JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 4, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 9, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1906. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1907. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the management and disposition of acquired properties as administered by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10786. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10946. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 589. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10788, a bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956; without amendment (Rept. No. 1555). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 590. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1159, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; without amendment (Rept. No. 1556). 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. VINSON:

H.R. 11131. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11132. A bill to terminate the authority of supplemental air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DURNO:

H.R. 11133. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to terminate the authority to suspend the marking requirements with respect to sawed lumber and timber, certain poles of wood, and bundles of shingles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 11134 A bill to provide a right of ingress and egress across national forest lands to all persons owning property within the boundaries of such national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 11135. A bill to require the establishment of an appeals procedure in matters related to the sale of timber from national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11136. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11137. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11138. A bill to amend section 4142 (relating to the definition of radio and television components) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 11139. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 11140. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by FHA-insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 11141. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, in order to improve the administration of justice and discipline in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 11142. A bill to amend sections 1612 and 1613 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran eligible for educational benefits on account of Korean conflict service has reentered military service, such service shall not be counted as part of the periods within which his education must be begun and completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 11143. A bill to amend section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with regard to furnishing court quarters and accommodations at places where regular terms of court are authorized to be held, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 11144. A bill authorizing the modification of the project for flood protection on Blackstone, Mill, and Peters Rivers, in Woonsocket, R.I.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 11145. A bill to repeal subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, limiting the area in the District of Columbia within which sites for public buildings may be acquired; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11146. A bill to provide an office building for the Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 11147. A bill relating to certain facilities and improvements of the United States and the rights of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. Res. 588. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the appointment of professional and clerical staffs of the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H. Res. 591. It has been the commercial policy of the United States to recognize appellations of origin applicable to foreign and domestic products, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALLHAUSER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey memorializing Congress to appropriate the funds necessary to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting certain pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11148. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Dobrich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 11149. A bill for the relief of Franklin D. Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 11150. A bill for the relief of John Korakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1962

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

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

Most merciful God, who knowest our necessity before we ask, and our ignorance, limitations, and fallibility in asking, have compassion, we beseech Thee,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

upon our infirmity; strengthen us in all noble impulses; and daily increase in us the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel, knowledge, and true godliness. Dowered with privileges and with the stewardship of power as no other Nation, may our high estate be to us Thy summons to protect the weak and exploited, that through the potent ministry of this Republic of freemen, all peoples of the earth may be blessed.

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

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 4, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 4, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.R. 11038. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 270. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic; and

S. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 11038. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Public Health Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee.

The Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Finance were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. SPARKMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PAY CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 84)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States in the amount of $1,065,929 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA, MISSOURI, COLORADO, TENNESSEE, AND GEORGIA

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on San Gabriel River, western area, California; South Fork Blackwater River, Mo.; Indian Wash, Colo.; Mulberry Creek, Tenn.; and Rocky Comfort Creek, Ga. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency for the period January 1 through June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on its activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF TRACKED VEHICLES AT FORT BRAGG, N.C.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the review of tracked vehicles at Fort Bragg, N.C. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSITION OF ACQUIRED PROPERTIES, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of management and disposition of acquired properties, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, March 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES OF LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM IN THE NINE-STATE AREA ADMINISTERED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGIONAL OFFICE, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected activities of the low-rent housing program in the nine-State area administered by the San Francisco regional office, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated March 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of financial and administrative activities relating to the development and construction of the Dulles International Airport, Federal Aviation Agency, September 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT HOUSING RENTAL RATES AT LOS ALAMOS, N. MEX., ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of Government

housing rental rates at Los Alamos, N. Mex., Atomic Energy Commission, September 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN NORTH DAKOTA AND ARIZONA

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on the north branch of Forest River (supplemental), North Dakota, and Florence area, Arizona (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

LIMITATION OF AREA IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WITHIN WHICH SITES FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS MAY BE ACQUIRED

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, limiting the area in the District of Columbia within which sites for public buildings may be acquired (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of New York, favoring the enactment of House bill 4222, to provide medical care for the aged, financed through increased social security taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission, Phoenix, Ariz., relating to the salinity of the waters of the Colorado River delivered to the Mexicali Valley of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3120. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of May 29, 1884; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3121. A bill for the relief of Dinh Khon Ngo (also known as Robert (kun Ting) Wu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 3122. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage the formation of regional agencies to develop comprehensive plans for meeting, through balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation systems, the transportation needs of metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 3123. A bill to provide an office building for the Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3124. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3125. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernst Badian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3126. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3127. A bill to provide for the establishment of a municipal arts council representative of local nonprofit organizations and institutions, including educational organizations and institutions, in the District of Columbia with active programs in the arts, to set aside for such local cultural activities 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COORDINATION OF MASS TRANSPORTATION AND HIGHWAY SYSTEMS OF THE URBAN AREAS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the coordination of the mass transportation and highway systems of the urban areas of the nation.

The bill is intended to bring about the development, by State and local initiative, of balanced and integrated programs to meet the transportation needs of the country's urban areas.

Federal planning grants are already available under Section 701 of the Housing Act for use in formulating land-use plans, including plans for transportation. Too, the Community Facilities Administration, under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, is required to administer the new loan program available for purchase of transportation facilities and equipment in keeping with the needs of a balanced mass transportation system.

But as desirable as these programs are in themselves, and I believe that they are, the stimulus to bring about comprehensive planning as provided by existing law has not been sufficient, particularly in the field of transportation.

The bill I am introducing today would:

First. Require that locally initiated land-use plans developed with Federal assistance under Section 701 shall include comprehensive transportation plans.

Second. Authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to designate specific urban areas whose transportation needs can only be met by coordinated highway and mass transportation systems.

Third. After a 3-year period, require that all Federal financial assistance available for mass transportation purposes and highway construction within an urban area designated by the Administrator be granted only if the Administrator determines that the purpose of such assistance is consistent with a comprehensive transportation plan for such areas locally developed and approved by the Administrator.

As I have indicated, Federal planning grants are currently available for those communities, counties, States, and interstate agencies which want to plan on a regionwide basis for the comprehensive use of their available land. This bill requires that comprehensive transportation plans be included in such land-use plans. The bill is based on the principle that the Federal Government is willing to help those who seek to help themselves. It recognizes the fact that land-use plans developed on an areawide basis ought not to be handed down by Washington.

But, at the same time, the bill could cut off the funds it makes available for mass transportation as well as for highways through urban areas unless these locally developed plans make sense to the Housing Administrator.

For many decades, the Federal Government has been putting up half the money for urban, primary, and feeder roads. And since 1956, Federal aid has leaped to 90 percent for interstate highways. In New Jersey alone, in the current fiscal year, the Federal Government has allocated about $80 million for highways, most of it in urban areas.

Besides that, the Federal Government has available nationally another $75 million for the first year of a new program to help rehabilitate commuter railroads. And there has been talk about broadening this Federal program to provide new rolling stock and equipment. In his budget message this year President Kennedy asked for another $100 million for more Federal loans for this purpose. A basic purpose of my bill is to designate someone—in this case the Housing Administrator—to decide where these programs are going and to coordinate them with plans for other forms of mass transportation and urban roads.

If both the Federal urban road and mass transportation programs are to proceed in completely parallel directions, we may not be making the wisest use of our resources in the search for sound solutions of our transportation problems in urban areas.

Of course, in some areas, parallel development of these systems might be in order. In others, rapid transit, rather than major highway construction or vice versa, may suit a specific situation. As I have indicated, what this bill basically aims to accomplish, in addition to attempting to promote the growth of areawide plans, is to give the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency a vantage point from which the use of Federal funds to promote transportation may be objectively reviewed.

In developing a local transportation plan there would be opportunity for coordinating present and future highways and existing public transit facilities with new subway, express bus, monorail, or other rapid transit facilities.

I feel that planning for an entire metropolitan area is most desirable, among other things, to reverse the present wasteful trend toward the purchase of obsolescent or outmoded rail passenger cars and equipment; to curb the present uncoordinated competition for the primacy of one transportation system over others, highways, for example, as against modern rail, rapid transit and bus commuter service. My bill is designed to permit the tailoring of specific solutions to the practical needs of each metropolitan area.

Future Federal transportation programs, as well as those now on the books, would come within the provisions of this bill. That is to say, their availability for an urban area designated by the Administrator would depend upon the Administrator's determination that it is consistent with a comprehensive transportation plan for such area approved by the Administrator.

In my judgment it is fundamental that comprehensive areawide transportation programs should be worked out so as to insure the most effective use of any large-scale Federal assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of my bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3122) to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage the formation of regional agencies to develop comprehensive plans for meeting, through balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation systems, the transportation needs of metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, 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 section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by—

(1) striking out the fifth sentence of subsection (a);

(2) redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) as (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(3) adding after subsection (a) a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Planning assisted under this section with respect to metropolitan and other urban areas shall include the preparation of comprehensive urban transportation surveys and studies, and the preparation, review, and, when necessary, the revision of comprehensive urban transportation plans to aid in solving problems of traffic congestion, facilitating the circulation of people and goods, and meeting transportation needs in such areas. The Administrator shall designate those metropolitan or other urban areas where he determines that the solution of such problems can be solved only on an areawide or regional basis by an agency of the type specified in paragraph (2) of subsection (a). The Administrator shall utilize the authority conferred by this section to encourage the formation of such an agency to perform planning functions for each such area, and to assist any such agency to develop at the earliest practicable date comprehensive plans for meeting, through a balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation system, the transportation needs of the area. Subsequent to three years after the effective date of this subsection, the Administrator shall not extend any assistance under (1) section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to any mass transportation demonstration project in any area designated under this subsection, (2) section 202(a)(2) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to provide transportation facilities or equipment to serve any such area, or (3) any other provision of law now or hereafter in effect authorizing Federal assistance to provide mass transportation facilities for any such area, unless (i) an agency of the type hereinabove described performs metropolitan or regional planning for such area, (ii) such agency has prepared and maintained on a current basis comprehensive plans, approved by the Administrator, for meeting, through a balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation system, the transportation needs of such area, and (iii) the provision of such assistance is in furtherance of, or consistent with, such plans."

SEC. 2. Section 106 of title 23 of the United States Code (relating to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for the Federal-aid highway systems), is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) All surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates submitted to the Secretary under this section which relate to any proposed project in any metropolitan or other urban area designated by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') under section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 shall, prior to the approval thereof by the Secretary, be submitted by him to the Administrator for review. No such project shall receive the final approval of the Secretary unless the Administrator determines, and certifies to the Secretary, that the proposed project is consistent with any comprehensive plans which may have been developed by an agency of the type described in section 701(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1954 for meeting, through a balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation system, the transportation needs of such area: *Provided,* That the Administrator shall not certify any such project in any such area subsequent to three years after the effective date of this subsection unless such plans have been developed for the area involved and the proposed project is considered, as determined by the Administrator, with such plans."

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] introduced a bill, intending to ask that it lie at the desk for a week to enable other Senators who may wish to do so to become cosponsors. However, he forgot to ask unanimous consent that that be done. I now ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for a week for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 287) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

EXCLUSION OF INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING FROM JONES ACT RESTRICTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1962, the names of Mr. CHURCH and Mr. GRUENING were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3105) to provide that the law limiting the transportation of merchandise in the coastwise trade to certain U.S. vessels shall not apply to such transportation between a port on the east coast of the United States and a port on the west coast of the United States, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER on April 3, 1962.

NOTICE CONCERNING H.R. 10431, AN ACT TO REVISE, CODIFY, AND ENACT INTO LAW TITLE 37 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES"

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the subcommittee now has under consideration H.R. 10431, 87th Congress, 2d session, and the acompanying report thereon, House Report No. 1399, regarding the revision and codification of the laws relating to the pay and allowances of the uniformed services, such bill having passed the House of Representatives. Such revision deals with title 37 of the United States Code.

The purpose of this notice is to advise any and all interested parties of the consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee and that the subcommittee desires to have any statements or comments relating to the proposed legislation. The subcommittee realizes that the enactment of such a codification is a major project and that a codification is limited to the revision and codification of existing law only, so that there will be no change in the statutes under discussion as they now exist. The statements or comments requested are for the purpose of allowing any and all persons to express a view as to whether or not in the proposed legislation, H.R. 10431, there has been a change in existing law.

The subcommittee desires that such statements or comments be forwarded to the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, room 226, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., on or before May 18, 1962.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING H.R. 10433, AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO INCORPORATE RECENT LAWS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the subcommittee now has under consideration H.R. 10433, 87th Congress, 2d session, and the accompanying report thereon, House Report No. 1401, regarding certain amendments to the laws relating to the armed forces,

having passed the House of Representatives.

The purpose of this notice is to advise any and all interested parties of the consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee and that the subcommittee desires to have any statements or comments relating to the proposed legislation. The statements or comments requested are for the purpose of allowing any and all persons to express their views as to such amendments.

The subcommittee desires that such statements or comments be forwarded to the subcommittee on revision and codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, room 2226, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., on or before May 18, 1962.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING H.R. 10931, AN ACT TO REVISE, CODIFY, AND ENACT INTO LAW THE GENERAL AND PERMANENT LAWS RELATING TO AND IN FORCE IN THE CANAL ZONE AND TO ENACT THE CANAL ZONE CODE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the subcommittee now has under consideration H.R. 10931, 87th Congress, 2d session, and the accompanying report thereon, House Report No. 1509, regarding the revision and codification of the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, having passed the House of Representatives.

The purpose of this notice is to advise any and all interested parties of the consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee and that the subcommittee desires to have any statements or comments relating to the proposed legislation. The subcommittee realizes that the enactment of such a codification is a project of great magnitude and that a codification is limited to the revision and codification of existing law only, so that there will be no change in the statutes under discussion as they now exist. The statements or comments requested are for the purpose of allowing any and all persons to express a view as to whether or not in the proposed legislation, H.R. 10931, there has been a change in existing law.

The subcommittee desires that such statements or comments be forwarded to the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, room 2226, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., on or before May 18, 1962.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

THE TIGHTROPE REPORT AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION BY THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I believe Senators will be interested in several recent developments within the Federal Aviation Agency.

Senators know of my view that the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 vested in the Agency extraordinary powers of rule making and enforcement in dealing with those engaged in civil aviation in this country. Senators know also of my continued, and upon occasion critical, interest in the activities of this Agency, particularly as they relate to the methods and spirit in which the rulemaking and regulatory functions have been discharged.

I am pleased to note and to advise Senators that one of the early and principal steps taken by the new Administrator of the FAA, Mr. Najeeb Halaby, was to ask an independent group of recognized experts to take a critical look at FAA rulemaking and enforcement procedures. Organized under the name of Project Tightrope, this group consisted of Mr. Lloyd N. Cutler, a prominent Washington attorney, who served as its chairman; Mr. John Floberg, vice president and general counsel of Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., and a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air; Mr. Louis J. Hector, a Florida attorney, and former member of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Mr. Frederick B. Lee, a former Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; Mr. Gerhard P. Van Arkel, a Washington attorney, and former General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board; and Mr. Alfred B. Fitt, who is Deputy Under Secretary of the Army for Manpower. For a period of some 6 months this group made an exhaustive study of these sensitive and all-important Agency functions. Its report on FAA rulemaking and enforcement procedures was formally received by Administrator Halaby on November 21, 1961.

The Tightrope report, in effect, vindicated those of us in the Congress and in the aviation industry who expressed uneasiness over the vast power given the Federal Aviation Agency Administrator over the right of the individual to fly his own airplane.

I repeatedly expressed my alarm over this condition, in sessions of the Aviation Subcommittee and on the floor. In January 1960 I told the subcommittee that the FAA's power to institute charges and adjudicate them violated every conception of the Anglo-Saxon law and justice. Let me quote one of my observations made at that time in committee:

> We have the FAA Administrator making the rule, then he turns around and acts as judge, jury, and prosecutor. Then you have an appeal to him, not only in reference to whether the rule is sound, but whether you are guilty under the rule. I have grave misgivings about being given the right to appeal to the man who ruled against me in the first place.

I should also like to call attention to a statement I made on the floor of the Senate on May 18, 1960, during a speech on the treatment of licensed pilots by the Federal Aviation Agency:

> Mr. President, I continue to be distressed at what I feel to be arbitrary actions by the Federal Aviation Agency in the matter of treatment of licensed civil pilots under the authority granted to the FAA Administrator by the Congress in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Senators may recall the tragic series of midair collisions that prompted a review of the then existing Civil Air Regulations and resulted in enactment by the 85th Congress of the Federal Aviation Act, which placed extraordinary powers in the hands of a single man—the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. At that time, I expressed concern with regard to the vast power that would be lodged in one individual, but the act was passed most expeditiously in the overall interest of safety. It may be recalled that testimony before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee indicated the desire of the aviation industry to cooperate in the legislative overhaul of our Civil Air Regulations. Misgivings were voiced by aviation leaders concerning certain aspects of the appeals provisions of the Federal Aviation Act and the thought was expressed that recourse to the Congress would be utilized if a reasonable period of operation indicated that some modification or amendment of the act was required.

I also pointed out that an accused pilot stood guilty until he could prove his innocence; that his avenue of appeal was extremely limited, due to the fact that the act gave the Civil Aeronautics Board authority to hear an appeal to determine whether the action against the airman was correct and proper under the terms of the rule established, in the first place, by the Administrator.

Again, I quote from my speech before the Senate on May 18, 1960:

> In practical operation, we have discovered that the rights of an individual pilot receive less consideration under the administration of the Federal Aviation Act than would be accorded the most common criminal in a court of law. Substantial and upright citizens of this country, who are active civil pilots, 380,000 by the last count of the Federal Aviation Agency, are subject to being charged with a violation of the regulations under the present enforcement program of the Agency and thereafter stand guilty until they can prove their innocence.

J. B. Hartranft, Jr., president of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, expressed concern over the lack of a system of checks and balances in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, when he testified before the Senate Aviation Subcommittee in January 1960. The AOPA consists of 87,000 members who are the owners and pilots of nonairline civil aircraft. It was these thousands of airmen who felt keenly the lack of such safeguards in the act. Mr. Hartranft said:

> The lack of a system of checks and balances and adequate appeal machinery that will afford an impartial hearing for a pilot is the greatest single area of the Federal Aviation Act that needs clarification. When the act of 1958 was put in final form and passed by the Congress, a provision was included in section 609 for appeal to the Civil Aeronautics Board with regard to airmen and aircraft certificates. We soon discovered that this did not give the Board the authority to review or take any corrective action on a rule or regulation, but merely allowed the Board to hear an appeal with respect to

whether or not the action against the individual was correct and proper under the terms of the rule. Thus, the Board could not consider or take any action with regard to correction of a faulty or unsound rule. We also discovered that it was relatively simple for the FAA to amend any rule under which they were receiving adverse rulings from the Board on actions against individual certificates.

