Milk contains three important nutrients—calcium, riboflavin, and protein, in addition to other essential food elements—which people get too little of for their best nutritional health, and usually because they do not get enough milk.

In fact, milk makes it easy to get the calcium and riboflavin we need. In this Nation's food supplies, milk provides about two-thirds of all the calcium, nearly half of the riboflavin, and a fourth of the protein.

Another reason that milk is a necessary food source is that it contains many different nutrients in highly beneficial balance which meet one of the basic requirements of good health. The nutrients work together efficiently to meet the body's needs.

The decline in milk consumption last year was small when compared with the total supply of milk—barely 2.5 percent. But coming at a time when it is known that milk and dairy products help fill essential nutritional needs, I think everybody should be concerned.

The second area of concern relates to the basic responsibility of the Department to the generations of the future—to insure the productivity capability of our farming resources and to provide adequate food at reasonable cost.

The soil and water resources of this Nation, together with the most efficient system of agriculture history has yet known—the family farm—have helped make the American the best nourished person of all time.

The dairy industry has a vital share in the mission of American agriculture, for dairy products are a dependable and economical source of good nutrition.

The dairy farm is an exceptionally efficient means of utilizing soil and water resources to meet human needs. The dairy cow can crop the land that is too steep, too soft, too irregular for the plow and combine. Grassland agriculture yields abundant harvests of meat and milk, without the cost to the future of erosion and soil exhaustion.

The dairy industry—from farm and barn to grocery shelf and the kitchen refrigerator—performs an industrial and economic miracle. It furnishes consumers with basic food products that are highly perishable, yet reach the consumer fresh and pure and at moderate cost.

It encompasses more independent and competing enterprises than any other single industry in our economy. There are about 1 million farmers who sell milk, and over 400,000 of them receive more than half their income from dairying. Cash receipts from dairying last year were almost \$5 billion. The processing and handling of dairy products before they reach the retail level provides jobs for almost 300,000 persons with an annual payroll of more than \$1.3 billion.

The dairy industry is a worthy example of American agriculture, and it should be maintained and strengthened. Thus, anything which may cause it to change should be considered seriously and with cold logic, for it is a vital and highly integrated part of our national economy.

If its products endanger national health, then we should not be afraid to face that fact and the adjustments it entails; but we should not be so fearful of the unknown that we hasten to make a change which in itself

may damage the physical health of our people and the economic health of the Nation.

I believe the industry already recognizes that the impact of science and technology on dairying has created a situation where the dairy farmer receives less for his investment and labor than do most other agricultural producers. For example, the return per hour of work for the operator and his family in 1960 in the major dairy regions of the country varies from less than 50 cents an hour to no higher than 67 cents.

There is a growing realization that the adjustment which will provide greater economic reward, while reducing Government expenditures to stabilize milk prices, is a program of supply management.

Thus, the industry is willing to consider changes which will improve the economic health of their industry and their community, and which will insure an adequate supply of milk and dairy products while reducing the cost of Government programs.

But, given the weight of all available evidence as to the nutritional needs of the American people, the adjustments which may be required by the current drop in consumption and the increasing productive capacity must include vigorous efforts to encourage the use of milk in the interest of good and balanced nutrition for our population.

That also is the purpose of this conference—to explore the opportunities which our abundance of milk and dairy products gives to us to raise our dietary standards, and to improve the health and vitality of our people.

I can only underscore the importance of the task you will soon undertake by saying that your concern as well as mine is shared by the President. He has felt this strongly, and we are honored that he would come personally to be with us and to speak to us.

With his leadership, we can, I believe, begin to place many of the forces now affecting the health of our people as well as the economic future of dairying in a much clearer perspective.

of our friends delight in calling these inspections "junkets"—or even worse. Some take particular pleasure in heaping scorn and ridicule on those Members who travel outside the country to find out what is going on. These same people, however, are always the first to blame Congress for failures in our overseas programs. All Members should be urged to find out firsthand what is going on in the world at every opportunity.