The AOPA president at that time also made a plea for a fair and impartial hearing for airmen accused under regulations promulgated by the FAA, which, as I previously stated, also acts as judge and jury in such cases. He said:

It is imperative that civil pilots so accused—who are, after all, American citizens—have access to due process of law, before a fair and impartial hearing. The sixth amendment of the Constitution describes the safeguards we seek. The present FAA may be a good deal more vigorous, forceful and streamlined than its predecessors, but it also is encroaching upon the right of individuals to get justice under our democratic processes. George Washington said it: "The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism."

Statements such as those made by Mr. Hartranft and myself were the natural aftermath of an enforcement crackdown, such as was instituted at the command of General Quesada, then FAA Administrator, in 1958. Thousands of charges—many of which should never have been filed in the first place—clogged the FAA machinery and created chaos in American aviation, particularly among the owners and pilots of nonairline civil aircraft. Tightrope appropriately noted this Quesada crackdown in its October 1961 report, as follows:

In March 1959, Administrator E. R. Quesada ordered an enforcement crackdown. The results were apparent almost at once. The 12 months ending June 30, 1959, saw a 50-percent increase over the previous year's violations filed, from 2,092 to 3,128, and in the next 12 months the inspectors turned up 4,448 cases. The flood continued at a rate of 400 new cases a month until November 1960, when, for reasons discussed below, Administrator Quesada called a halt.

The Washington enforcement staffs of the Flight Standards Service and of the General Counsel simply could not cope with the burst of activity by the inspectors. The new volume of cases being fed into a very complicated multiple review system soon choked it almost completely. The time taken to process a violation from start to finish gradually and steadily grew until in the first quarter of 1961 the average was 10 months.

Distressing as this was to all concerned, it also developed that much of the Washington enforcement effort was being wasted on cases that never should have reached the top of the system. During 1960, while the Washington backlog was swelling from 485 to 689, of the cases completed 55 percent were closed without action. (This same ratio has continued during the first 5 months of 1961. Whether it continues after the last of the pre-1961 cases has been completed will soon show whether the "crackdown period" produced more activity than it did results.) Another 23 percent were closed by reprimand, a sanction reserved for "minor and unintentional offenses" and so trivial as to be unreviewable by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Tightrope also commented on the futility and unfairness of the filing of many trivial charges against airmen. In fact, this portion of the report expresses my opinion exactly:

No matter how scrupulously fair is the treatment of individual cases, an agency which ultimately drops so many of the proceedings it starts, and which takes so long to lay a hand on those it does laboriously decide have violated the regulations, must expect the fairness of its system to be questioned.

It is not fair to make the aviation industry worry about and cope with so many charges that come to naught; nor is it fair to remain silent for 10 months and then discipline an airman for a "minor unintentional" and presumably long since forgotten offense.

An editorial in the May 1960 issue of the AOPA Pilot, which I shall quote in part, clearly defined the conditions Tightrope talked about in its report a year and a half later. Entitled "In the Interest of Safety," the editorial stated:

The FAA is presently using this phrase ("in the interest of safety") as its primary justification for harassing civil aviation—all of it, from the airline pilot to the farmer—on all sides, usually in a manner that can only be construed as reckless, once one studies the facts. The issue involving the forced retirement of the 60-year-old airline pilot is already a well-known example of FAA arbitrariness—"in the interest of safety." So is the proposal to ban the family physician, again without a shred of factual justification. There's more to come, and the only ground rules are that they can and will do anything that strikes their fancy—"in the interest of safety." The FAA's Bureau of Aviation Medicine has fast become an empire all its own, and age limits and other limitations are already being looked at for all pilots, not just airline.

If the average person could see how far the FAA's police state has already gone "in the interest of safety" he would be frightened, not merely uneasy as so many now are. FAA agents have closed in on all sides, from the airlines to the smallest light-plane manufacturer. An AOPA member who's a fixed-base operator in Pennsylvania complained about the way he was being pushed around by FAA personnel; and an FAA civilian official from New York and an Army lieutenant colonel from FAA headquarters in Washington descended on the man at his home, complete with a tape recorder. General Quesada himself deplored the tape recorder when we told him about it.

In Minnesota another member was charged with a violation because he misunderstood an inquiry from an FAA communications station and didn't give them his full street address. In Kansas an FAA agent showed up at a busy airport with a bathroom scale—to weigh people arriving and departing in private aircraft, hoping to catch someone with an overload. The top engineer of one of the country's leading general aircraft manufacturers recently told AOPA that, since FAA took over, the cost of performing many routine engineering tasks to the satisfaction of arbitrary Government agents has doubled. He bitterly went on to point out that he once refused to hire the very FAA engineering expert who now held a life-or-death grip on his company, due to his lack of qualifications.

The Tightrope Committee verified the conclusion that many of us did earlier: that the FAA Administrator had tremendous power and, if he so chose, could penalize an airman for an alleged infraction of the regulations, and could develop his case later. After assessing the power of the Administrator, the Tightrope Committee in its report says:

In short, the Administrator was given the power in all certificate actions to punish first, then justify his action at a subsequent trial. This power can be likened to the edict of the Queen of Hearts: "Sentence first—verdict afterward." However, carefully such power is used, and we do not suggest that it has been abused thus far, we think it is too much power for the Administrator to want or to wield. We think that, except when the accused waives a trial, the Administrator ought to have to prove the guilt of the accused first in formal proceedings, then impose the punishment.

Again, I call attention to testimony given in 1960 by Mr. Hartranft, who questioned the infallibility of the Administrator:

We do not embrace the doctrine of infallibility of the Administrator; we do not embrace the theory that "the king can do no wrong"; we do not believe in these archaic doctrines—and neither did our Founding Fathers—which are totally foreign to our democratic system of government whether we are regulating the commerce of the sea, land commerce, or commerce of the air.

In the same statement, Mr. Hartranft also told the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, back in 1960:

In the enforcement of safety rules, it has been publicly stated that the FAA policy is to be "fast, firm, factual, and fair." Unfortunately, the last two ingredients; namely, "factual" and "fair," appear to have been lost in the zeal to be fast and firm. Under the present administration of the Federal Aviation Act, a pilot may be charged with an alleged violation of the regulations and be given only the alternatives of paying a compromise fine (usually nominal) or taking his case to a Federal court. Presentation of the facts to the FAA—who may have filed the charge, who investigates the charge, who judges the case, who levies the penalty and who may have promulgated the rule—usually has no noticeable effect on the outcome of the case.

In its eagerness to crack down on civil aviation, in keeping with General Quesada's mandate, the FAA even got crossed up in its own procedures. What originally were intended to be only reports showing the activity of one bureau, Air Traffic Management, turned into instruments of harassment when they reached another bureau, Flight Standards. To Mr. D. D. Thomas, Director of the Bureau of Air Traffic Management, goes credit for stopping what would have been a comedy, had not so many unsuspecting pilots been ensnared in the FAA's regulatory machinery. Details of this "snafu" were given in an article appearing in the June 1960 issue of the AOPA Pilot, which reported a meeting between AOPA and FAA officials on the agency's enforcement drive. The magazine said:

Ironically, the meeting developed the fact that some of the "ridiculous" enforcement resulted from the well-meaning efforts of the Bureau of Air Traffic Management to obtain evidence that the millions of dollars being spent for air traffic control and navigation facilities was a good investment for the taxpayers as well as for the aviation community. Here is the story:

Each year, FAA has to justify to the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget its requests for funds. A few months ago the Agency decided that it would be a good idea to have on hand some specific examples

showing how ATM facilities and personnel were assisting users of the airspace. An instruction went out to controllers, communications specialists, and other field personnel asking them to report instances where unusual services were rendered fliers.

When the busy controllers and communications people got around to writing reports there was only one FAA form available for such purpose. That was form 304A. It turned out that form 304A was a lethal weapon as far as quite a few flyers were concerned. Containing an original and six carbon copies, form 304A is widely distributed within the Agency once it is filled out. It is labeled "Federal Aviation Agency Incident Report." Now, "Incident Report" means only one thing in the FAA. It is a signal that somebody has done some wrong and that corrective action is indicated. The only instruction the form contains follows in part:

"The following is a description of either an accident or of an incident, which adversely affected the operation of this air traffic control facility. It appeared advisable to prepare a formal record, and a copy is being forwarded to acquaint you with its particulars. It is requested that, as necessary, these details be brought to the attention of the pilot or individuals involved. We hope that, through review, recommendations leading toward action to prevent recurrence of incidents of this type will be obtained."

Needless to say, the Bureau of Flight Standards took to heart the message carried on the interoffice form and started scanning the reports for violations. AOPA told the FAA officials that the spurt in violations filed on trivial in-flight occurrences was making many pilots extremely reluctant to use FAA communications and navaid facilities, particularly radar. Greatly perturbed over the turn its efforts to show how it was aiding pilots had taken, the Bureau of Air Traffic Management took immediate steps to halt the use of form 304A for its evidence of effectiveness. In the future, such reports will be written in straight narrative form and will go directly to ATM.

While overenthusiastic enforcement, the lack of restraints on enforcement officials, and absence of meaningful appeals were of pressing concern to every person who flew an airplane, the rulemaking procedures themselves were disturbing to many in the industry and to some in Congress. I have often expressed myself on the system which allows this regulatory agency to enact rules, at its discretion and often without justification, that vitally affect the lives of thousands. I have suggested on several occasions that the Congress should set up an aviation code, similar to the motor vehicle codes found in many States. Tightrope's conclusion—that FAA's rulemaking practices were responsible for a large amount of the criticism leveled at FAA in the past—is entirely correct. Tightrope said:

The committee quickly concluded that the major public complaints against FAA rulemaking were historical and stemmed from a small number of controversial rules abruptly promulgated early in the Agency's life.

Again, quoting testimony of Mr. Hartranft of the AOPA, given before the Senate Aviation Subcommittee in January 1960:

A matter which has caused considerable dissatisfaction on the part of industry with the administration of the Federal Aviation Agency under the act of 1958, is the lack of advance consultation and coordination with industry, prior to legal promulgation of proposed rulemaking. As you gentlemen know, the unsatisfactory operation of the old Civil Aeronautics Administration within the framework of the Air Coordinating Committee, led to the inclusion of language in section 301 of the act of 1958 to prohibit the Administrator from submitting his decisions for the approval of any committee, board, or other organization created by Executive order. We were among the critics of the old CAA–ACC relationship and we wholly support the inclusion of this provision in the Federal Aviation Agency Act. It is unfortunate that the zeal of the FAA staff to comply with this mandate from the Congress has apparently led to an interpretation that has effectively prevented adequate advance consultation with industry prior to institution of formal rulemaking procedures.

This has created a great area of dissatisfaction on the part of general aviation and has caused an untold amount of bitterness, wrangling, and unnecessary work on the part of all concerned. AOPA, and others in industry, repeatedly have requested the FAA to seek the advice of knowledgeable persons and organizations outside of Government in order that the decisions of the Administrator, when made, may be based upon the best knowledge available throughout the aviation community.

Here is a part of the solution to this problem, as suggested by Tightrope:

3. Notices of proposed rulemaking: Notices of proposed rulemaking by the Agency are now published in most cases only at the end of the rulemaking process, after the Agency staff has discussed the matter in question with all interested parties and has reconciled or reached a judgment on all controverted issues. In almost all cases, the Agency has largely made up its mind before a notice of proposed rulemaking is issued, and the notice and subsequent comments are almost formalities.

In our opinion, it would be preferable for the Agency, whenever feasible, to utilize that portion of the Administrative Procedure Act which provides that a notice of proposed rulemaking shall include "either the terms or substance of the proposed rule or a description of the subject and issue involved," APA section 4(a) and issue a notice when a matter first comes under consideration by the Agency for possible rulemaking.

Such early notices do not, of course, preclude a second publication of a proposed rule for final comment just before it is promulgated. We can see no great hardship or waste in such double publication, and it would insure ample opportunity to all to comment throughout the rulemaking procedure.

Mr. Halaby's committee also suggested that greater use be made of public hearings in the rulemaking process. I quote:

5. Oral argument on proposed rules: The policy standard used in determining whether to have public oral argument following issuance of a notice of proposed rule should be reconsidered. Too often the standard has been, "Are we in the Agency likely to learn anything from a public hearing?" Since its answer to this question was usually "No," the Federal Aviation Agency has not held many such hearings.

In our judgment the Agency should also consider the possibility that the public learns something from public hearings, and that however boring they may be to the man conducting them, they are quite valuable in gaining support for the Agency's proposals or, at the very least, an acceptance of its good motives.

By "hearings" we do not mean evidentiary proceedings. We mean open conferences at which the Agency would present its proposals and their justification, and the members of the public in attendance could then in turn have their say. There is a justifiable complaint in some cases that the public is not adequately informed by the rulemaking notice as to the Agency's actual basis for action and thus has no real opportunity to comment on the Agency's reasons. A presentation by Agency officials at a public hearing thus serves a most useful purpose.

An excerpt from an article appearing in the March 1960 issue of the AOPA Pilot shows clearly the regard held by General Quesada's regime for the public hearing:

The FAA held a public hearing—its first in 14 months' operation—on a proposed rulemaking.

Up for discussion was FAA's draft release 59–2, which would require all examinations for third-class certificates to be made by FAA-designated medical examiners. The term discussion is used rather loosely here. Only the witnesses offered evidence. The Government Agency's justification for its move to take away from the family doctor the right to make these examinations was limited to its brief allegations printed months ago in the thinly circulated, official Federal Register.

A frequent complaint heard by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY's subcommittee earlier in the month, when that group's hearings were going full swing, was that the FAA was prone to make rules in the name of safety without showing there was a need for more restrictive rules.

The magazine article referred to above was a report on a public hearing held on January 14, 1960, on a proposed rule that would require private pilots to get their third-class medical certificates from physicians especially designated by the FAA. Disregarding the opposition expressed by industry leaders and many doctors, the rule was enacted anyway.

Why was the instrument of public hearing practically ignored in the early days of FAA? The following excerpt from another article in the AOPA Pilot explains FAA's attitude, which Tightrope later criticized:

In addition to the innovations in the revised part 29 itself, final action on the regulation clarified to some extent FAA's position in regard to requests for public hearings in the matter of the Agency's rulemaking procedures. A request for such a hearing on the proposed changes in the medical standards for airmen was made by AOPA and the National Association of State Aviation Officials. Although no formal turndown of these requests was made by FAA, the changes in the CAR were made without such hearing being granted. However, the following explanation of FAA's action in not granting a hearing is contained in the preamble of the document signed September 4:

"It is the opinion of the Administrator that the changes being incorporated in this amendment eliminate, to the greatest practicable degree consistent with safety, all the features of the proposal to which objection was expressed. In addition, in evaluating the comments received, with particular reference to the professional knowledge represented by the comments, it is the Administrator's opinion that they give overwhelming and authoritative support to the medical standards being adopted in this amendment. It does not appear, therefore, that a public hearing would serve any useful purpose and the Administrator does not deem such a hearing to be necessary in the public interest."

Regarding FAA's justification for its new regulations, an editorial entitled

"Dictatorship?" in the December 1959 issue of the AOPA Pilot, pointed out that little justification was given for its regulation radically changing the medical standards for private pilots. The magazine said:

Most glaring of this year's case histories to AOPA, of course, is the arbitrary manner in which the FAA has railroaded into being the new medical rules. They didn't care a damn what anyone else thought, they said so frankly, and ordered the new rules into being with hardly a shred of factual evidence to support their actions—another fact which they candidly admit.

President Kennedy also was concerned, prior to his election, with the situation in the Federal Aviation Agency, as evidenced by the following statement which he gave to the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association:

As private aviation has expanded the horizons of business, so has it expanded the horizons of politics.

It was only because of civil aviation that I was able to continue my work in the Senate and campaign vigorously in the preconvention primaries.

In my earlier campaigns—both in Massachusetts and traveling across the country for Democratic candidates—I have compiled, I think, an impressive amount of flying time.

I am fortunate enough to own a Convair, which I use quite extensively. Lately, however, I am confined to charter flights of larger planes due to the large number of staff and press accompanying the campaign.

Long hours in the air and an intimate association with pilots have made me fully aware of the activities of both the AOPA and FAA. I was one of those concerned about coordinating aviation activities in one agency.

My Democratic colleague and campaign associate, Senator CLAIR ENGLE, of California, has expressed great concern over some of the powers concentrated in the hands of the FAA as a result of legislation we passed in the Congress in 1958.

I know of his belief that an adequate review of FAA decisions, affecting the 330,000 civil pilots, is not provided by the Federal Aviation Act. An AOPA'er himself, Senator ENGLE believes pilots are being deprived of inherent rights belonging to all Americans.

As a friend of civil aviation, I can assure you that Senator ENGLE's views will get a full and fair hearing by a Democratic administration.

I, personally, see a threefold problem at this time.

One concerns the balance needed between the rules and regulations required for safety and the guarantee of civil rights of private pilots.

The second is the question raised by AOPA about former military men filling the top civil positions in aviation.

The third is the lack of public awareness of the percentage of air time recorded by civil aviation as related to commercial aviation and the resultant apathy toward civil aviation.

These problems will be considered by a Democratic administration and fair answers provided.

Growing use of private aviation for pleasure and business provides one of the new horizons on our New Frontier of the sixties.

I congratulate AOPA for being one of the pioneers of this New Frontier.

Following his election, President Kennedy very carefully reviewed a long list of candidates for the position of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. His selection of "Jeeb" Halaby started a move to restore confidence in the FAA. Mr. Halaby's appointment of the Tightrope Committee was clear evidence that he shared President Kennedy's concern about the FAA rulemaking and enforcement procedures.

Acting with dispatch upon the recommendations of the Tightrope committee, Mr. Halaby has created, by Agency order, a panel of hearing officers who are responsive directly to him, and who are authorized to act for him in enforcement cases. Beginning February 1, certificate holders against whom violation action is initiated looking to the suspension or revocation of their certificates, are being given an opportunity to request a hearing before one of these independent hearing officers. Upon such request, the matter will be set for an early hearing at a location convenient to the certificate holder, and the Agency Counsel who has initiated the certificate action will bear the burden of proof in presenting evidence and witnesses to substantiate the charges made against the certificate holder. The latter will have full opportunity to confront and cross-examine the witnesses and to present testimony on his own behalf. Upon a full record thus made before him, the assigned hearing officer is authorized to decide the case and to issue an order on behalf of the Administrator. This procedure does not, and of course cannot, deprive any certificate holder of his right of appeal to the CAB, a right which was preserved to him in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. If a certificate holder is not satisfied that he has obtained a fair measure of justice from the Administrator's hearing officer, he may appeal. In doing so, he may either rely upon the record which was made before the FAA hearing officer, or he may ask for a new hearing either wholly or in part before the CAB. This forward-looking step on the part of the Agency should do much to dispel the "punishment first—trial later" approach to enforcement cases and to enhance the appearance of fairness which, as Tightrope observed, is so "vital to public acceptance of any governmental regulation and enforcement system."

In relation to the rulemaking processes of the Agency, Administrator Halaby has moved apace to carry out in large measure the recommendations of the Tightrope report. He has established an Agency Regulatory Council, of which he himself is Chairman; and he has created, and filled, the post of a Vice Chairman, who will serve as Executive Director of the Council, and will devote his full time to assuring that the rulemaking processes of the Agency undergo high-level surveillance and are responsive to the principal objectives outlined by the Tightrope study group.

Members of the Council will be top officials who are most particularly concerned in the rulemaking processes of the Agency, including the General Counsel, the civil air surgeon, and the directors of the flight standards service and the air traffic service. Upon call from the Chairman or Vice Chairman, this Council will not only advise with respect to rulemaking policies and practices, but will also counsel the Administrator as to the justification for any significant or potentially controversial rule, as well as resolve or advise him with respect to differences of opinion which may arise internally within the Agency. The principal thrust of the Council's role, as well as of the duties assigned by the new Executive Director, is to assure that there is justification in depth for all rules which may hereafter be issued and affect the regulated aviation public. At the same time, attention will be given to the processes by which these rules are produced, in order that public petitions for rulemaking will be responsibly handled and the public's views will be sought and fully considered. As yet, it is too early to assess the full impact upon the rulemaking processes of the Agency, and the product thereof; but it appears that the Agency has embarked upon a course which may be welcome, indeed, to those who in the past have been critical of these processes.

The Administrator is to be commended for having had the courage to invite an independent group of experts to evaluate and report upon this sensitive area of the Agency's activities, then for releasing this report to the public, and, finally, for taking these specific and constructive steps to implement the report's principal recommendations. We shall watch with great interest their development.

PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE NATIONAL ARMIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the distinguished majority leader to the statement I am going to read, because I think it has great bearing on the debate which is taking place in this Chamber now. I did not see this article in any of the Washington papers, the article to which I shall call attention, although undoubtedly it was there; nor did I see it in any of the New York papers. I was first told about this by a friend of mine in Los Angeles who called me yesterday and said he had the article on his desk. A search for the article in the papers here was unsuccessful, but yesterday afternoon my local paper from Phoenix, Ariz., arrived on my desk. It was the March 31 issue of the Arizona Republic, and carries the UPI byline from Geneva of that date.

I want to read this article and ask the majority leader if he is aware of it; and, if he is, if he knows whether the statement is true or not.

I have written, and had carried by page, a letter to Secretary of State Rusk and Mr. Foster, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, asking them about it, because while I am sure the UPI quotes reliable sources, sometimes they are unreliable. I read the article:

UNITED STATES SEEKS ELIMINATION OF ARMIES

GENEVA.—The United States will submit to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a plan calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years and their replacement by a United Nations force, reliable sources said yesterday.

The American plan is to be submitted to the 17-nation group to counter a Soviet draft

treaty for general and complete disarmament within 4 years, introduced when the Conference opened here 2 weeks ago.

It was understood Secretary of State Dean Rusk and William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, were meeting in Washington with their principal advisers to put the finishing touches on the plan.

The West complains that the Russian 4-year plan gives the Russians an undue military advantage in the early stages and does not include specific and detailed proposals for international controls to insure each nation destroys its arms on schedule.

The American plan was said to include these precautions as well as a U.N. peace force to maintain international law and order as national defenses are torn down.

The Soviet plan omits any mention of a standing peace force.

At yesterday's session the Soviets tried to commit the United States to total disarmament within 4 years but American negotiator Arthur H. Dean told Soviet delegate Valerian Zorin "you cannot build a house without a blueprint."

Zorin suggested the Conference start taking up the Russian plan point by point and when Dean put the brakes on the proposal Zorin warned that the Conference might be heading into another impasse.

Dean proposed instead the 17-nation group set up subcommittees to consider such specific problems as how to end nuclear weapons production, how to destroy or reduce nuclear delivery vehicles, including ships, submarines, planes, and rockets, and how to verify such measures.

"These are not problems of language but of substance," Dean said.

Zorin rejected the subcommittee suggestion, first made by Rusk, and said "these problems cannot be solved separately. If we are going to have general and complete disarmament they must all be dealt with at the same time and in stages."

Zorin said the Soviet Union is ready to discuss any plan put before the Conference, a statement interpreted by Western observers as a challenge to the United States to bring forth its own proposals.

British Minister of State Joseph Godber, speaking after Dean had rejected the Soviet proposals, said general agreement on certain basic issues must be reached before they can be put into treaty form. He particularly insisted that subcommittees study detailed problems.

As expected, Poland, Bulgaria and Rumania lined up behind the Soviets in demanding point-by-point consideration. Neutral Brazil came out in favor of the American approach. India and the United Arab Republic, the only other speakers, were on the fence.

The query I wanted to put to the distinguished majority leader was just this: Does he have any knowledge of a suggestion being submitted, or a plan to submit such a suggestion, to the Geneva Conference, that the United States turn over its military to the United Nations?

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, I want to reply that this is the first indication I have had that a proposal of this nature is being considered, if one is being considered. I certainly would not question the reliability of the UPI as a news gathering organization. I do not know to what reliable sources it refers, but, if I understand the import of what the Senator from Arizona has said, it is to the effect that a proposal has been made by the American delegation that within a period of 9 years, national forces of all countries, will be disbanded and their places taken by a United Nations armed force.

A question of that nature is one which merits the most serious inquiry and study. I have never heard anybody on the floor of the Senate, or, for that matter, in this country, make a declaration going that far, which would seek to abandon our own national forces. I do recall that the Senate and the House of Representatives, a few years ago, under the distinguished leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], did pass a resolution to the effect that we believed there should be a United Nations armed force on a standby basis, so to speak. But certainly no one has, in the very remotest manner or way, suggested that there should be a disbanding of national armies or forces.

So I am delighted that the Senator from Arizona has called this matter to the attention of the Senate. I am delighted he has taken the matter up personally with the Secretary of State. I am sure all of us will be interested in the reply he receives. I assure him that I, too, will take it up with the Secretary of State, and see that a reply either affirming or denying this particular proposal is forthcoming as quickly as possible.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I was quite sure he was not aware of this development, because, for some reason or other, it was not displayed prominently in the press in the East.

It has received rather prominent display in the press of the West.

I might say that the article stated, "will submit," and did not state they have already submitted it. This was quoted from what we call reliable sources. We know sometimes they are not.

I, too, have no reason to disagree with the accuracy of the UPI. I, for one, feel that the United Nations, to be effective, is going to have to have a standby force. I have often advocated it.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Arizona voted and spoke in favor of it several years ago.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

I notice the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] coming on the floor. He is handling the bill before the Senate. I know he will be interested in this, because it will have some bearing on the matter we are debating.

I may say to the Senator from Alabama that the matter to which I was addressing myself was a UPI story that appeared in western papers. I have not found it in the papers available to me here. The effect of the story was that "the United States will submit to the Geneva disarmament conference a plan calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years and their replacement by a United Nations force, reliable sources said yesterday."

Realizing that the story said it came from reliable sources, I have asked Secretary Rusk and the head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency about this.

I was wondering if the Senator from Alabama had any knowledge of such a proposal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I can only say I know absolutely nothing about it. Anything I say now is purely speculative and gratuitous.

My own individual thinking is, if that is the full story, that what is suggested would be wholly impractical. I do not see how there could possibly be an abolition of national armies and a sole reliance placed upon the United Nations.

In that connection, I have urged for many years, as I think the Senator from Arizona knows, that there be a small police force at the command of the United Nations for the purpose of doing police duty, not for engaging in wars and fighting and combat other than that which is entailed in police duty. It would be a relatively small force.

The Senate unanimously voted in favor of that a few years ago, and at a second time in another Congress I believe a joint resolution to the same effect was passed through both Houses. It has become the policy of the United States to advocate a police force for use by the United Nations, but certainly nothing considered would envisage anything like the proposal mentioned.

I am stating my personal views, and I know absolutely nothing about the story.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator for his observations. I asked him to comment because he is so important in the present debate. I agree completely with the Senator about the need for a police force in the United Nations. I have advocated that often myself, and in fact I have voted for it whenever it has been before the Senate.

I pray the story is not true, for I cannot imagine any member of our Government ever suggesting that we should do away with our Armed Forces within a period of 9 years, or 90 years, but if the account is accurate, I am sure that what is suggested would meet with the complete disfavor of the people of this country.

I hope I shall get the reply I seek within a few hours, because the matter is to be a subject for discussion this afternoon, and I trust there will be a denial, or at least a complete explanation by Secretary Rusk and Mr. Foster.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield further, the Senator may know or may not know that Secretary Rusk is now appearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have just come from that hearing. That was the reason for my being slightly tardy. I am sure the Secretary is not available at the present time and will not be available until the hearings are concluded for the day.

ANTITRUST PROCEEDINGS ARE PERTINENT TO THE CAB'S PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AN AIR TRANSPORTATION MONOPOLY IN THE STATES-ALASKA SERVICE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, recently, on the floor of the Senate, I called attention to the attempt by the Civil Aeronautics Board to create a monopoly situation with respect to air service between Alaska and the lower 48 States.

When an agency of the Federal Government seeks to limit air service to an area one-fifth the size of the other 48 States to one carrier it is time that other agencies of the Federal Government charged with the enforcement or the oversight of the enforcement of our antitrust laws should take a good hard look at such a proposal.

In his message to the Congress today, the President says with respect to mergers in the transportation field:

"Effective competition should be maintained among alternative forms of transportation, and, where traffic volume permits, between competing firms in the same mode of transportation."

It is clear from the Civil Aeronautics Board's order in Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service case—Docket No. 13463—that the Board is seeking to eliminate Pan American Airways from Alaska altogether, although Pan American was the pioneer in establishing service between Alaska and the lower 48 States, as well as being an unsubsidized carrier; to limit Northwest Airlines to merely stop off-and-on passengers incidental to its service to the Orient; to merge Pacific Northern Airlines and Alaska Airlines and to limit service from the lower 48 States to Alaska to service by this merged airline.

It is my conviction that such a result would not be in keeping with the objective outlined by the President in today's message on transportation.

In order that the antitrust features of the Board's proposed action may be properly reviewed, I have directed a letter to the Attorney General asking that he intervene in the case to protect the interests of the people of the other 48 States who should not be forced to rely upon the services of one airline in reaching the whole of the 49th State.

I ask unanimous consent that the communication which I addressed to the Attorney General be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

APRIL 2, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
The Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On March 19, 1962, the Civil Aeronautics Board issued Order No. E-18120 (Docket No. 13463) proposing a drastic revision in airline service between the lower 48 States and the State of Alaska. The Board's announced concept of the best manner in which Alaska should be connected by air with the other States is through one airline—a merged Pacific Northern Airlines and Alaska Airlines—with limited access through Northwest Airlines.

Except for limited access by motor over the Alaska Highway, Alaska-bound passengers are dependent on air transportation. If the Board has its way, those passengers will be dependent on one airline to reach an area one-fifth the size of the United States.

It does not seem to me that the powers granted to the Civil Aeronautics Board were intended to be so exerised as to result in such a large area being served by one carrier. I appreciate the fact that the Board can prevent ruinous competition among airlines. But that is not the situation here involved. If the elimination of competition were the function of the Board, then the simplest way to achieve that objective would be to grant an absolute monopoly to one company. That would not be tolerated with respect to the lower 48 States. Why should it be tolerated for the 49th State?

My purpose in writing you at this time is to request that you intervene in this matter on behalf of the United States to make certain that any decision of the Board properly represents the provisions of the antitrust laws enacted by the Congress.

I am enclosing copies of my remarks I have made on this subject on the floor of the Senate.

With all best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

THE PROPOSED TRADE BILL

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, as a Senator from the State of Maine I am very much concerned over the economic growth of our country. My State has been plagued by unemployment for many years and I realize that we must encourage general economic growth if we are to overcome many of our own economic difficulties.

I recognize that expanding international trade represents one important facet of the President's efforts to stimulate a dynamic domestic economy. However, although I agree with this objective, I think there are substantial problems involved in the trade bill, H.R. 9900, which must be resolved.

Last year, I introduced S. 1735, the Orderly Marketing Act. This proposed legislation would give the President the power to enter into trade agreements with exporting countries restricting the importation of commodities to a certain percentage of our domestic market where such commodities are produced at a substantially lower labor cost than applies in the United States. My bill has the twin advantage of defining injury far more explicitly than in existing trade legislation and of adopting the principle of permitting exporting countries to share in our expanding domestic market even in cases where our domestic industries are threatened with injury. I believe that trade legislation must take into account the peculiar problems of those industries which require high labor imports which compete with low wage industries in highly industrialized countries. In interstate commerce, we have used the minimum wage law to insure fair competition, as well as to protect workers from substandard working conditions.

In international trade we cannot impose a minimum wage requirement, but we can adjust trade in commodities produced by foreign industries with substandard wages so as to minimize the impact of such competition.

To take this position is not to embrace the cause of protectionism. It is, I believe, a realistic approach to our trade problem.

I have been very much encouraged by the attitude taken by the shoe industry on this issue. This industry, as well as others in the State of Maine is confronted by rapidly expanding imports from low-wage countries. The industry has substantial reason to be concerned over import threats. In spite of this, they have taken a very balanced and reasonable approach to the trade problem.

Today, Harold O. Toor appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means to testify on H.R. 9900. I was gratified by Mr. Toor's endorsement of S. 1735, my "Orderly Marketing Act" bill.

Because of the pertinence of Mr. Toor's statement to the debate on the national trade policy, I ask unanimous consent that his testimony be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TESTIMONY OF HAROLD O. TOOR FOR THE U.S. SHOE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, APRIL 5, 1962

I am Harold O. Toor, treasurer of the National Shoe Manufacturers Association, president of H. O. Toor Shoe Corp., and chairman of the board of the Freeman Shoe Corp. I am representing the National Shoe Manufacturers Association, the New England Shoe & Leather Association, and the St. Louis Shoe Manufacturers Association, which together include over 500 manufacturers producing at least 90 percent of all the footwear made in the United States.

The shoe manufacturing industry of the United States recognizes the necessity of a policy and a program of trade expansion, full employment, and a vigorous healthy economy as a national objective. We endorsed and supported the proposed Orderly Marketing Act of 1961, under which foreign manufacturers would share in the growth of our domestic market.

We would like to support the proposed trade expansion bill, H.R. 9900. We have grave doubts, however, that we could survive as a healthy industry under this proposed legislation unless there are improved safeguards for businesses such as ours which face increasingly severe competition from imports.

The leather shoe manufacturing industry is made up of approximately 850 companies with over 1,300 factories. These are located in communities represented by 262 congressional districts in 38 States.

It is not generally realized that shoe manufacturing is one of the most highly competitive industries in the United States. The intensive competition prevailing is reflected by the fact that the average wholesale factory value of shoes as measured by the Department of Commerce was $3.80 per pair in 1961, compared with $3.44 in 1950. Over 58 percent of the women's shoes sold each year retail below $6 a pair. Over 60 percent of all men's dress shoes retail under $10. And over 72 percent of all children's shoes retail under $6.

These shoe factories provide the major support, or at least are important contributors to the support, of the economic life of hundreds of communities. In Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, for example

(according to the three-digit Standard Industrial Classification for 1959), shoe manufacturing was the largest manufacturing industry employer; in Missouri, it was the 2d largest; and in Wisconsin and Pennsylvania, 11th.

Shoe manufacturers and their suppliers have an annual payroll of somewhere between 350,000 and 400,000 employees, and the activities of these workers, it is estimated, have a direct or indirect effect on the welfare of a million or more citizens in these communities.

If imports continue to expand at the current rate then the total for 1965 would amount to 76.6 million pairs, or 11.7 percent of an estimated 1965 output of 630 million pairs. We believe this is a conservative calculation.

If imports of an estimated 68 million pairs of canvas-rubber footwear are added to leather imports, then total imports would represent 20.4 percent of the estimated U.S. production in 1965 of 710 million pairs of leather and canvas-rubber footwear.

We estimate that for every 10 million pairs of nonrubber footwear produced in the United States there are jobs for 4,100 workers in shoe manufacturing and for another 1,400 in the supplying trades, or a total of 5,500.

Imports, on this basis, will have absorbed a good part of our normal growth and displaced well over 30,000 jobs in the domestic shoe manufacturing and supplying industries over the period 1956 to 1965.

The question may be asked: How can this happen if the shoe industry in the United States is a modern industry, has built at least 80 new plants with over 3½ million square feet of space since 1950, is keenly competitive, is alert to changes in markets, and possesses an excess capacity of over 100 million pairs per year? The answer is simple.

Imports are increasing rapidly because there are wide differences in wage rates between the United States and the shoe-exporting countries of the world. It is simply a case of lower priced labor in foreign countries competing against higher priced labor in America. Wages in the United States are anywhere from two to five times wages in important shoe-exporting countries.

The technical structure of shoe manufacturing in the exporting countries is almost identical with our own. New and modern plants have been built with our aid. Shoe machinery and shoe technology are universal today. No one advanced country enjoys any substantial advantage over the other in machinery and methods. The rate of productivity, furthermore, in the larger factories making shoes for export in these countries is comparable with ours even though they make more of their components than we do and employ more people for what we would call unnecessary operations.

This is why the shoe manufacturing industry is vitally concerned with maintaining its present duties. These are the lowest of any important trading country in the world. Any reduction in our duties would speed up imports. Some countries now very easily jump the hurdle of our tariffs. As these tariffs become lower, other "runners" will also be able to jump over them.

A comparison of tariff schedules of the United States with those of foreign countries indicates further that there has been little reciprocity in previous trade negotiations. We believe at this stage of world industrial development that the United States must insist in its negotiations upon real reciprocity.