GENERAL

These countries were visited: Great Britain, France, West Germany, East Germany, Italy, Israel, Jordan, and Spain. By using commercial airlines, buses, railroads, subways, taxis, and trolleys almost entirely, it was possible for me to see Europe as the average traveler sees it and also to meet and talk with the man on the street wherever I went. Inspections were made of all NATO and American defense installations in the areas covered. Discussions were held with Allied and American military and civilian personnel of varying levels of command and rank. However, my conversations and observations were by no means limited to the military sphere alone. Many civilians in each country visited helped to give me an all-round, balanced picture of local conditions.

It was my good fortune to have as my military escort, Lt. Col. Harry J. Salisbury, U.S. Army, who proved to be an unusually able and perceptive officer. His excellent planning, guidance, and counsel throughout this tour was invaluable to me.

EUROPE

Mr. Speaker, Berlin, without question, was the most tense place in Europe. My stay there was marked by long talks with Allied and U.S. military and civil officials, as well as with West Germans and even some East Germans, too. At my own request, I inspected the entire length of the wall separating East from West Berlin which was constructed last August by the Communists. The feelings aroused by the wall are impossible to describe. Nothing in modern history quite compares with it. To me, it is a sign of Communist weakness, not strength; of their failure, not success. Somehow it makes one feel that the Communist world must be the largest concentration camp ever known to mankind or there would be no wall or barbed wire. The contrast between free, prosperous, and progressive West Berlin on one side of the wall and drab, dull, and disillusioned East Berlin on the other is the most dramatic tribute to free enterprise and initiative in the world today.

By permitting the East Germans, under Soviet goading, to construct this wall unchallenged, we enabled them to stop for all practical purposes the flow of skilled workers and professional people to the West; to effectively halt the flow of information to us from behind the Iron Curtain; to pull down a shade before the eyes of millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain who had looked enviously at our "showcase of freedom" in West Berlin.

European Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, during late November and early December 1961, at the direction of Chairman VINSON, of the House Committee on Armed Services, I visited Western Europe and the Near East for the purpose of making an on-the-spot evaluation of U.S. and Allied defense forces and other factors that affect our future peace and security.

NEED FOR INSPECTIONS

Let me say at the outset of this brief report, Mr. Speaker, that this trip has convinced me more than ever that it is of the utmost importance for Members of Congress to go abroad for the purpose of seeing for themselves what is going on, how our money is being spent and which of our programs should be dropped, improved or continued as is. We simply cannot sit here in Washington making decisions for spending huge sums of tax money for defense and foreign aid with information received solely from Government employees or members of our armed services. Some

NEAR EAST

The visit to Israel and Jordan, my first to the Near East, was a revelation. Most Israelis are European refugees of varied backgrounds. The spirit and mood of the people closely resemble that here in the United States. The State of Israel, with a population of 2 million, has a land area about the size of New Jersey.

While there, I talked with Gen. Moshe Dayan; Shimon Peres, Deputy Minister of Defense; Nathan Bar-Yaakov, director of the U.S. desk in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and Israel Meir, his assistant. I also had an opportunity to hear Prime Minister Ben-Gurion eloquently address the Knesset—Parliament. About 25 percent of the people in Israel live in kibbutzes, or communal co-operatives, which are organized usually for agricultural purposes. As Israel improves economically, and personal income rises, these kibbutzes may not be as widely used in the future as they are now, according to local opinion.

It is almost impossible to visualize a nation that has received so few of nature's favors as has Israel. Centuries ago, the land was almost entirely denuded of its forests. There are no real fresh water resources except those shared with unfriendly neighbor nations. That is why the inexpensive desalination of sea water, when available, will have such great future significance. Not only are the nations on all of their borders potential enemies, but a sizable and restless Arab minority lives within Israel.

Financial help from the sale of Israel bonds in the United States, reparations from West Germany, and foreign aid from us have helped immensely in the surprising development of trade, industry, and agriculture.

This small, new nation is a monument to man's determination to live free from persecution and prejudice no matter how great the hardships. Mr. Speaker, the spirit there is very contagious and exhilarating.

The atmosphere in Jordan, on the other hand, I found to be most depressing. Its people are poorly clothed, schools are few, health standards are low and the economy seems to be standing still. Quite a contest to busy Israel.

Here are brief summaries of my findings in the military, economic, and political fields.

MILITARY

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces are in excellent condition, admirably trained and well armed. The basic concept of NATO is as sound and valid as ever. The quality of the leadership, contributed by all of the nations, remains very high.

Unfortunately, there is a general misconception in the United States with respect to the relative strength of NATO in comparison with the Soviet bloc in conventional military ground forces. Americans must face the fact that the combined conventional strength of the U.S.S.R. and its satellites considerably exceeds ours on the land mass of Europe.

I found the morale of American forces was high. However, as new U.S. troops arrive, this morale is declining for the

simple reason that new arrivals are forbidden to bring their dependents with them, while those servicemen whose families are already there are permitted to keep their families with them for the duration of their tour of duty. Just what caused this order to be issued is unclear. Because it was issued in October, it could not be based on fear of war as a result of the August-built Berlin wall. If it is an economy move, it is a most unwise one. This order does more harm than good and should be rescinded.

No real evidence of imminent conflict could be found in Europe that would justify the abrupt action by the President last October when he called up reserve units and individuals. There was administrative failure to use good judgment in excusing hardship cases. The lack of preparation at many installations for the proper use, equipping and training of the reserves called was inexcusable. This must not happen again.

ECONOMIC

It is in the economic field where the most dramatic changes have occurred in Europe in the last few years. The six-nation European Common Market has without doubt brought great gains to the member nations, and additional nations may soon join. There is virtually full employment in the Common Market area, where the rate of economic growth now exceeds both that of the United States and the Soviet Union. Spain, although modest growth is evident there, lags far behind the Common Market countries economically.

The progress and prosperity of the free enterprise system in Europe is proving to be the greatest stumbling block for the Communists to overcome in their attempts to subvert modern industrial nations. This most likely explains why their efforts are now primarily directed at new and underdeveloped nations.

POLITICAL

It is now evident to all who follow the international scene that there are deepening divisions between men and nations in the whole Communist world. To exploit these divisions, our own policies must be clear and strong.

There is a general disillusionment with the United Nations throughout Western Europe. No longer is the U.N. regarded there as the major instrument for finding solutions to the world's really knotty problems. The U.N.'s tolerance of aggression in the name of anticolonialism, the fiscal irresponsibility of many of its members and the uncertain voting record of some of the new, small, undeveloped, member nations, have made it progressively more ineffective in the eyes of many officials in London, Paris, Bonn, and Rome.

The importance of West Berlin to the free world as a symbolic island of freedom more than a hundred miles inside the Communist empire is greater than ever. West Berliners, as well as U.S. and allied military personnel, are still bewildered by our permitting the unchallenged construction of the wall. Berlin is the world's most conspicuous testing ground for measuring our deter-

mination to prevent Russian takeover by the "slice-by-slice of the salami" method.

CONCLUSIONS

First. NATO is still a solid cornerstone for our European policy and the most effective means of checking Communist aggression. The leadership and training of NATO and American forces in Europe is excellent.

Second. Free Berlin must not be bartered away. If necessary it must be defended with all our resources. Failure to do so will encourage the Soviets to take over all of Europe. World confidence in the integrity of the United States would be destroyed for at least a generation.

Third. The regulations forbidding families from joining servicemen now being sent to Europe should be rescinded.

Fourth. The Reserve callup of last fall was unnecessary because no real emergency existed. Those reservists who are serving at great personal and family sacrifice should be relieved from active duty immediately and replaced by volunteers and draftees as needed.

Fifth. The growth, prosperity, and unity of the free world require us to explore every possible avenue of economic cooperation not only with the European Common Market but all other free and friendly nations everywhere.

Sixth. We must carefully reexamine the record of the United Nations to determine how it can be improved or what else we might do to help attain world peace and security.

BRIEFINGS CONDUCTED FOR CONGRESSMAN OSMERS

London, England: Adm. Harold P. Smith, commander in chief, U.S. Navy in Europe, and commander of the U.S. naval forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean; Col. C. A. Thompson, deputy chief, MAAG/England; Mr. Frank Wisner, political division, American Embassy; Lt. Comdr. R. P. Sluyter, escort officer.