In summary, the footwear industry is an essential industry whose products were rationed in World War II. We believe it is necessary to establish some market arrangement for footwear similar to that outlined in S. 1735 which would provide for a sharing of our domestic market growth with foreign footwear producers on an orderly basis.

We recognize that Congress may pass a trade expansion program. We urge, therefore, that certain safeguards for domestic industry be included in the final form of such trade legislation. Our suggestions are as follows:

1. There should be incorporated in the bill a procedure establishing general specifications, without a preliminary determination as to national security, which would serve as guides to negotiators in developing orderly marketing arrangements for such industries as shoes with high labor content. Congress should enact specific provisions which would empower the Executive to negotiate and proclaim agreements establishing equitable market sharing arrangements where the facts and circumstances justify them.

2. The escape clause provisions of existing law should be preserved and strengthened.

3. The Tariff Commission should, under section 221 of the proposed bill, be directed to hold hearings and to report to the President in advance of negotiations the level of duty or import restriction on any article or categories of articles below which domestic producers of such articles would suffer serious injury from importation. The President should inform Congress where reductions are made in tariff duties or restrictions below such levels. Provision should also be made for industry advice and counsel in negotiation with other countries in conformity with the practice followed by other countries.

4. We approve the reaffirmation of the most-favored-nation principle contained in section 241 and 242 of Joint Resolution 9900. There has, however, been a lack of reciprocity in past trade agreements and a failure to enforce reciprocity by suspending most-favored-nation treatment with respect to any country which discriminates against U.S. commerce or pursues other policies that subvert the most-favored-nation principle. We submit that the principle of reciprocity should be rigorously enforced in future negotiations.

5. We approve the provisions of section 222 of the proposed bill which requires the President to reserve from negotiation for reduction or elimination of duty any article on which escape clause or national security proceedings are in progress. In addition, we would recommend that articles be reserved from negotiation until the President receives the advice of the Tariff Commission under section 221 of the proposed bill.

6. We recommend that section 212 of the bill be clarified to exclude footwear as an agricultural commodity or product thereof.

Finally, the American shoe industry goes on record as being in step with a recognition of the need for trade expansion—to help our own country and, doing so, to help the economy of friendly nations. We ask of Congress this consideration—a fair chance to survive as an industry in competition with countries having wage levels far below ours.

SUMMARY OF CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK ECONOMIC STUDY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, when controversy arose in my State about the best use of the area I propose for the Canyonlands National Park, the National Park Service asked the Bureau of Economic and Business Research of the University of Utah to make a full economic study of the question. The bureau did so, taking a sharp, objective look at the present economy of the five counties surrounding the proposed park, at the importance of tourism in the area today, at the probable number of visitors the new park might attract to the area and the amount of money they would spend, and finally at the present and possible future use of the natural resources within the boundaries of the proposed park.

In analyzing these data, the bureau took into consideration the rapid and growing demand for outdoor recreation, and the impact of that demand on other national parks, particularly those in areas as remote as Canyonlands.

The report has now been completed and released. Anyone who studies it dispassionately cannot help but conclude that it has been drawn with care and accuracy. I should like to discuss some of the estimates offered and conclusions reached, and to comment briefly on them.

The report shows that beyond any doubt, the best primary use of the spectacular area in question is for a national park. A park would bring both more money and more prestige to Utah. It would pour more than $10 million annually into southeastern Utah in new tourist spending with 15 years, and $16.5 million annually in 25 years. The report states:

> Total expenditures of visitors to the new park, as well as expenditures of the National Park Service should total $10.7 million during the first 5-year construction period. These expenditures will create personal income in the geographic area of the park of approximately $3.2 million during this 5-year period. If indirect income, which will be created by the respending of the $3.2 million of directly created income, is included, the total monetary impact will amount to $5.6 million.
>
> By the 15th year of operation, 10 years after the completion of the construction period, total visitor expenditures should amount to over $10 million. In that single year, personal income created by these additional visitor expenditures and wage and salary expenditures of the National Park Service should result in direct total personal income created in the area of about $3 million. Thus by the 15th year, sufficient growth will have occurred that the total for the 1 year will be almost equal to the total for the first full 5 years of the park's existence.
>
> By the 25th year, total visitor expenditures should amount to over $16.5 million annually, with total personal income directly created amounting to $4.7 million.
>
> During the first 25 years of operation, it is expected that cumulative expenditures of visitors to the park and expenditures of the National Park Service should total almost $220 million and that the new personal income created because of these park and visitor expenditures should amount to almost $65 million for the 25-year period.

These estimates do not include expenditures by private individuals for tourist facilities outside park boundaries—motels, guest ranches, service stations—or for concessions within the park for boating, jeep trips, guides, and so forth, because of the difficulty of arriving at an approximation.

The report estimates that the park would be attracting 250,000 visitors annually within 6 years, 500,000 visitors a year in 10 years, and more than a million a year in 25 years. The daily expenditures of these visitors is estimated at $7, which is the average daily expenditures of present tourists in Utah, and the average length of stay in the park is estimated as 2 days.

The Bureau found the problem of accurately estimating the size of future tourist crowds a difficult one. These are the factors which were considered:

First, the designation "national park" and the high and unique appeal of Canyonlands would have considerable drawing power.

Second, existing patterns show tourists travel some distance to visit national parks. The report points out:

It was found, for example, that 74 percent of the visitors to Grand Canyon National Park came from localities more than 500 miles away. Within a radius not much greater than this, particularly on the Pacific coast, there are presently large concentrations of population * * *. Thus the distance of the new park from large population centers should not be a serious handicap.

This point is elaborated in another section:

Virtually all tourists visiting Canyonlands would come by car * * *. The relative distance of Canyonlands from major population centers means that it would get very little use by tourists making 1-day or even weekend trips (although Salt Lake City and Denver are within feasible weekend driving range). On the other hand, this remoteness from population concentrations does not seem to have prevented heavy tourist use in other cases where the intrinsic value of the tourist attraction was high, e.g., Carlsbad Caverns and Mesa Verde National Park. Of the visitors to Grand Canyon National Park, according to one estimate, 97 percent came from homes more than 300 miles away, and 74 percent came from more than 500 miles away. For Glacier National Park the figures were 77 percent and 57 percent, respectively.

Third, a comparison of traffic flows and attendance at other parks indicate that there are presently enough out-of-State cars on major transcontinental highways to generate an immediate attendance of 150,000 visitors to the new park as soon as it is opened. The report states:

Traffic flows along U.S. 40 was the source of some 142,000 visitors to Dinosaur National Monument in 1960. The out-of-State flows on U.S. 50 in the vicinity of Canyonlands is heavier than on U.S. 40 near the Dinosaur Monument. It should also be borne in mind that U.S. 50 will become Interstate Highway 70, probably within the next 5 years, and will provide the shortest route from Denver to southern California, and the fastest route from Chicago to southern California. Thus, a substantial increase can be expected.

Fourth, by the time facilities and access roads are completed within Canyonlands, important new highways will have been built or hard-surfaced, and traffic flows on them will have increased traffic generally to the "golden circle" of national parks and monuments—the name applied to the outstanding concentration of scenic, archeological, and recreational outdoor attractions in southern Utah, northern Arizona, western Colorado, and northeastern New Mexico.

For example, Arches National Monument is expected to attract 230,000 visitors by 1970; Mesa Verde National Park, almost 500,000 visitors, and most important of all, Glen Canyon recreation area will be attracting almost a million visitors a year by the 1966–1967 date.

Fifth, the climate of Canyonlands has many advantages—warm with an abundance of sunshine in the day, but no humidity, and cool nights.

Sixth, the increase in the demand for outdoor recreation which has been spelled out in great detail in the recent report of the Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission, indicates that space for outdoor living will be at a premium in coming years. It has been predicted that cars will be bumper-to-bumper on highways leading to our outdoor recreation spots.

In making the projections about Canyonlands, the Bureau naturally had to make many assumptions—assumptions that National Park Service construction of facilities and access roads would go forth on schedule, and that other important roads outside the park—such as the road from the park's north entrance to U.S. 160 north of Moab, and the road from the park's east entrance to U.S. 160 near Monticello—would be hard-surfaced. The Bureau also assumed that U.S. 70 will be completed, that the park when established will contain all the presently proposed scenic, scientific and recreational factors attractive to visitors and that developments in the Glen Canyon recreation area will proceed on approximately the same scale as at present.

I think it is safe to make these assumptions—I am convinced that the majority of the people of Utah want the Canyonlands National Park and they favor making all of the adjustments and undertaking all of the developments necessary to make it a success. I am confident also that the National Park Service will move as fast as appropriations allow to open up and improve the park area.

The Canyonlands controversy in my State has mainly swirled around the question of alternate uses for the land which would be encompassed within the park borders. The park would be approximately 30 miles long by 15 miles wide, or about one-seventh the size of Yellowstone. All of the land is now owned by the Federal Government or by the State of Utah. There would be no cash acquisition cost to the Federal Government. State lands would be exchanged for Federal lands located elsewhere in the State, which Federal lands are extensive and valuable. The State would benefit in being able to acquire valuable lands "blocked-up" to facilitate administration. Present State lands in the park area are noncontiguous and some are so remote as to be almost inaccessable.

One alternate use of the park area would be for grazing. The report states:

Although the forage resources of the park lands are not great, large acreages are presently used for grazing, particularly for the grazing on Federal lands of 683 cattle, 6,436 sheep and 18 horses. The animal unit months of range use on Federal lands amount to 11,865 AUM's, for which annual grazing fees amount to about $2,254. There is also grazing on approximately 11,000 acres of State land, with fees approximately $275. Road and range improvements (reservoirs, spring development, corrals, storage facilities, etc.) have been made by the Bureau of Land Management in cooperation with local range users in the amount of about $6,000.

This means that the area is now sustaining about 10 sheep and 1 cow per every 500 acres. Thus, grazing is not now and never would be a major use. However, I realize that the right to graze sheep to even this limited extent is most valuable in an arid State like Utah, and I do not propose to take from anyone this right without allowing ample time for readjustment. My bill protects all present grazing rights for 25 years and for the lifetime of any member of the immediate family of the present holder of the right.

Since forage is scarce and water is limited to riverflows, this is not an area of abundant fish and game. The report puts it this way:

There is reported to be Channel Catfish and other warm-water fish throughout the river system. On the land there are a small population of mountain sheep, a rather abundant number of beaver, fairly large numbers of mule deer, especially along the riverbeds, and substantial populations of chucker partridges.

Should—at any time—any of these species of wildlife become too populous for the limited forage in the park area, my bill provides for a controlled hunt.

The pervading issue on alternate use of the park is, of course, whether there are minerals of great value below its rugged surface. The report recognizes that this is the crux of alternate-use objections:

The potential of mineral resources within the proposed park requires careful evaluation. The existence of possible mineral resources within the area have become significant because of the extensive uranium, petroleum, and potash developments in recent years within the southeastern Utah area.

Since I recognize the vast importance of not "locking up" any mineral resources there may be within the park, and placing them beyond possible development as they are needed, my bill leaves locatable minerals open to location, entry and patent—inclusive of land containing minerals—and would permit exploration for deposits of minerals subject to lease. The bill then provides that the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe regulations for mining and drilling to preserve the "scenic, scientific, and recreational values of the area."

The report has this to say about the bill's approach on mining:

The provision of the bill departs somewhat from past national park policy which restricts or prohibits nonconforming use. It should be noted, however, that mining is permitted in Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska. Valid oil, gas, and mineral rights and leases covering some lands in the Everglades National Park in Florida were recognized at the time of the park establishment; other mineral rights have been provided for by the act of October 10, 1949 (63 Stat. 733), which was enacted after Everglades National Park had been established. Three national monuments (Glazier Bay in Alaska, Death Valley in California, and Organ Pipe Cactus in Arizona) and one additional memorial (Coronado in Arizona) permit mining under regulations by the Secretary of the Interior.

The report then attempts to evaluate the mineral potential within the proposed park, and to forecast the possible revenue from it for the State of Utah. Following are excerpts:

Within the last 2 years an extensive potash deposit has been in the process of being developed by the Texas-Gulf Sulphur Co. at a cost of approximately $30 million. This is located on the Colorado River in the Cane Creek area which is situated within about 5 miles of the northeast corner of the park. A shaft for the development of an underground mine is being constructed as well as a mill and railroad facilities into the area to transport the finished product out.

A recent U.S. Geological Survey study indicates that potash probably exists within the park. Whether or not the deposits are in commercial quantity can only be determined by further drilling and exploration.

I understand that the Texas-Gulf Sulphur Co., the mine and plant now going into production, will probably produce enough potash from Cane Creek and Seven Mile to meet our needs for many years—but, of course, we always need to know where future supplies are.

The report continues:

The last production of uranium from within the park was in 1957. Prior to that date there was relatively small production from about five mines in two locations. Uranium prospects during the period of uranium exploration were discovered at 10 other locations. In the area immediately surrounding the park there has been production from 22 locations and prospects at an additional 2 locations. Thus the possibility of unknown deposits exists.

Again, I feel I should point out that there is almost no demand for new domestic sources of uranium at this time.

As to other minerals within the park area, the report says this:

The mineral records of San Juan County at Monticello were analyzed and a tabulation made of all "active claims." Active claims for the purposes of this report were designated at those filed in 1960 and 1961 as well as older claims on which assessment work has been done for these 2 years. Although only half of the data have been analyzed at this writing, the results show only a total of * * * 54 active claims fell within the area of the proposed park.

The most vigorous opposition to the park has been based on the contention that there may be great reservoirs of oil and gas under its acres.

The report has this to say:

Virtually all of the area within the park is at present under oil and gas lease. There have been a total of 11 wells drilled within the park and there is one producing well brought in within the park boundaries during February, 1962, with a daily producing capacity of 600 barrels.

I feel I should interpose here to state that I have amended my bill to exclude the well and the area around it from the park. The well is located on the northeast border—it was necessary only to adjust the boundaries by a few miles to eliminate it from the park.

The report continues:

Since 1955, 62 wells drilled in the area surrounding the park have resulted in three producing wells in the Big Flat area immediately to the north of the proposed park.

Another indication of oil and gas interest in the park is the unit agreements which have been effected. Within the general area, a total of 30 unit agreements have been made. Some have been terminated, but six are in existence in the area immediately outside the park and one exists within the park.

Geologists interviewed in the preparation of this report have stated that oil and gas prospects within the park are good, but they also said that the extent and size of any discovery cannot be determined at this time.

The report then tries to answer the big if in the park controversy. What if there is oil under Canyonland? How much would it be worth?

This is the conclusion the experts in the Bureau drew:

In making such an analysis a careful study was made of the value to the State of Utah and the local area if another Aneth oilfield (Utah's major oilfield) were discovered within the park. If such a discovery were certain, the economic value would total about $156 million. About half of this or $78 million would accrue to the State (in the form of royalty payments, severence tax, and corporation franchise tax) and the balance of these benefits or $78 million, would accrue to the local area (in the form of property taxes and wage and salary payments). If there were only a 50–50 chance of finding another Aneth oilfield within the proposed park area, a prudent man would be willing to pay only half the total value of a "certain" oilfield. If there were only a 25-percent chance of finding such a field, the value would be worth only about one-fourth of the full amount.

Oil drilling experience throughout the United States may be used upon which a probability calculation of finding a large oilfield may be based. The American Petroleum Institute reported that in the years 1952 through 1955 (for which data are available) 5 of the 14,178 new field wildcat wells drilled resulted in the discovery of fields with a reserve of 50 million barrels or more. It is calculated on the basis of this discovery experience that the value of the probability of finding a large field within the Canyonlands is worth about $2.2 million. To this value of the "chance" of finding a large oilfield must be added the $2.2 million benefits to the local area because of exploration expenditures. Thus the probability value of the economic benefits to the area of finding a field the size of Aneth is estimated to be about $4.4 million. This probability value of $4.4 million of an uncertain oilfield can be compared with the economic value to the local area which would result from a park.

However, a comparison can be drawn between a certain oilfield and a proposed park not just between an uncertain oilfield and a park. One would need to measure the income stream produced by both over a given period of time. As noted above, the benefits which would accrue to the local area from a large oilfield were estimated at about $78 million. On a relatively modest scale of operation, the local income produced by the park during the period of construction and the first 25-year period of operation would amount to about $65 million, but in another 3 years, with no increase in use, it would have produced an amount equal to the $78 million. The difference would be that the oilfield at the end of its life would be exhausted whereas the park would go on producing income into the indefinite future.

If actual park visits should prove to be higher than the estimated visits, the economic impact of park attendance would be even greater than indicated. If the attendance estimates of this report are high, or if interrupted by periods of decreased attendance, it would take longer for the income stream from tourist spending to equal the benefits to the local area of an oil and gas development.

After carefully analyzing all the data available, there is only one sensible conclusion that can be drawn from the economic study on Canyonlands—which is that the economic potential to Utah from the park is greater than from any other use. There is an assured income in tourist dollars that such a magnificent and widely advertised national park would bring. It would be foolish to turn down those tourist dollars, along with the prestige and splendid recreational opportunities for Utahans and all other Americans which the park would provide on the gamble that unlimited mineral prospecting and drilling for oil might, on some distant day, turn up a great strike—a strike larger and more rewarding than any found yet in Utah. No park or little spot parks would lose for Utah an assured continuing income from tourists, and would not assure mineral production. Canyonlands National Park would assure tourist income and permit continued exploration for minerals as a secondary use which would not injure or degrade the park.

The area proposed for the Canyonlands National Park amounts to less than three-fifths of 1 percent of Utah's 54.3 million acres. But this small area could have the almost magic drawing power of a national park. The Moss bill would open up an area which is now almost inaccessible and which only a handful of people have ever seen.

It would bring a new surge of prosperity to the five Utah counties closest to the park and better times to all Utah. It would literally be a "mint" according to the Salt Lake Tribune news story on the economic report.

And finally, it would give to the people of these United States a new and unique area for play and recreation—an area which is almost indescribable in its unsullied beauty and grandeur, in its majestic sweep and timelessness. I will continue to do everything within my power to create the Canyonlands National Park.

U.S. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, the U.S. transportation system, serving as an economic lifeline, has grown into a great, intricately complex, water-rail-road-air network for trade and commerce.

Realistically, the Nation has found it difficult to adequately coordinate transportation policies administered by separate agencies and pertaining to differing modes of transportation.

Representing the Great Lakes region, I have a special interest in improving and updating national transportation policies.

The St. Lawrence Seaway, completed in 1959, opened a new door of trade opportunity for the great industrial-agricultural complex of the Midwest.

Unfortunately, however, governmental and nongovernmental trade patterns have not yet been adequately revised to take full advantage of the seaway route for trade and commerce. The creation of more uniform policies throughout

our system would, I believe, result in fairer treatment of all segments of the economy and areas of the Nation in the shipment of goods under Federal programs, millions of dollars in savings to U.S. taxpayers, and provide for more efficient and economical nongovernmental, as well as governmental, transportation.

For these reasons I, joined by seven other Senators earlier this week, urged the release by the President of a Department of Commerce study on U.S. transportation system completed in November 1961. The purpose was to enable the Nation to utilize the information as a launching pad for efforts to improve practices and procedures.

The President's message on transportation today—coincidental in timing—will, I hope, provide a key to improving such procedures and policies for better meeting the ever-growing needs of the Nation.

I request unanimous consent to have the jointly signed letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, as Senators from the Great Lakes region, respectfully urge release of the study by the Department of Commerce of U.S. transportation policies—which, we understand, was completed in November 1961.

Over the years, the U.S. transportation system—serving as an economic lifeline—has grown into a great, intricately complex, water, road, rail, air network for trade and commerce.

Realistically, the Nation has found it difficult to adequately coordinate transportation policies—administered by separate agencies—and pertaining to differing modes of transportation.

Representing the Great Lakes region, we have a special interest in improving and updating of national transportation policies.

The St. Lawrence Seaway—completed in 1959—opened a new door of trade opportunity for the great industrial-agricultural complex of the Midwest. Unfortunately, however, governmental and nongovernmental trade patterns have not yet been adequately revised to take full advantage of the seaway route for trade and commerce.

Recognizing this situation, we recommended, in 1961, a special study on Defense Department policies relating to the shipment of military goods overseas. In response, the Department appointed a special task force to undertake a comprehensive analysis of its shipping procedures and policies. Completed in January 1962, the study revealed that—within the Department—there exists a wide range of differing practices and often uncoordinated policies.

Let us cite some examples. According to the study: Wide discrepancies exist in inland freight rates; e.g., as between Midwest to Atlantic and gulf ports; and Midwest to Great Lakes ports; there were instances in which procurement agencies failed completely to consider Great Lakes ports in their contracting procedures for shipment of materials; there is a lack of information outlets to governmental shippers on the advantages of Great Lakes Seaway shipping; approximately $840,000 could have been saved by use of Great Lakes ports for shipment of military cargo during 1961—if all factors were considered—including making available adequate amounts of American-flag shipping.

The creating of more uniform policies, then—not just within a single department, but throughout our system—would, we believe, result in: Fairer treatment of all segments of the economy and areas of the Nation in the shipment of goods under Federal programs; millions of dollars in savings to U.S. taxpayers; and provide for a more efficient and economical nongovernmental, as well as governmental, transportation system.

For these reasons, then, we respectfully urge early release of the Department of Commerce study of U.S. transportation which, we understand, awaits your approval.

If adequate in scope, analysis, objectivity, and constructive recommendations the study, we believe, will provide a key to improving procedures and policies for better meeting the ever-growing needs of a rapidly progressing nation.

With appreciation for the consideration we know you will give this matter, we remain,

Sincerely,

ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin; EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois; PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois; FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio; PATRICK V. MCNAMARA, of Michigan; VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana; WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin; STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio.

ADDRESS BY HON. THEODORE R. McKELDIN BEFORE PILGRIM CHAPTER OF DEMOLAY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the remarks of the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin to the Pilgrim chapter, Order of DeMolay, in Harrisburg, Pa., on March 31, 1962.

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

REMARKS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, PILGRIM CHAPTER, ORDER OF DEMOLAY, HARRISBURG, PA., MARCH 31, 1962

In the past three decades I have left my home many times to keep speaking engagements over the length and breadth of this country, but when I come to Harrisburg to visit with the Pilgrim chapter of DeMolay, it is not like leaving home at all; indeed, it is like coming home.

Since 1939, when I addressed your anniversary banquet in the old Harrisburg Consistory Building, I have been with you at your annual dinners a full score of times—missing only three in all the intervening years—and I missed those three only with great reluctance because of the pressures of official business or for other causes that could not be surmounted at the times.

I say I missed them with great reluctance because I truly have come to enjoy these visits—and to keep up with old acquaintances—and to make new friends as your order grows with the rising generations.

Even before 1939—the year before—in 1938—I was close by, in Hershey, to address the annual Conclave of the Associated Chapters of DeMolay in Pennsylvania.

Through those wonderful years, I have made many friends among you—some active now in the prime of their lives and their years of accomplishments—some with the happy satisfaction of years of community building and human advancement behind them—and some of fond memory who have gone to their heavenly rewards.

I would like to name all of those friends, even as I see many of you seated before me, and with me here at the head table. Time, of course, prohibits that. But two stand out in my pleasant and grateful thoughts tonight as I know they stand out in your affections. One, happily, is among us—a great leader—a great Mason of national note and accomplishment—a great pioneer of DeMolay. He is, of course, the esteemed Wilbur L. Minich, the adviser of Pilgrim chapter—and the only member of the original advisory council who still is associated with the chapter.

He assumed that office with the founding of the chapter on March 3, 1925—only 6 years after the Order of DeMolay was founded in Kansas City, Mo., in 1919. And since that date more than 4,300 boys and young men—15 to 21 years old—have been initiated into the chapter and the great aims and purposes of the order. What a magnificent tribute to man. What a wonderful succession of generations he helped to launch or maintain on the high road of patriotism—love of home—love of family—and respect and understanding between parents and children.

The honors that have come through the years of his labors have been well deserved by Wilbur Minich. He was invested with the Honorary Legion of Honor and the Cross of Honor by the supreme council. He was awarded the Founder's Cross by the late Frank S. Land, the founder of DeMolay. He was district deputy of the supreme council for southeast central Pennsylvania from 1932 to 1959. He received the 33d degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry in Boston, Mass. in 1948. And he is a past officer of all York Rite Masonic bodies in Harrisburg. When he was worshipful master of Harrisburg Lodge No. 629, I was honored to be the 40th anniversary banquet speaker on May 12, 1943. A great man among the great of Freemasonry, and I know that all of you join me in my tribute to him tonight.

Unhappily, the other who stands out so vividly in my memory among these familiar scenes is with us no more—but he will live as long as there is Masonry and an Order of DeMolay in Harrisburg. He will live in his works, his accomplishments and his contagious enthusiasm which never can die. He, of course, was Ralph M. Lehr.

Ralph Lehr became a member and chairman of the advisory council of Pilgrim chapter in 1937, and served in that capacity until he died a year ago last month. There was another Mason to warrant our pride in the great organization and the men who made it great. I know I was proud of his friendship—proud, indeed, of just knowing him as I attended the induction ceremonies in Philadelphia when he became grand master of Masons in Pennsylvania in 1954. In that year, too, he was invested with the DeMolay Honorary Legion of Honor. He had become a 33d degree Mason in the Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry in Cincinnati in 1943. He, too, held office in all the York Rite Masonic bodies in Harrisburg. I was the speaker at his banquet in 1930 when he was worshipful master of Harrisburg lodge.

Yes, there is a great role to be played by Freemasonry and DeMolay in the precarious and dangerous years that lie before us—and if we are prepared to cope with the part, it is because of the leadership and inspiration we are receiving today from such men as Wilbur Minich—and because of the undying lessons of love and loyalty and faith in our God that came to us from men like Ralph M. Lehr.

SMITH KLINE & FRENCH FOREIGN FELLOWSHIPS FOR MEDICAL STUDENTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am delighted that three medical students from Pennsylvania have been awarded Smith Kline & French foreign fellowships for medical students.

They are William E. Lathan, a student at Hahnemann Medical College, whose mother, Mrs. Stanley E. Lathan, resides at 5313 Kershaw Street, Philadelphia Pa.; Lewis Merklin, Jr., a student at Temple University School of Medicine,

whose parents, Dr. and Mrs. Lewis Merklin, reside at 42 Derwen Road, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.; Joel J. Nobel, a student at the Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, whose mother, Dr. Golda R. Nobel, resides at 2006 Delancey Place, Philadelphia, Pa. They will spend several months during 1962 working in Ilesha, Nigeria; New Delhi, India; and Kathmandu, Nepal, respectively.

I understand that 92 American medical students have received Smith & French fellowships since the program was originated. It sends senior medical students to remote areas of the world for about 10 weeks of work and study. They learn how medicine is practiced in different lands. They study diseases which are rare in the United States and learn at first hand how acute is the need for medical knowledge in other countries. Not the least of their roles is to serve as good-will ambassadors for our country abroad. The program is sponsored by Smith Kline & French Laboratories and is administered by the Association of American Medical Colleges.

I congratulate the students on their achievements and Smith Kline & French for its important contribution to person-to-person diplomacy of the highest order.

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. YOUNG of North Dakota:

News release from his office, dated March 21, 1962, and distributed to all North Dakota newspapers, radio and television stations, dealing with sundry agricultural subjects.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

Under the previous order, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted under the unanimous-consent agreement be under the control of the Senator who will be in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], instead of under the control of the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator in charge of the bill now before the Senate, I yield from the time on the bill such time as the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] desires.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am grateful to my able friend.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized.

HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE AND TELEVISION MUSEUM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on June 1, 1961, I had the honor to report on the first phase of the efforts of the Hollywood Motion Picture and Television Museum Commission, an official agency of the county of Los Angeles, the chairman of which is a distinguished leader in the motion picture industry and my good friend, Mr. Sol Lesser.

Members of the commission and other local government officials met at that time with representatives of many schools and educational institutions in southern California. They sought to elicit suggestions so that this museum, which is being established to record the achievements of these two great mediums of communication, might make a true cultural and educational contribution to the people, both young and old, of my State and Nation.

I was pleased to be helpful in enlisting the support and cooperation of Secretary of Defense McNamara and the armed services. The Department of Defense has cooperated wholeheartedly with the commission. As a result, a Government film and tape section will become a permanent part of this museum. This is fitting recognition of the fine work which has been done in this area by the various armed services as well as other Government departments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters pertaining to this particular aspect of the project be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE AND
TELEVISION MUSEUM COMMISSION,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 21, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: I have the honor and considerable pleasure of reporting to you:

1. The Los Angeles County Commission for the Hollywood Motion Picture, Television, Radio, and Recording Museum made the attached report from our governmental film and tape committee a part of our permanent minutes:

"As an expression of the gratitude of the Hollywood Museum Commission to Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, and to all those whose names are listed in the report."

2. Our commission also adopted the recommendation:

"The Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County be informed of this action of our commission with the request that the chairman of the board of supervisors express, to the Secretary of Defense, appreciation on behalf of the people of Los Angeles County."

3. The Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County approved this recommendation of our commission and the public expression of gratitude in the letter of March 15, 1962, from the chairman of the board of supervisors to Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense.

Our gratitude to Secretary McNamara, to you, Senator KUCHEL, and to all the others listed in the report of our committee, is now a part of the permanent records of our commission and of our Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

We believe that our citizens should know when there is such cooperation in the creation of a public service institution as our Hollywood museum.

Sincerely,

SOL LESSER,
Chairman, Hollywood Museum Commission.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE &
TELEVISION MUSEUM COMMISSION,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 7, 1962.

Mr. SOL LESSER,
Chairman, Los Angeles County-Hollywood Motion Picture & Television Museum Commission, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the committee on governmental film and tape, I am pleased to report to you that the effective establishment of the Government film and tape section of the Hollywood Museum is fully assured.

The visiting public from all over the United States and from all parts of the world will find here, when the Hollywood Museum is completed and open to the public, historical and educational collections and exhibits demonstrating the outstanding achievements and service, over the years, of our military service units in motion pictures, television, radio, and recording arts.

We state, without hesitation, that we are assured of all this, because of the remarkable and wholehearted cooperation we have received from the moment the Secretary of Defense received your original request.

You, as chairman of the museum commission, attended some of the meetings and witnessed the dedication and inspiring understanding of representatives of the U.S. Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force who are working on this project.

Their cooperation and inspiration are insuring that the Hollywood Museum shall also become a national monument honoring the men and women of our Armed Forces who are rendering such outstanding service in the great field of communications. It will also assure a tremendous educational stimulus to adults and children alike.

Therefore, we earnestly recommend that this report be noted in the minutes of your meeting as a record of gratitude to the following:

Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, who so fully understood our public purpose and gave leadership and inspiration to the whole program.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator from California, for his advice and active cooperation.

Hon. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), who has designated the means and personnel by which our aims are already being realized.

Mr. Bertram Kalisch, Chief, Audio-Visual Division of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, for calling the first meeting at the Pentagon and for organizing and counseling the work of this committee from the very beginning.

Also to the following people who have represented their respective units effectively and who are rendering the creative service that assures the high order of success of this operation:

Department of Defense personnel, Pentagon: Mr. Donald Baruch, Office of the Under Secretary; Mr. Norman Hatch, Office of the Under Secretary; Mr. James A. Moses, Army Pictorial Service; Lt. Col. T. J. Saxon, U.S. Marine Corps; Maj. Robert Loesch, U.S. Army; Maj. John Walker, U.S. Air Force; Lt. Dale Patterson, U.S. Navy.

U.S. Naval Photographic Center, Anacostia: Capt. Howard W. Crews, U.S. Navy, commanding officer; Mr. Walter Evans, Naval Film Production Office.

Armed Forces personnel, Los Angeles—military liaison group to the museum: Col. James Chesnutt, U.S. Army, chairman; Brig. Gen. James Hunter, U.S. Air Force; Col. Lothar Sibert, U.S. Army, Armed Forces Radio and Television Service; Capt. Pierre Sands, U.S. Navy, Navy Motion Picture Office; Lt. Col. Robert Blauvelt, U.S. Army; Lt. Col. Clement Stadlen, U.S. Marine Corps; Lt. Cmdr. Frank Coghlan, U.S. Navy.

Museum governmental film and tape committee: William Burke, 1961 commander, American Legion; Alfred Chamie, treasurer, Motion Picture Producers Association; Bart Conrad, Freelance William Hendricks, Warner Bros. Studio; Frank McCarthy, Twentieth Century-Fox Studio; Peter Smith, MGM Studio.

Sincerely yours,

JULIAN LESSER,
Chairman, Governmental Film and Tape Committee.

IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS ENTITLED TO AID—LET THE CONGRESS LIVE UP TO THE LAW

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for too long a time conflicting convictions and differing opinions have frustrated earnest efforts to frame legislation which would bring the most effective cooperation of Federal, State, and local agencies to meet the crisis and to remedy deficiencies in public education in America.

I deplore the inability of sincere, determined citizens to reach agreement on a sound, equitable plan to avert tragic neglect of the growing generations who are being shortchanged in the form of overcrowding, inadequate attention, part-time sessions, and insufficient facilities.

While an impasse appears to have been encountered in dealing with the broad public education problem, the Congress repeatedly has recognized a particular obligation upon the Federal Government to assist in the construction and operation of schools in what have been termed "federally impacted districts." There are some 4,000 of these in our Nation and the number of pupils is growing annually at a rate making it almost impossible to obtain current statistics.

The Congress last year saw fit to enact legislation continuing the impacted aid program, in simple justice to hard-pressed, overburdened districts which must accommodate substantial numbers of children of parents in the Armed Forces and employed in Federal service.

Experience has demonstrated that the funds appropriated last year are insufficient to make full payment of the entitlements to school districts under the law which we enacted in solemn recognition of an undeniable duty.

Within a few days, a supplemental appropriations bill will be before this body, to supply urgently needed funds to avert assorted deficiencies and to meet unexpected needs during the current fiscal year. This measure will be a vehicle by which the Congress can do simple justice to those harassed school superintendents and boards of trustees who will find it impossible otherwise to bridge the gap between revenues and expenses.

I trust that the Senate will acknowledge our moral obligation and provide in that bill the required $15,707,000 to avert an otherwise severe cut in payments under Public Law 874, providing aid for school operations, as well as $7,092,000 to prevent a smaller but no less painful shortage in funds for construction assistance under Public Law 815.

The failure to include a total of approximately $23 million in the supplemental bill will do violent injury to taxpayers in every one of our 50 States. With the largest number of federally connected students, my own State of California inevitably will be most grievously affected.

I have been furnished with tables showing the precise amounts required in each category of funds to do justice to each individual State. I ask unanimous consent to include these statements as part of my remarks. I invite my colleagues to compute the degree of hardship which will be imposed upon their own constituents and the children attending their schools.