Paris, France: Gen. Lauris Norstad, SACEUR and commander in chief, EUCOM; Lt. Gen. E. H. Underhill, chief of staff, EUCOM; Mr. J. P. Perez, headquarters EUCOM, escort officer.

Heidelberg, Germany: Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commander in chief, USAREUR; Maj. Gen. W. H. Nutter, chief of staff, USAREUR; Lt. Col. Lloyd W. Brown, U.S. Army, escort officer.

Frankfurt, Germany: Mr. Hugh T. Cunningham, political division, American Consulate.

Berlin, Germany: Maj. Gen. Albert Watson, U.S. commander, Berlin; Brig. Gen. Frederick O. Hartel, commanding general, Berlin command; Capt. F. J. Fogh, U.S. Army, escort officer.

Verona, Italy: Maj. Gen. Eugene F. Cardwell, commander in chief, SETAF.

Rome, Italy: Capt. R. H. Blair, U.S. Navy, deputy chief, MAAG/Italy; Maj. Madison D. Hartley, U.S. Air Force, escort officer.

Tel Aviv, Israel: Col. Bill J. Tutin, Army attaché; Maj. William H. Norris, assistant Army attaché.

Naples, Italy: Rear Adm. Donald T. Eller, acting chief of staff, AFSOUTH; Cmdr. B. B. Holt, escort officer. (Participating in briefing were officers from the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Greece and Turkey.)

Madrid, Spain: Col. Robert C. Williams, Army attaché; Brig. Gen. Gines Perez, U.S. Air Force, deputy chief, MAAG; Capt. James A. Smith, U.S. Navy, deputy chief, JUSMAG; Col. Robert T. Calhoun, commander of Tor-

rejon Air Base; Maj. Thomas F. Hogan, U.S. Air Force, escort officer.

Rota, Spain: Capt. H. T. Hazelton, commander in chief, Rota Naval Station; Capt. G. H. Webber, U.S. Navy; Lt. J. R. F. Bowers, U.S. Navy, escort officer; Comdr. James J. Mayer, U.S. Navy, escort officer.

Electrical Energy From Shasta Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Bureau of Reclamation and the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District, which is in the Second Congressional District of California, concluded a contract permitting the district, an agency of local government, to continue to serve its community with dependable, reasonably priced electrical energy generated at Shasta Dam.

The Senator from California, CLAIR ENGLE, has expressed quite well my thoughts and those of the people in the vicinity of Shasta Dam concerning the ironic situation where the people living in the shadow of one of our greatest reclamation projects were experiencing difficulties obtain electrical energy from that project.

I respectfully request that Senator ENGLE's letter to the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and an editorial published January 15, 1962, in the Sacramento Bee be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1962.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "STEW": Please read the enclosed editorial from the Sacramento Bee on the Central Valley project power contract recently executed with the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District. I want you to know that I feel exactly the same about this contract.

It has the merit of continuing direct service to a public customer that has had direct service from Shasta Dam for 15 years; it eliminates the overload on the small Toyon transmission line; it follows the pattern of standard Reclamation power contracts in other areas; it is the least expensive way for the Government to serve the district and for the district to serve its customers; there-by saving money for both taxpayers and rate-payers—all without any Federal appropriation for construction.

I congratulate you and your staff and the district officials who worked it out.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

CLAIR ENGLE,
U.S. Senator.

VICTORY IN SHASTA

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall's action in signing a contract with the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District should end that agency's long fight to get electric power directly from Shasta Dam.

The contract permits the district to build a transmission line from the Government's generating plant and to buy power on a 1 mill per kilowatt-hour discount basis,

which is the same wheeling fee paid the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for carrying power on its lines.

As Government contracts go this one is for peanuts. The line will be about 10 miles long and will cost around \$180,000. The amount of power it will tap will be only a drop in the bucket compared with the total Shasta hydro output. But the principle is a big one.

The Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District, which includes the tiny communities of Central Valley, Project City, Toyon, and Summit City, has had to fight for its life every step of the way against the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the private power lobby in Washington, D.C.