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

Payments to school districts by State, Public Law 874, as amended, fiscal year 1962 (estimates)

[Dollars]

State or territory (1)	Amount available fiscal year 1962 appropriation (2)	Total estimated requirements fiscal year 1962 (3)	Difference, col. 3 —col. 2
Total	231,293,000	247,000,000	15,707,000
Alabama	4,968,700	5,323,700	355,000
Alaska	7,444,800	7,985,400	540,600
Arizona	5,002,900	5,366,200	363,300
Arkansas	1,043,500	1,119,300	75,800
California	39,500,400	42,338,000	2,837,600
Colorado	6,108,500	6,552,100	443,600
Connecticut	2,005,200	2,150,800	145,600
Delaware	934,300	952,800	18,500
Florida	7,189,800	7,632,800	443,000
Georgia	7,326,000	7,757,800	431,800
Hawaii	4,849,100	5,201,200	352,100
Idaho	1,647,800	1,767,500	119,700
Illinois	3,573,100	3,829,800	256,700
Indiana	1,003,800	1,076,700	72,900
Iowa	784,200	841,100	56,900
Kansas	5,233,700	5,613,800	380,100
Kentucky	4,451,800	4,555,800	104,000
Louisiana	991,400	1,063,400	72,000
Maine	1,797,900	1,928,300	130,400
Maryland	8,957,000	9,607,500	650,500
Massachusetts	6,553,800	7,006,100	452,300
Michigan	1,437,600	1,521,700	84,100
Minnesota	561,100	601,800	40,700
Mississippi	1,611,900	1,729,000	117,100
Missouri	2,561,100	2,747,000	185,900
Montana	1,690,000	1,812,700	122,700
Nebraska	2,049,800	2,198,700	148,900
Nevada	1,513,800	1,623,700	109,900
New Hampshire	1,299,200	1,393,500	94,300
New Jersey	4,084,700	4,376,600	291,900
New Mexico	5,000,500	5,363,600	363,100
New York	5,694,400	6,074,400	380,000
North Carolina	5,285,500	5,473,300	187,800
North Dakota	407,000	436,600	29,600
Ohio	5,331,700	5,718,900	387,200
Oklahoma	7,934,900	8,511,100	576,200
Oregon	997,500	1,069,100	71,600
Pennsylvania	5,376,300	5,743,500	367,200
Rhode Island	1,951,000	2,120,700	169,700
South Carolina	3,717,100	3,978,700	261,600
South Dakota	2,085,300	2,236,600	151,300
Tennessee	2,315,400	2,483,500	168,100
Texas	13,303,600	14,269,700	966,100
Utah	1,979,100	2,122,800	143,700
Vermont	111,700	119,800	8,100
Virginia	18,313,900	19,472,800	1,158,900
Washington	8,823,000	9,463,700	640,700
West Virginia	136,500	146,400	9,900
Wisconsin	650,200	697,400	47,200
Wyoming	792,900	850,500	57,600
Guam	817,700	877,100	59,400
Puerto Rico	1,930,000	1,930,000	----------
Virgin Islands	55,900	60,000	4,100
Wake Island	105,000	105,000	----------

Construction aid by State, Public Law 815, as amended, fiscal year 1962 (estimates)

State or territory (1)	Amount available fiscal year 1962 appropriation (2)	Total estimated requirement fiscal year 1962 (3)	Difference between cols. 2 and 3
Total	$54,850,000	$61,942,000	$7,092,000
Alabama	1,427,300	1,646,400	219,100
Alaska	2,361,100	2,447,300	86,200
Arizona	1,379,500	1,552,900	173,400
Arkansas	542,900	626,300	83,400
California	7,923,200	9,039,900	1,116,700
Colorado	478,400	551,800	73,400
Connecticut	690,200	796,200	106,000
Delaware	----------	----------	----------
Florida	433,100	499,600	66,500
Georgia	816,000	941,300	125,300
Hawaii	1,515,600	1,748,300	232,700
Idaho	523,700	604,100	80,400
Illinois	84,800	97,800	13,000
Indiana	769,200	887,300	118,100
Iowa	273,900	316,000	42,100
Kansas	1,693,400	1,845,900	152,500
Kentucky	886,700	907,700	21,000
Louisiana	----------	----------	----------
Maine	1,061,600	1,147,800	86,200
Maryland	1,904,800	2,197,200	292,400
Massachusetts	1,104,800	1,166,900	62,100
Michigan	2,575,900	2,971,400	395,500
Minnesota	12,800	14,800	2,000
Mississippi	798,300	920,900	122,600
Missouri	1,433,200	1,522,700	89,500
Montana	886,300	1,022,400	136,100
Nebraska	593,700	684,900	91,200
Nevada	258,800	298,500	39,700
New Hampshire	286,700	330,700	44,000
New Jersey	848,600	978,900	130,300
New Mexico	3,509,400	4,048,200	538,800
New York	2,020,800	2,300,000	279,200
North Carolina	991,400	1,143,600	152,200
North Dakota	677,700	781,700	104,000
Ohio	619,600	714,700	95,100
Oklahoma	1,988,200	2,267,300	279,100
Oregon	572,900	660,900	88,000
Pennsylvania	----------	----------	----------
Rhode Island	171,200	197,500	26,300
South Carolina	729,000	814,800	85,800
South Dakota	566,400	653,400	87,000
Tennessee	207,000	238,800	31,800
Texas	2,886,700	3,329,900	443,200
Utah	452,900	522,400	69,500
Vermont	----------	----------	----------
Virginia	2,023,500	2,272,800	249,300
Washington	1,459,100	1,618,600	159,500
West Virginia	----------	----------	----------
Wisconsin	20,400	23,500	3,100
Wyoming	$169,600	$195,600	$26,000
Guam	1,124,700	1,297,400	172,700
Puerto Rico	195,000	195,000	----------
Virgin Islands	----------	----------	----------
Wake Island	----------	----------	----------
Technical services	900,000	900,000	----------

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, less than a year ago, in trying to stave off threatened undermining of the schools which educate federally connected children, I told this Senate that "local school districts ought not to suffer the heavy additional financial blow which is about to fall upon them. Property owners in most instances cannot bear the burden." With gratification, I joined in passage of a bill which did promise to ward off such a blow. And now, because the executive branch was unable to prevent such action by Congress, we find that the injury is about to be inflicted by failure to request a supplemental appropriation.

I submit, Mr. President, that if the administration still feels the Federal Government does not have the obligation which I—and an overwhelming majority in both this and the other body—feel it does, the honest, the truly American way is to renew efforts to change the basic law, not to rob our children. To ignore the basic fact that 1961 estimates have been exceeded and to decline blithely to request funds necessary to discharge an obligation is, in my view, unconscionable as well as tragic.

Since it became obvious available funds will be 8 percent short of the total needed, and apparently the requested 1963 total would mean an even greater deficiency next year of about 19 percent, I have been deluged with pathetic appeals from my State. School authorities up and down California have described to me in graphic terms the frustrating problem confronting them. The California State superintendent of public instruction as early as February warned me of the consequences of failure by Congress to vote these deficiency appropriations. I ask unanimous consent that his letter to me may be printed as part of these remarks.

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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Sacramento, Calif., February 27, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: In a letter dated February 15, 1962, from me, your support to meet the current year's deficit in Public Laws 874 and 815 by a supplemental appropriation was urged. The letter indicated, and we understood that such a supplemental appropriation was being recommended by the U.S. Office of Education. Additional information received indicates that no such recommendation will be made by that agency.

It seems apparent that independent congressional action must be taken to amend a current appropriation bill if full entitlement under the law is to be made available to federally impacted school districts. The current year's deficit in Public Law 874 funds amounts to about $15.7 million in total and means $2.5 to $3 million to California school districts educating pupils connected with federally owned property.

We further understand that the amount to be appropriated for fiscal 1963 is the amount now appropriated for fiscal 1962. This means an impending deficit in fiscal 1963 of 19 percent. California districts will receive more than $6 million less under Public Law 874 than the entitlement computed under the law would lead them to anticipate.

We are sorry that our prior understanding of the facts proved incorrect. We urge you to take any appropriate action that will result in an appropriation permitting the payment of full entitlement under Public Laws 874 and 815 for fiscal years 1962 and 1963.

Sincerely yours,

ROY E. SIMPSON.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, from the literally scores of telegrams, letters, and resolutions reaching me from California, I have received a new insight into the importance of this program. For instance, I should like to point out that in Alameda County any welshing on our promised assistance will be felt in 28 of 35 districts, four-fifths of them all. In the important naval-base city of San Diego, with the greatest number of federally connected students in a single community of the Nation, these funds cover the cost of educating 25 percent of the regular daily attendance.

The Congress cannot overlook the fact that school districts, following our extension of the law last year, made their plans and formulated their budgets with rightful expectation the Federal Government would keep its word. This was emphasized to me in one letter which said:

We plan our educational program on anticipated income from three major sources: Federal, State, and local. Staff members are employed, and materials, supplies, and equipment are purchased on these budget estimates. When one source of budgeted revenue is curtailed, it creates a tremendous financial problem because prior commitments have been made.

Another school board tells me it has "already made cutbacks in our budget for the 1962–63 fiscal year and unless we can expect receipt of some form of Federal aid we will have to make still further reductions." And still another comments they "cannot complete our educational program planning and cannot accurately determine our budget because of the deficiency problem." The story is well told in a sentence from a school official adjacent to Vandenberg Air Force Base saying:

Eight thousand and forty-six dollars and sixty-five cents is a lot of money to a small school district that has a rather low tax valuation and that must provide for federally impacted children.

Doubtless comments of these types could be multiplied many times by worried education officials in every section of this land. In my view, the figures which I have received speak eloquently of the reason why these supplemental funds must be voted.

FALLOUT SHELTER SCHEMES—LET US STOP FURTHER WASTE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] as much time on the bill as he may desire.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I believe I shall need 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last August in the midst of the Berlin crisis, the President requested and the Congress appropriated $207,600,000 for surveys for fallout shelters in Government buildings. At that time I reluctantly opposed the administration and attempted unsuccessfully to strike that appropriation from the Department of Defense appropriation bill. It was my belief then and it is now that this expenditure will prove an utter waste of taxpayers' money.

At that time no hearings were held in the Senate Committee on Appropriations regarding this request. The Secretary of Defense himself admitted that the subcommittee involved was not afforded the opportunity of giving its customary and careful consideration to this appropriation. Although the international situation is no less critical, the hysteria and fear of last summer have subsided. We can now calmly appraise the results of this hastily approved appropriation.

I assert that not one American is one whit safer in event of nuclear war as the result of this $207 million expenditure. Furthermore, the appropriation of this vast sum of taxpayers' money has in no way deterred the aggressive intentions and actions of Communist dictators.

What has been accomplished? First, many people made a great deal of money. It encouraged all kinds of commercial exploitation by shelter builders, many of them fly-by-night concerns, whose salesmen went from door to door showing movies of nuclear explosions and frightening people into buying shelters and stocking them with food they often could not afford. Contractors and grocers have benefited.

Many of these contractors are legitimate businessmen taking advantage of a good opportunity. Some, however, crawled out from under the rocks to prey on their neighbors' fears and anxieties. To attest to this fact one has only to see some of the advertisements for fallout shelters under investigation by the Federal Trade Commission.

In the Washington Evening Star of March 26, 1962, there appeared an excellent article by Sylvia Porter, one of our country's leading financial commentators, entitled "1962's Consumer Gyps." Miss Porter points out the fact that the most lucrative consumer gyp item in 1962 was fallout shelter program schemes. I commend this outstanding column to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that this portion of it relating to fallout shelters be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 26, 1962]

CONSUMER GYPS OF 1962

(By Sylvia Porter)

When publicity about fallout shelters was reaching crescendo a few months ago, a Long Island salesman set up a firm called U.S. Fall-Out Shelters, Inc. Its salesmen, representing themselves as connected with civil defense authorities (untrue), talked homeowners into paying up to $1,000 toward the construction of shelters and pledged the work would be completed within 2 weeks.

In most cases, construction wasn't even started. The firm has now been enjoined from engaging in "fraudulent and illegal acts."

Still at the top of the consumer gyp parade in 1962 are home improvement rackets—and fallout shelter frauds are the latest twist. In 1962 alone, the estimate is unscrupulous contractors will fleece the American public out of at least $1.5 billion. While fly-by-nighters are a fringe of the home improvement industry, they're growing fat with profits because the market is constantly expanding, the crooks are, as the fallout shelter gimmick indicates, impressively imaginative, and the American public remains astoundingly naive.

BAIT AND SWITCH

Inexpensive fallout shelters also are being used as a lure in the old "bait and switch" game. You'll see an ad for a shelter at low cost, say under $200, and if you send in an inquiry, a salesman will come to your home. He'll debunk your need for a shelter, tell you to spend your money instead on a "basement playroom which will be just as safe and an investment, too." If you take the bait and switch, you may be sure your playroom will cost much more than $200.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Incidentally, when President Kennedy took office, Leo A. Hoegh, Director under the Eisenhower

administration of the now defunct boondoggling Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, left for Chicago to become vice president in charge of sales of the civil defense shelter building program of the Wonder Building Corp. According to a recent report, Mr. Hoegh and Wonder Building have been reaping a rich financial harvest. While in public office, Mr. Hoegh consistently urged Americans to build fallout shelters. This is the same ex-Governor of Iowa who, when he was denied a second term by the citizens of Iowa to the $12,000 per annum position as Governor of that State was rewarded by appointment to a $22,500 position as Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Also, an insidious moral twist has crept into our national thinking. Theologians, philosophers, and everyday citizens are pondering the question as to whether it is proper to kill one's shelterless neighbor or his children should they attempt to enter your shelter in event of a nuclear attack. This is not just idle talk. Reams of articles, pro and con, have been written on it. Leading churchmen and thinkers of all faiths have spoken out on it.

Mr. President, there was a time in our history when it was taken for granted that neighbors would come to the aid of one another when disaster threatened. It was this spirit which helped build our country and make it great. It is a sad commentary on our times that anyone constructing a fallout shelter should be quoted as threatening to shoot a neighbor's child if that child tried to enter his shelter at a time of emergency and panic. Yet many men have made such statements. Of course, such men would not be fit persons to help rebuild an America devastated in an atomic attack.

This year the administration has requested $695 million for civil defense purposes, $460 million of which is earmarked for Federal incentive grants for shelter construction in selected community buildings. It is my hope that before we embark on such a useless, if not foolhardy, program, we carefully review this proposal and its consequences.

May I say at the outset that it is my fervent belief that fallout shelters would be of little, if any, protection in a nuclear war. Few could object to the journey of mankind back into the caves if it were known that these shelters would defend us in an atomic holocaust. This is a very, very slim possibility. Those making it to their shelters in the 15 to 20 minutes available—if our warning systems are perfect, and they are not near that today—would await probable entombment by the pulverizing blast of the bomb or suffocation from the firestorms expected to follow the blast.

During the Second World War, 60,000 residents of Hamburg, Germany, perished in their shelters from suffocation caused by firestorms as a result of an intensive bombing raid on July 27, 1943. This raid was infinitesimal in its destructive power compared with that of one atomic bomb with a one megaton yield.

It is estimated that the lethal radioactive fallout from a 10 megaton thermonuclear explosion would cover several thousand square miles. The resulting firestorm would cover an area of 5,000 square miles. Our cities would be blazing pyres and a mass of radioactive debris. Shelters in the target area would be crushed. Any who managed to escape these blazing tombs would be killed by the firestorms and explosions raging for miles around.

There is no reason to expect that an enemy who hopes to knock us out with one massive blow, would be so merciful as to use just one 10 megaton explosive on a given target. There would be no outside help arriving, no medical supplies, food, water, or transportation. Any who managed to survive and to climb back into the world would find it knee deep in radioactive debris. What was left of our cities would be an uninhabitable desert. Death would merely be delayed. Radiation would probably eventually catch up with those in shelters far enough away from the blast area to escape demolition.

A national shelter program would have to be concentrated in our major cities which hold not only the bulk of our population but the keystone of our social and industrial structure. Yet, it is precisely in these cities that these shelters would be least useful, if they have any use whatsoever.

One eminent scientist wrote a syndicated series of articles about his $30 backyard shelter. This very same shelter was completely destroyed in the brush fire in the Los Angeles area a few months ago. A thermonuclear explosion would not be a brush fire. Another prominent physicist asserted that an adequate shelter would cost from $3,000 to $5,000. The Federal Government says $150. There are all kinds of conflicting estimates both as to the effectiveness and the cost of these shelters. The public is bewildered and confused.

Mr. President, I would not be opposed to a shelter-building program if I thought there was some probability that it would be of real use in saving American lives. However, even those favoring such a program have testified that to be at all effective it would require an eventual expenditure of anywhere from $50 billion to $200 billion.

The very real problem of obsolescence also exists. It is quite apparent from the extensive advances being made today in rocket and nuclear technology that any shelter program would conceivably be obsolete before it was half completed. Then, there is also the possibility of even more deadly types of warfare—chemical and biological warfare. Certainly, were an aggressor to unleash the horror of a thermonuclear war, he would have no misgivings about using other methods equally as terrifying. Modern warfare is keyed to hunt down the civilian wherever he is. Morality in warfare would be a thing of the past. All of the deadly diseases—and some not even known to the public at large—are now in the arsenals of the major powers primed for instant use.

Unless we are prepared to embark on such a vast gamble it seems futile to me to waste additional hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars on schemes which are, in reality, nothing more than expensive doses of psychological pablum for a frightened and bewildered public seeking some way out of the dilemma of our times. It would be far better to spend this money strengthening our Armed Forces and our retaliatory capability so that no aggressor would dare attack us.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, in commenting on fallout shelters some months ago said:

> I don't think I would put that much money into holes in the ground to crawl into, that I would rather spend more of it in offensive weapons in the first place.

In my opinion this expenditure is impractical because it will offer no protection worth mentioning at a cost that would be a tremendous burden on our economy. It is also dangerous in that it fosters the delusion that there is some measure of security in a nuclear war. We cannot bury our heads in the sand and refuse to realize the consequences of such a disaster.

The truth is that people living far enough away from the blast area might be able to protect themselves for the first 48 hours of intense radiation, perhaps even the first 2 weeks. After that their chances for survival are indeed slim. It has been estimated that the radioactive cloud from a single relatively small nuclear bomb may be expected to cover an area downwind for fully 200 miles. No one knows how many bombs would fall or what weather conditions would be at that time. This is only one of the innumerable unanswerable "ifs" involved in a massive shelter building program.

It is my fervent hope that those now charged with the responsibility for protection of our civilians in time of war will immediately embark on a vigorous and continuing campaign of education on realistic self-protection in a nuclear war using all media of communication at our command—television, radio, newspapers, magazines, and our schools.

Furthermore, no reasonable person would object to the Federal Government's advising citizens on the type, effectiveness, and cost of various fallout shelters. A modest amount of money could be appropriated for research and dissemination of this information. If the individual citizen then wants to build his own shelter and feels that he lives in an area where it could possibly be of some use to him and his family, perhaps as a recreation room, that is his business. He would be putting his money in circulation by helping a building contractor.

Mr. President, it may seem unbelievable, but at this late date there are still some civil defense officials advocating the thoroughly discredited theory of evacuation of our cities. Secretary of Defense McNamara himself suggested that the Cuyahoga County, Ohio, civil defense organization abandon its policy of evacuation. Cleveland, Ohio's largest city and the seventh largest in the Nation, is located in Cuyahoga County. As late as December 11, 1961, John J. Pokorny, well paid civil defense director of that county, said his office is still in favor of evacuation.

Only a few months ago, in Cuyahoga County, the citizens of Cleveland were urged, in case of disaster, to evacuate that city and flee toward Lorain, 25 miles distant. At the same time the citizens of Lorain were told to evacuate Lorain and run to Cleveland. If that were to happen, there would be the *worst* traffic jam anyone has ever experienced.

It was our hope that when the boondoggling Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization was abolished and its functions transferred to the Department of Defense, that such muddled thinking and planning would go with it. Apparently, this has not happened. At local and State levels the same political hacks are still riding the civil defense gravy train. If our Nation's mayors and Governors seriously believe that this program is urgent, why have not these boondogglers been replaced with men of stature and competence?

President Kennedy has called for sacrifice in this time of emergency. Surely, it is not too much sacrifice for Americans to provide protection for themselves and their families. It is the duty of their Government to advise them on how to do this—if such a thing is possible—but not to do it for them. Our forefathers in settling this land and in pushing back the frontier knew this well.

All of us can be proud of the thousands of patriotic Americans who, as volunteers, gave their time and effort often at great risk to themselves in times of flood, fire, and other natural disasters. These Americans have, and always will, continue to help their neighbors regardless of the doubtful leadership of paid civil defense officials safe behind desks.

Mr. President, I urge the administration to reevaluate this problem. Mass evacuation was offered as the panacea only a few years ago, but it is now seen as an illusion. Fallout shelters are no better. The basic fact about nuclear war is that organized society cannot survive it. No amount of warnings, sermons, or reams of type will change this fact. It would be wiser to face the truth squarely than to evade it by talking of the survival of some individuals.

Let us not dig holes in the ground to hide in while waiting for the conquerors to come. Let us do what we have done before. Let us strengthen our tremendous power of retaliation, so that no dictator will dare attack us.

The President's desire to offer Americans some form of survival insurance in event of nuclear attack is laudable. Certainly some sensible forms of catastrophe planning are in order. However, I assert that it is not sound planning to divert substantial resources and effort into a program which offers very little true assurance and which could well assume the proportions of a boundless boondoggle, and which encourages a cruel illusion of security.

It is better for us to face the fact that no modern society can survive all-out nuclear war, than to delude ourselves by inadequate efforts to try to assure the survival of some individuals. All agree that we live in a grim period of international anarchy. However, we must not allow this to cloud our judgment regarding defense of civilians. We should not embark on expensive schemes that will prove of no real value in event of war. The civil defense requests should be carefully scrutinized before additional taxpayers' money is wasted.

I expect to oppose any such appropriations for civilian defense shelter surveys and construction.

We have already wasted more than $1,100 million on civil defense as conducted by the now happily defunct Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. We should call a halt to further waste of the taxpayers' money.

OUR FOREIGN AID GIFTS SHOULD BE PROPERLY ADVERTISED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Texas such time as he may require.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the things that has contributed so heavily to the strong belief of millions of Americans that the fat should be cut out of foreign aid is covered by what we find in the New York Times of April 4, 1962, where there appeared a very cogent editorial on this subject, entitled "Pattern of Economic Aid." It points out that in 1960 the United States granted $8 billion in foreign aid and that the Communist bloc granted $178 million. However, through their success in advertising, they have created the impression in many countries that they were spending more on foreign aid than we were.

The United States does not get the maximum benefit in tangible friendships and cooperation on vital free world goals from tax funds spent on aid to other countries.

Americans are the unchallenged leaders of the world in the field of advertising; advertisers sing to us on television and on the radio; they dot our highways and byways with words and pictures; they fill whole pages in our newspapers and magazines and inundate our mailboxes.

Nowhere in the world can a distributive economy be found that is woven so thoroughly about advertising as in the United States.

There is an ironical side to the fact that the United States, world leader in advertising and communications, has never been successful in calling to the attention of the world its own vast program of economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

The apparent failure of the United States in this regard has given a solid basis to criticisms of the foreign aid program by the American taxpayer, who foots the bill.

It is the responsibility of our Government at the national level to see to it that, where aid is given, due credit is obtained for the United States.

Our Nation also has a responsibility to combat the distortions of Communists in foreign countries who level unrelenting and often unanswered attacks on private American investments abroad, which have played a vital role in development of the very countries which allow, and sometimes encourage, these attacks.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from the New York Times of Wednesday, April 4, 1962, entitled "Pattern of Economic Aid," which tells in a few simple, well-chosen words how the Russians have seized a giant's share of the credit for a pygmy's share of aid.

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

PATTERN OF ECONOMIC AID

A useful perspective on the pattern of economic aid to underdeveloped countries is provided by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's latest report. The clearest fact to emerge is that the developed free world nations are enormously ahead of the Communist bloc in providing economic aid of all kinds: $8 billion against $178 million in 1960. But few people are cognizant of this tremendous disparity.

One cause of the disproportion between reality and the propaganda image is the Communists' skill in exploiting such help as they do give or promise. In effect, Moscow sells the same horse over and over again. A great fuss is made when there is agreement in principle for Sovet aid; another propaganda celebration occurs when a total commitment and program are finally agreed upon; a third round of credit grabbing takes place when the first Soviet technicians and machinery start arriving in the recipient country, and so on until a particular project is finally completed. The more businesslike West does not expend nearly so much energy and effort upon squeezing every bit of propaganda advantage out of the aid it provides.

Another reason for the difference between reality and image is the fact that a substantial portion of Western aid is not viewed as such by influential elements in some underdeveloped countries. The $2,400 million in private direct investment in these nations during 1960 is regarded with suspicion by the Communists and the extreme nationalists. Both groups condemn such investment as exploitation, slavery, robbery, and the like. The advantages in employment, income, and technical training which such private investment brings are often lost sight of, though the wiser leaders of underdeveloped countries fully understand the indispensable role of private investment in creating the conditions of real economic progress.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES ARE NEEDED FOR DEFENSE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the United States is spending more money and expending more effort to maintain a strong national defense and retaliatory power than on any other single governmental function.

Defense expenditures are a necessity to survival now, and there are no signs of immediate change.

Proposed expenditures in the national budget for the fiscal year of 1963 call for 63 cents of each dollar to be spent on national defense, international affairs, and financing space research and technology, all related in their importance to the survival of the United States as a free country.

For national defense alone, the 1961 expenditure was $47.5 billion; the estimate for 1962 is $51.2 billion; and for 1963, a total of $52.7 billion. The cost of the guard is very small out of this total. The National Guard is an im-

portant and essential part of our national strength.

Of the total of 44,371 Army National Guardsmen called to active duty in October of 1961, the Texas Army National Guard provided approximately 22 percent; of the 9,898 guardsmen called to duty in Texas, only 117 were delayed in reporting to duty because of hardship or other reason.

Recently, I received a letter from the National Guard Association of Texas, signed by Maj. James M. Rose, president, setting forth the views of 8,000 members of the Texas association.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Major Rose printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS,
Austin, Tex., March 26, 1962.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: In behalf of the 8,000 members of the National Guard Association of Texas, I want to strongly voice this association's opposition to any action by Congress or the Department of Defense which would reduce the number of Army divisions currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States in the Reserve component troop basis.

I am attaching a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at our 3d annual conference at Galveston on March 3, 1962.

Two of the many vital factors which prompted the Army affairs committee of the National Guard Association of Texas to sponsor this resolution are as follows:

a. Elimination of any National Guard division will significantly impair the combat potential currently available to the United States.

b. It is contrary to the public interest to destroy trained organizations which would be available for deployment in a relatively short time for general war and/or mobilization, when such war or mobilization would require the organization of numerous divisions, the cadres for which would have to be obtained from existing units.

We are acutely aware of the high cost of maintaining an adequate national defense in this space age. However, when you compare this with the value we all place on liberty and our American way of life, this cost loses its significance. We do not believe this is the time to be reducing our military forces and thus our capability to resist Communist aggression. We do believe we should obtain the maximum from the dollars we spend and it is already a matter of record that our Army and Air National Guard force is provided at only a fraction of the cost required for similar Regular units. The present active duty use of thousands of Army and Air Guardsmen is proof of the need for the National Guard as has been the situation in every crisis since 1775.

It is not necessary to dwell upon the history or exemplary record of the National Guard divisions serving in all wars fought by the United States since 1775. The National Guard is more than a tradition—it is the bulwark of our national defense.

May I solicit your support in behalf of the Army National Guard and respectfully urge you to oppose any action by the Congress or Department of Defense which would eliminate any Army division currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. ROSE,
Major, Texas Air National Guard,
President.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this letter constitutes a powerful argument for maintaining the number of Army divisions currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States in the Reserve component troop basis.

Mr. President, cuts in the Reserves were announced today. I hope they are not carried out.

A ready National Guard is a barrier to the constant push of the Communist powers, and a bulwark for freedom.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution submitted by the National Guard Association of Texas, which clearly states the reasons for vigorous opposition to any action by the Congress or the Department of Defense which would reduce the number of Army divisions currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States in the Reserve component basis, and similar opposition to the withdrawal of either of the two Army divisions currently allocated to the State of Texas.

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

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS
RESOLUTION

(Submitted by the Army Affairs Committee relating to the possible loss of National Guard divisions, and particularly the loss of a Texas division, through Department of Defense reorganization of the Reserve component troop basis)

Whereas recent news releases from the Department of Defense indicate that reorganization of the Army will withdraw six to eight divisions from the Reserve component troop basis; and

Whereas these news releases further indicate that the National Guard may have as high as four divisions withdrawn, if such reduction of Reserve component troop basis follow this plan; and

Whereas if such reduction is imposed upon the National Guard, it is logical to assume that States with two divisions organized would probably be first to be considered for loss of a division; and

Whereas National Guard divisions were organized at the request of the War Department in 1945 before any U.S. Army Reserve divisions were organized; and

Whereas the approved policies of the War Department of 1945 concerning Reserve components missions provided that the required number of combat divisions be organized and maintained by the Army National Guard, indicate that it was clearly the intent of the War Department to rely upon the National Guard for its Reserve division force, and for the Army Reserve to furnish only those units needed that could not be furnished by the Active Army and the Army National Guard; and

Whereas National Guard divisions have long histories in all wars fought by the United States since 1775 and eight National Guard divisions have served in three wars; and

Whereas the elimination of any National Guard division would significantly impair the combat potential currently available to the U.S. Army because of the superior strength, state of training, and status of equipment when compared to a division of the U.S. Army Reserve; and

Whereas the loss of either Texas National Guard division would be contrary to the best interests of the State of Texas in heritage, integrity, and community economy; and

Whereas it is contrary to the public interest to destroy trained organizations which would be available for deployment in a relatively short time for general war and/or mobilization, when such war or mobilization would require the organization of numerous divisions, the cadres for which would have to be obtained from existing units; and

Whereas, the U.S. Conference of Governors, representing the chief executives of all States, consistently has opposed any action which would adversely affect the combat potential of the National Guard: Now, therefore, be it,

Resolved, That the National Guard Association of Texas, in general conference assembled this 3d day of March 1962, at Galveston, Tex., vigorously opposes any action by the Congress or the Department of Defense which would reduce the number of Army divisions currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States in the Reserve component troop basis, and particularly opposes any such action which would cause the withdrawal of either of the two Army divisions currently allocated to the State of Texas; and be it further

Resolved, That the president of the National Guard Association of Texas be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretaries of Defense and Army, the Director of the Budget, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of Congress, and all duly elected Senators and Representatives to the Congress of the United States from the State of Texas, and to the president of the National Guard Association of the United States.

JAMES M. ROSE,
Major, Texas Army National Guard,
President.

PEOPLE OF TEXAS FAVOR PADRE ISLAND PARK NOW

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most gratifying experiences of this session has been the way so many of the best known newspapers in Texas have spoken out strongly in favor of a national seashore recreational area on Padre Island, off the south Texas gulf coast.

I first introduced the bill to create a national park on Padre Island in 1958 and have been working for it ever since. This year, the bill, S. 4, has advanced out of the Senate committee by more than a 2-to-1 majority and is expected to be before the full Senate for action shortly.

I wish to quote what some newspapers in Texas are saying about the Padre Island bill.

First, let us consider this comment from the Houston Chronicle in Houston, near the gulf coast:

Congress should pass Senator YARBOROUGH'S bill, the President should sign it and the Park Service should get busy. When it is finished, there will be a magnificent park close to Houston—a treasure that can slip away if we fiddle.

Now let us move upstate to Abilene, in Central West Texas, where the Abilene Reporter-News had this to say in an editorial on March 8:

A national seashore on Padre Island would become a major tourist attraction with more than local appeal.

And the Abilene paper added:

Only national development can achieve this, and there is no reason to back off from it on any political philosophy of Federal intrusion into State affairs.

The Abilene Reporter-News then pointed to the success of the national parks systems in other places and said that the appropriations for Texas State parks have always been meager.

The Corpus Christi Caller-Times, summed up the State versus national development argument in these words, in an editorial on March 9:

The alternative to the national park is no park on Padre Island.

The Corpus Christi Caller-Times has long been a vigorous advocate of a national park on Padre Island.

The Texas Observer, published in Austin, said in an editorial on March 9:

The time for a showdown on Padre Island has arrived.

The Texas Observer has been one of the earliest and strongest advocates of the Padre Island National Park.

The Big Spring Herald, in Howard County, west Texas, said in an editorial on March 8:

Padre Island, if preserved for future generations, could be one of those major attractions that would draw heavy tourist traffic. Those coming into Texas to it would have to traverse almost the full length of the State and thus every town and city would benefit.

On March 2, the Beaumont Journal, in Beaumont, southeast Texas, stated of the Padre Island bill:

Congressional approval is a long step nearer.

The Beaumont paper has also been a strong supporter of a national seashore park on Padre Island.

There are many others. The Paris News in Lamar County, near the Oklahoma line, endorsed a national park on Padre Island with the following editorial comment:

Texas has on Padre Island a natural phenomenon worth preserving in its natural state, and developing as only the National Park Service can do as a pleasure and educational attraction for all Americans.

The Paris News:

Who, among those who have seen them, have not thrilled and been benefited for having seen Yellowstone and other great parks? What kind of price are they worth? Should the State of Wyoming have borne the burden of developing that for the whole Nation, even if it could?

Americans have, from the beginning of the automobile age, planned their vacations to see the marvelous national parks of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Arizona, Washington, California, and New Mexico, just to list a few. In going there, they also saw the States and regions where they are located.

This is a byproduct, and an important one, that would accrue to Texas if Padre Island were developed into a national seashore.

Texas is entitled to the support of its congressional delegation, regardless of party lines, in behalf of this need.

The Houston Press, another long time supporter of the Padre Island Park stated in an editorial shortly after the bill was voted out of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

Committeemen studied the matter long and hard and—for the most part—at firsthand. An overwhelming committee majority saw it as the press has seen it ever since it started its fight for Padre:

That a substantial part of Padre's raw and untouched majesty of sand-sea-sky should be preserved for all the people of this Nation for all time.

This was a big victory for U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the National Park Service, and for the people of Texas as well as the Nation.

Many more must be won.

The Wichita Falls Times, in an editorial March 21, stated:

The question boils down to whether the Federal Government or the State government should undertake the project.

That answer is not difficult to find. Any Texan just has to ask whether this State has adequately located and developed parks and recreation areas with the opportunities it has had in the past. It has not.

The Wichita Falls paper summed it up this way:

It would be fine if Texas already had recognized its potential and had done something about developing the area. It has not and to defeat the Federal proposal now is to lengthen the odds that it can be preserved in time. More use and better publicized possibilities exist if it is incorporated in the Federal program. These are advantages which State development proponents are overlooking in trying to confuse the issue.

The Temple Daily Telegram, endorsing S. 4 in an editorial on March 25, stated:

The Yarborough bill would save the best and still not squeeze out private enterprise.

Senator YARBOROUGH's plan is sound and in line with National Park Service recommendations. Congress should give it prompt approval.

Mr. President, these editorial comments, ranging from the Gulf of Mexico to the Oklahoma State line, are indicative of the widespread public support in Texas for a national seashore park on Padre Island.

The New York Times has also endorsed the bill. On March 11, the New York Times stated in an editorial:

Here is one of the finest of our undeveloped shoreline areas that can yet be saved for the public. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH is sponsor of a good Padre Island bill that has been cleared by Committee and is ready for Senate passage. The plan advocated by the Texas Senator is sound and in line with the Park Service recommendations. It deserves prompt approval.

Mr. President, here is written newspaper evidence of strong public support for a national seashore park in Texas. I urge support of Senate bill 4.

AMENDMENTS TO TAX BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I submit for appropriate reference an amendment to H.R. 10650.

The amendment has a twofold purpose:

First, it provides for a three-step reduction in the depreciation allowance for oil and gas with a 2½-percent reduction for each year for the next 3 years, bringing it down from its present level of 27½ percent to 20 percent.

The second provision of the amendment permits a simultaneous three-step reduction in the overall limitation on individual income taxes from its present limitation of 87 percent, bringing it down to 60 percent over the 3-year period.

The combination of these two proposals would effectuate a long overdue correction in our existing tax structure and would make this adjustment with an actual gain of revenue to the U.S. Government.

For example, in the first year the depreciation allowance on oil and gas would be reduced from 27½ to 25 percent, and the estimated revenue gained from this action is $75 million.

At this same time the maximum effective rate limitation on individual income taxes will be reduced from its present 87 percent to 75 percent, which would result in a loss of revenue of $25 million, thus representing a net gain to the Treasury Department for that year of $50 million.

The second year the depletion allowance for oil and gas would be reduced from 25 to 22½ percent, thus providing additional revenue over present law of $160 million for that year.

Simultaneously, the effective rate on individual income taxes would be further reduced from 75 to 65 percent, which action would result in an estimated revenue loss of $80 million.

Thus as the result of this combined action the Federal Government would gain $80 million.

Effective the third year and for each year thereafter the percentage depletion rate would be reduced from 22½ to 20 percent. The estimated revenue gain resulting over present law by bringing the depletion rate on oil and gas down from the present 27½ percent to the 20-percent level would be $250 million.

At the same time, beginning with the third year, the maximum effective rate limitation on individual income taxes would be further reduced to 60 percent. The revenue loss by reducing this maximum effective rate limitation on individual income taxes from its present 87 percent to 60 percent is estimated at $130 million.

The net effect of the adoption of this twofold amendment would be that at the end of the 3-year period the present 27½-percent depletion allowance on oil and gas would be reduced to 20 percent and the present overall limitation on individual income taxes would be reduced from its 87 percent to 60 percent with an annual net gain to the U.S. Government of $120 million.

One of the main arguments in support of the need of the present 27½-percent depletion rate for oil and gas has been that under our existing tax structure, which runs as high as 91 percent—with an overall 87-percent limitation—has been that without some special incentive men of wealth would not venture their capital for the narrow margin of gain of 9 or 13 percent. On that point they have a valid argument, and it is for that reason that we have combined this proposed reduction in the depletion allowance with the simultaneous reduction in the overall limitation on individual income taxes.

The most important feature of this amendment is that its adoption would

provide a more equitable distribution of the tax load in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated January 7, 1961, signed by Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, in which the estimates as to the revenue of the different sections of the amendment are outlined.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, June 7, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: As you requested the staff has prepared a draft of an amendment (attached) to reduce the overall maximum limitation on individual income tax from 87 percent at present to 60 percent over a 3-year period, and to lower the rate of percentage depletion in the case of oil and gas wells from 27½ percent at present to 20 percent also over a 3-year period.