Citizens of these communities built the first line themselves but as the population grew so grew the need for a larger power allocation and bigger facilities. Federal funds for the line were included in the budget in 1959, but were withdrawn when the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. offered to wheel the power for a price.

Tiring of waiting for congressional action, the citizens took steps to do the job themselves. For their courageous battle and for their way of pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps, they deserve a round of applause.

Farm Price Fixers Are in the Saddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from an article in the Farmers Union Herald, November 20, 1961, by Mr. M. W. (Bill) Thatcher, general manager, Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., and president, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives:

We also have troubles in the Department of Agriculture. More and more this Department is moving into the field of marketing. Less and less do your cooperatives market your grain. We store grain for you and for the Government but more and more the Government takes grain out of storage and disposes of it in a socialistic fashion.

This quotation bears out my contention that in the midst of the somewhat confusing reports and policies of the present administration, one clear course seems to be emerging in the field of agriculture—an attempt at the Federal fixing of prices.

This is the only way that one can interpret the actions already taken by this administration as they affect agricultural prices and the requests for even greater authority in fixing farm prices.

It is rather an amazing situation which we find in Washington when on the one hand the Department of Justice is prosecuting the electrical equipment manufacturers because they are accused of fixing prices, and yet at the same time the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture are used to do exactly that. Not only that, but he is requesting additional authority to increase his scope of price fixing.

Step by step Secretary Freeman is attempting to destroy even the limited free market for agricultural commodities

and to fix prices. Let us examine several examples of this effort:

First. When the emergency feed grain bill was before the Congress, many Congressmen including myself pointed to the fact that farmers were in the midst of marketing their 1960 crop of corn and other feed grains. There was fear that the Secretary of Agriculture would use the extraordinary powers proposed in that measure to force down the cash price of corn by the sale of tremendous Government stocks on the free market. The Secretary gave pious assurances that he would not do this. He said as follows:

You may be sure that we will not administer this program so as to reduce the income received by farmers prior to October 1, 1961, from sales of feed grains from the 1960 crop, below that they would have received if this program had not been enacted.

However, as soon as the feed grain bill became law, the Secretary proceeded to sell tens of millions of bushels of feed grains under the pretext that this was corn "threatened with going out of condition." However, any reasonable analysis of the corn that was sold reflects the fact that much of it was No. 1 and No. 2 corn not subject to that threat.

The price fixers have caused the price of 1960 crop corn to be at least 10 cents a bushel below the level it should be—below what the free market would have paid. The price fixers have taken tens of millions of dollars out of the pockets of corn producers.

The objective was obvious—the objective was to break the price of corn in order to drive farmers into the new corn program.

Second. Never at any time has the merchandising operation of all segments of the grain trade, including the cooperatives, been in such great danger. The grain trade, not only has to face tough competition from other merchandisers, but also the greatest giant of them all—the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The grain marketing system in the United States, if allowed to function, is the most efficient of all organizations ever devised in the mind of man. The Department of Agriculture is moving more and more into the field of marketing. As the USDA expands its scope, there is less and less room for the merchandising operations of the normal grain trade, and by normal grain trade I mean both private firms and cooperatives.

The small country elevator who normally sold to a feed manufacturer or to a corn processing plant is being replaced by a Government bureaucrat who can sell corn directly. The assembler of corn is fearful of owning corn because he knows that Secretary Freeman in his anxiety to hurt the corn noncooperator—60 percent of the corn producers—can break the price, and as a matter of fact has already done so. He has forced the market price of corn down to only 58 percent of parity. In his own State of Minnesota he has forced the price down to the lowest in the Nation—83 cents per bushel.

Secretary Freeman goes around the country waving a banner marked "The Free Market Must Be Destroyed." No

one—no farm organization—can support a man waving a flag designed for massive Government interference and price destruction.

The Secretary is buying corn at \$1.20 per bushel plus interest, plus carrying charges, plus bureaucracy, and selling corn at less than \$1 per bushel. What a travesty. For the first time in history we have a Secretary of Agriculture whose objective is to drive the price of corn down.

Third. What has this done to farmers?

First, the prices received by farmers for all commodities during the 1961 mar-

keting year were 79 percent of parity—the lowest in 22 years.

Second, the tremendous outpouring of corn from CCC stocks has forced corn prices down, and now livestock prices are following. The prices received by farmers for livestock items on December 15 were 8 percentage points below a year earlier. The Secretary has said in testimony before the House Agriculture Committee that cheap feed means cheap livestock. Unfortunately, he had accomplished both. Bear in mind that livestock provides 56 percent of cash farm income.

It is about time that the Secretary took stock of what he is doing to the American farmer and the highly delicate competitive system of marketing and merchandising grain. The bureaucrat with an unlimited checkbook should not be allowed to substitute for the private and cooperative grain trade.

We built the greatest agricultural system in the world by producing for demand, now that the Federal farm price fixers are in the saddle we see this magnificent system threatened by a philosophy that advocates producing for Government.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 26, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

I Samuel 12: 24: Fear the Lord, and serve Him in truth with all your heart: for consider what great things He hath done for you.

Almighty God, grant that we may be more worthy and appreciative of the blessings of Thy grace and goodness with which Thou art daily supplying our many needs.

Show us how we may courageously use and implement those spiritual values and virtues of faith, hope, and love which Thou hast ordained for the building of a finer social order and a nobler civilization.

May our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of this legislative body be guided in some special way by the eternal truth and wisdom of God.

Hear us in the name of Him who is our Redeemer and Saviour, our Lord and Master. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 157. An act to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6025. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1760. An act to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2470) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE DONALD G. NUTTER, GOVERNOR OF MONTANA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Montana, and indeed the entire country, were shocked today by the news of the tragic death of Donald G. Nutter, the Governor of Montana.

Governor Nutter was killed yesterday evening in a plane crash in a mountain canyon north of Helena, capital city of Montana.

Killed along with the Governor were his executive secretary, Dennis B. Gordon; Montana Agriculture Commissioner Edward C. Wren, and a three-man crew of Cliff Hansen, Andy Devine, and C. W. Ballard.

The news was terribly shocking and saddening to me, too.

Governor Nutter and I represented opposing political parties—and opposing philosophies of what is the best government for Montana and America.

But no one would deny that he was a good Christian and an able leader. Governor Nutter was aggressive and outspoken in the beliefs he stood for—and he never wavered from them.

Above all, he was an honorable and an honest man.

A Republican, the Governor took office 1 year ago this month. Before his election, he was a lawyer in Sidney, Mont., a State senator from his county for two

terms and Montana State Republican chairman.

It is a terrible irony that an airplane took his life. For he had given so much of his life in behalf of his country, as a B-24 bomber pilot during World War II.

He had a distinguished war record. He flew 62 combat missions and had more than 500 hours of combat time. He spent nearly 4 years in the old Army Air Corps, 13 months of that time in the China-Burma-India theater.

And he was the holder of the Air Medal with clusters and the Distinguished Flying Cross with clusters.

In short, his was a lifetime of unstinting public service.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy and regrets to the Governor's family and to the families of the men who died with him. Montana will miss him, I will miss him, his country will miss him.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 25, the State of Montana and the Nation lost a great man when a National Guard C-47 crashed near Wolf Creek, Mont., and killed Gov. Donald G. Nutter. Also killed in this tragic accident were Dennis Gordon, his administrative assistant, Ed Wren, the commissioner of agriculture from Montana, Cliff Hansen, the pilot, Andy Devine, the copilot, and Sgt. C. W. Ballard, a member of the crew.

This is a great personal loss to me, for I had known the Governor for many years, worked closely with him in the arena of politics, and had been associated with him in a social and friendly way.

Governor Nutter was a man of determination. During World War II he was a B-24 pilot and flew 62 combat missions and had more than 500 hours of combat time. He spent 39 months in the old Army Air Corps, 13 months of that time in the China-Burma-India theater. He was holder of the Air Medal with clusters, as well as the Distinguished Flying Cross with clusters.

After coming home from the war and at rather a late age in life, the Governor went to the University of Montana where he was graduated in law. Don practiced law for a number of years in Sidney,