With respect to the overall limitation on individual income taxes, the draft provides for a three-step reduction, at 1-year intervals, commencing in 1962. For taxable years beginning in 1962, the rate would be 75 percent; for taxable years beginning in 1963, the rate would be 65 percent; and for taxable years beginning in 1964 and thereafter, the limitation would be 60 percent. The staff estimates that these changes in the overall limitation would cause a reduction in revenues to the Federal Government in the amounts shown in the following table.

[In millions of dollars]

Maximum effective rate limitation (percent):	*Revenue loss*
75	$25
65	80
60	130

The draft also provides for a three-step reduction in the 27½-percent depletion allowance for oil and gas, at 1-year intervals, commencing in 1962. Under the draft, for taxable years beginning in 1962, the rate would be 25 percent; for taxable years beginning in 1963, the rate would be 22½ percent; and for taxable years beginning in 1964 and thereafter, the rate would be 20 percent.

It is extremely difficult to estimate the effect of small changes in the depletion rate for oil and gas, because we do not have the data we need concerning the present effect of the 50-percent limitation, and because the data on depletion claimed on individual income tax returns is incomplete. Consequently, our estimates for your proposal are rough.

Tax year	Proposed depletion rate for oil and gas	Estimated revenue gain over present law
	Percent	*Millions*
1962	25	$75
1963	22½	160
1964	20	250

I hope this will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance and was ordered to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call not to be charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of that United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MILLER to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute was read, as follows:

At the end of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 4. In order to encourage preservation of the financial solvency of the United Nations which is being threatened by the failure of some member nations to pay currently their assessments and/or contributions to the United Nations, no assistance shall be furnished under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (other than supporting assistance under chapter 4 of part I, assistance from the contingency fund established under chapter 5 or part I, and military assistance under chapter 2 of part II), or any other law authorizing assistance to foreign countries (other than military assistance, supporting assistance, or assistance from the President's contingency fund), to the government of any nation which is more than one year in arrears in its payment of any assessment by the United Nations for its regular budget or for peace and security operations, unless the President determines that such government has given reasonable assurance of paying (independently of such assistance) all such arrearages and placing its payments of such assessments on a current basis, or determines that such government, by reason of unusual and exceptional circumstances, is economically unable to give such assurance."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am not averse to having this amendment considered; but I believe I must, in good conscience, state that the amendment does not fit in with the unanimous-consent agreement, which provides that all amendments must be germane. However, I shall not press the point, although I think I should bring it to the attention of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask the distinguished majority leader whether he has any objection to my offering this amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, I have no objection; but I would not want it considered as establishing a precedent, because the amendment was pending before the unanimous-consent agreement was reached. However, I call attention to the fact that, based on the agreement, there is a question about whether the amendment is in order. However, I shall not press it.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand that the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], is properly before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, it is properly before the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Then am I correct in understanding that it is in order for me to proceed now with my amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, if no objection is raised. If objection is raised, the Chair will proceed to rule.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to obtain a little clarification in regard to the possibility of objection. I was under the impression that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the so-called substitute was in order, regardless of objection. Does the Chair's ruling mean that if any Senator objected to consideration of the Miller amendment at this time, the objection would prevail? I have no objection, but I should like to obtain clarification on this point. I thought the amendment to the substitute was in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. So far as the Chair has been informed, the amendment to the amendment is in order. No objection or point of order has been raised, so far as the Chair knows, on the ground that the amendment to the amendment is not in order. In the absence of such a point of order, the Chair assumes that the amendment to the amendment is in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Chair has stated "no objection or point of order has been raised"——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair meant to say that no point of order has been raised.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I clearly understand the situation if no point of order is raised.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was in error in using the word "objection." The Chair meant to say that no point of order has been raised.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well; then I understand, and I thank the Chair. I merely wished to obtain clarification on that point, for I did not think an objection could lie against the amendment to the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will yield briefly to me——

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was actually printed and tendered before the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into yesterday. The distinguished Senator from Iowa could easily have objected to the agreement when it was proposed; and I believe we should make sure that the majority leader and I fully understand each other in connection with this matter. Consideration of the Miller amendment to the substitute will not constitute a precedent. Instead, I believe that under the circumstances it can be considered as an accommodation. Certainly we try to be fair to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the distinguished Senator from Iowa have a right to offer this amendment as a matter of right, as a Senator of the United States, rather than by grace of any agreement? As I understand the rules of the Senate, the amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been offered by the two leaders must be perfected before the vote is taken on the other amendment in the nature of a substitute; and the Senator from Iowa has a right, as a Senator of the United States, to offer any number of amendments, as he may see fit, to the substitute which has been offered by the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, let me comment briefly on the point which has been raised by the Senator from Georgia. I do not wish to push my amendment to the extent of standing on my rights as a U.S. Senator. My point merely is that if this amendment can be accommodated to the situation without delaying the taking of action by the Senate, I hope that can be done, because if it cannot be done, I shall be forced to revise my proposed procedure, and to offer my amendment to the main bill; and I understand that would be in order.

All I am trying to do is to accommodate my procedure to the best interests and convenience of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think we ought to say, for the benefit of all Senators, that a full understanding of this matter has been arrived at. We are not questioning the right of the Senator to offer any other amendment. We are trying to protect the rules of the Senate so that this procedure could not be used as a precedent later. The amendment was lying on the desk before the agreement had been reached. There is no question about that. The Senator has a right to offer it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Chair clarify what was stated by the Senator from Georgia? I thought he made a point on the question of germaneness and whether there was an interdiction against nongermane amendments in the agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct; there is not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, it does not involve the grace or sympathy of the leadership one bit. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Georgia is correct, as always, that the Senator has a right to offer an amendment. The question of germaneness has not been raised as to this Miller amendment, and since it was not raised, there is nothing for the Chair to rule on.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Chair will indulge me, the Senator from Illinois assumed the amendment was not germane. In my opinion, the amendment is germane.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not have to rule, because the question was not raised as to whether the amendment is germane.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

I have heretofore had the feeling that this action on the bill and on the amendments is somewhat premature, because there is pending before the World Court the question which the United Nations General Assembly referred to at the last General Assembly meeting last fall.

The question before the World Court is whether or not assessments for such operations as the Congo operations are in the same category as regular contributions to the United Nations for the purposes of the Charter of the U.N. The idea is that if the World Court issues an advisory opinion which holds that the assessments are in the same category as regular contributions, there are a good many nations which are delinquent in their assessments and which will lose their vote before the United Nations.

I know that the proponents of the pending bill have every confidence that the World Court will so rule. However, we all know that no one ever knows how a court or judge is going to rule until after the ruling has come out.

Moreover, we have long maintained a policy that a legislature should not take any action which might be calculated to interfere with the independent thinking of the judiciary. We had that proposition before us during the debate on the Du Pont tax bill, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] made a strong argument that we should take no action on the Du Pont tax bill at that time until after the Federal court in Chicago had taken certain action with respect to the case pending before it.

I can understand that if the United States, through the Congress, authorizes the purchase of United Nations bonds, it might have some impact on the otherwise independent thinking of the World Court. It is for that reason that I would prefer to have all of these matters await the outcome of the decision of the World Court. At that time the air would be cleared and we would know what the answer was in the matter of whether special assessments are in the same category as annual contributions. We may hope this will be the ruling of the Court, but I suggest we do not know, and any action on this bill prior to the Court's ruling may have an impact on what should otherwise be a completely independent judicial decision.

But, be that as it may, the amendment I have offered to the so-called Mansfield-Dirksen substitute to the main bill, to which I had originally offered my amendment, is designed to establish a policy, so far as our dealing with other nations is concerned, in the matter of foreign aid.

We have for many years been proclaiming our complete support of the United Nations. I point out that in my public statements, and I believe in my voting record, it is very clear that I am among those who have wholeheartedly supported the United Nations.

I have also taken exception to some statements which have been made to the effect that, merely because one might be opposed to a particular bill, therefore he was opposed to the United Nations. This is the same type of argument we heard in the debate on the so-called Department of Urban Affairs proposal. However, it became clear that the mere fact that someone opposed the so-called Department of Urban Affairs plan did not therefore mean that he was opposed to cities or opposed to Negroes. Mr. President, this question is not that simple. I do not know of any Member of the Senate who does not support the principles of the United Nations Charter, and I do not know of any Member of the Senate who does not want to see the United Nations succeed. But all of us are deeply concerned about the fact that the United Nations is not going to succeed unless it has the lifeblood with which to operate, and that lifeblood is its revenue. No government can long last if its revenue sources are cut off—if its taxpayers do not pay their bills. This is the problem before us.

The problem I see in the main bill, and in the substitute, is that there is nothing in them calculated to provide for the leadership of the United States in encouraging other members of the United Nations to practice fiscal integrity before the United Nations.

Some point has been made that the bill, as reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee, is an improvement because it authorizes the purchase of $25 million of bonds and authorizes the purchase of another $75 million of bonds on a matching purchase basis with other nations.

While I think it is a slight improvement, the bill, as well as the substitute, is merely treating the symptom; it is not getting to the root of the problem, and the root of the problem is that many other nations are not paying their bills.

With respect to the matching proposal, I do not know of a single nation which is behind in its payments to the United Nations which is offering to buy bonds. I would suggest that any nation which is behind in its payments to the United Nations and which offers to buy bonds is not in good faith. I think that before they offer to buy bonds they should get right with the United Nations and pay their bills.

So the main bill is calculated to get nations which are already practicing fiscal integrity before the United Nations to buy bonds. That is not the problem. The problem is to get the laggard nations to pay their bills.

My amendment does not affect military assistance, supporting assistance, or the President's contingency fund.

In effect, it relates only to development loans and development grants. The amendment would not affect loans to private individuals or to private corporations, but only loans or grants to governments, and, more particularly, to those governments which are more than 1 year in arrears in payment of their assessments and contributions to the United Nations.

The Congress has already established the policy set forth in the last section of the substitute amendment. Some point has been made that the substitute amendment is an improvement. It recites that the Congress is concerned about the financial situation before the United Nations and will exercise its best judgment—and it calls upon the President to exercise his best judgment—to work out some solution to the financial crisis before the United Nations.

This does not change our policy one bit. This has long been the policy of the United States and of every administration since the United Nations began. I cannot see any change in our policy. I am quite sure all nations of the world know that the position not only of the Congress but also of the President of the United States is that the United Nations should be on a sound financial basis and that those nations which are not paying should pay. That is our policy. The problem is to implement that policy.

In the Foreign Assistance Act which Congress passed last year it was declared that the policy of the Congress is to recognize the importance of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and it was urged that all other countries able to contribute join in a common undertaking to meet the goals of our foreign assistance program.

I invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial entitled "A Bankrupt U.N.," which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald as early as November 4, 1960. The editorial states in part:

> It would be a dreadful commentary upon the sense of world responsibilty if the principal agency of international security were allowed to go broke. That is a very real possibility for the United Nations, as Secretary General Hammarskjold has warned pointedly in his appeal for $20 million in cash by the end of the year.

I point out that additional editorials and articles on this subject can be found in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 12, pages 16372–16376.

This is not a new problem. At least, it is not a problem which has come up suddenly. In 1960 it was recognized that the United Nations was headed for a financial crisis. I called the attention of my colleagues to this fact in the last session, when we were debating the foreign aid bill. We all had assurance that the problem was recognized and that something was going to be done about it. But nothing has been done, except some very excellent work on the part of the Acting Secretary General, Mr. U Thant, who has, I am told, bent over backward to try to collect the outstanding arrearage accounts from the various member nations. However, the results have been very disappointing.

The U.N. is headed for a financial crisis. In fact, it has a financial crisis. The United Nations is headed for bankruptcy if action is not taken soon.

A point has been made that my amendment would, in effect, make a collector of dues out of the United States. Any time someone wishes to defeat proposed legislation, he can hang a label on it; but that is not responsive to the argument. I cannot imagine anything which would be worse than for us to pass legislation which would make the United States a collector of dues for the United Nations.

On the other hand, I think we have an obligation, as the leaders of the free world, at least, to administer our foreign aid in a manner which will encourage nations to get right with the United Nations.

It has been said that we can lift our voices in the proper channels in the United Nations and urge adoption by the United Nations of machinery for collection of dues, and that this should be done and payments should be kept up to date. These are fine words, Mr. President, but fine words mean nothing when they are not implemented, and the implementation has not yet occurred.

Favorable action either on the bill or on the substitute will continue to represent fine words. There is not one scintilla of leadership, with respect to the nations which are behind in payment of their assessments in encouraging them to get right with the United Nations.

Mr. President, I have a chart entitled "Examples of Nations in Arrears in Congo Operations Assessments," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

EXAMPLES OF NATIONS IN ARREARS IN CONGO OPERATIONS ASSESSMENTS

	Arrearages for Congo operation assessments	Economic assistance (fiscal 1961)		Military assistance (fiscal 1961)		Arrearages for Congo operation assessments	Economic assistance (fiscal 1961)		Military assistance (fiscal 1961)
		Grants	Loans				Grants	Loans	
		Million	*Million*	*Million*			*Million*	*Million*	*Million*
Poland	$678,553 (1961) 663,517 (1960)	$5.1	None	None	United Arab Republic	69,398 (1961) 154,982 (1960)	$51.2	$84.6	None
Italy	2,228,826 (1961) 1,089,718 (1960)	25.6	$9.3	$171.5	Afghanistan	11,887 (1961) 14,529 (1960)	35.8	None	$1.2
Spain	184,250 (1961) 450,417 (1960)	43.7	72.5	63.3	Argentina	219,911 (1961) 268,797 (1960)	None	68.0	12.1
France	4,746,601 (1961) 6,339,772 (1960)	None	7.9	47.8	Brazil	202,080 (1961) 247,002 (1960)	24.5	270.1	32.9
Iceland	7,925 (1961) None (1960)	6.0	1.6	None	Chile	53,492 (1961) 65,383 (1960)	30.2	108.5	8.5
Cambodia	7,925 (1961) 19,373 (1960)	24.2	None	6.6	Colombia	61,417 (1961) 75,069 (1960)	7.6	82.9	4.0
China	2,481,426 (1961) 1,446,543 (1960)	74.3	42.0	115.3	Mexico	140,664 (1961) 343,866 (1960)	4.6	27.8	1.2
Indonesia	93,115 (1961) 113,815 (1960)	16.4	8.9	None	Venezuela	99,059 (1961) 121,079 (1960)	.2	26.9	10.3
Yugoslavia	69,341 (1961) 169,512 (1960)	31.5	116.4	None	Sudan	11,887 (1961) 14,529 (1960)	9.4	None	None
Philippines	85,191 (1961) None (1960)	19.5	87.4	----------	Morocco	27,736 (1961) 343,866 (1960)	70.0	43.0	None
Greece	45,567 (1961) 55,696 (1960)	32.2	12.6	51.0	Ghana	13,868 (1961) 16,951 (1960)	2.6	None	None
Iran	41,605 (1961) 25,853 (1960)	39.5	75.3	55.1	Nigeria	41,605 (1961) None (1960)	10.2	None	None
Jordan	7,925 (1961) 19,373 (1960)	67.3	1.0	3.3					

EXAMPLES OF NATIONS NOT IN ARREARS IN CONGO OPERATION ASSESSMENTS

		Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*			*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*
Somali Republic	----------	$4.2	None	None	Turkey	----------	$100.0	$133.0	$129.0
Senegal	----------	3.6	None	None	Japan	----------	2.9	46.6	77.8
Liberia	----------	6.7	$40.8	$1.2	Thailand	----------	24.8	None	20.9

Source of arrearages: U.N. Secretariat statement on the collection of contributions as at Feb. 28, 1962.

Source of assistance: ICA Office of Statistics and Reports, obligations, and commitments, July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1961 (preliminary).

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the chart sets forth examples of nations which are in arrears in Congo operations assessments for the years 1961 and 1960. A number of countries are listed on the chart, but it is not all-inclusive.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 15 minutes allotted to the Senator from Iowa have expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. The chart sets forth examples. It also sets forth the economic assistance and the military assistance which the United States has furnished to these countries during the fiscal year 1961.

I invite the attention of the Senate to a few of the examples given.

First, let us consider the situation with respect to Poland. During 1961 the United States gave to Poland $5.1 million, not in loans, but in grants. While Poland was receiving our taxpayers' money, the Government of Poland did not see fit to pay $663,517 of its assessments for the Congo operation for 1960, and $678,553 for 1961.

At the same time, the Somali Republic was given $4.2 million in aid—less than Poland received from us. However, the Somali Republic is practicing fiscal integrity before the United Nations, and that country has no arrearages so far as the Congo operations are concerned. I suggest that the Government of the Somali Republic might wonder whether it profits them, in view of the way Poland is getting along, to practice fiscal integrity before the United Nations. They are treated the same, yet Poland is behind in its payments.

I cannot see any activity, any legislation, or any administrative declaration of policy which would indicate that the Somali Republic is going to be treated in a different manner. I do not say that we should never give to Poland or to any other nation some assistance, but the point is that nations which are in arrears should not be treated the same as nations which are paid up.

Another disappointment is Italy. During 1961 Italy received loans of $9.3 million and grants of $25.6 million, yet during the same time Italy was in arrears in United Nations payments. In 1960 Italy was over $1 million in arrears in its payments for the Congo operations, and Italy is $2,228,826 in arrears for the 1961 assessments.

It may be suggested that because of the economic situation in a country it cannot afford to pay the assessments for the Congo operations. I think it should be made very clear that the allocation of the assessments among the nations is on a fair and equitable basis, taking into account their economic situations.

It would not do, for example, for Cambodia to say that it could not afford to pay its assessments. In 1961 we gave—not loaned, but gave—to Cambodia $24.2 million, and also $6.6 million in military assistance, yet Cambodia failed to pay $19,373 for 1960 and $7,925 for 1961. After all we have given Cambodia, I do not think anyone would suggest that, from an economic standpoint, that country could not afford to pay $26,000 or $27,000 for the Congo operations.

I suggest that it is not a question of economic necessity or economic vicissitude that has resulted in this situation with respect to most of the countries to which I have referred. It is a matter of principle. I do not know what the principle is, but it is certainly not the principle of supporting the United Nations and practicing fiscal integrity before the U.N. I think it is high time that, in administering our foreign aid program, we should see to it that the principle of supporting the United Nations receives priority.

I point out that on the same continent, while Somali was receiving $4.2 million in grants and practicing fiscal integrity with the United Nations, Nigeria received grants totaling $10.2 million and still fell behind in its 1961 assessments for the Congo by $41,605. Japan received $2.9 million in grants and $46.6 million in loans. It is current in its payments. It is practicing fiscal integrity before the United Nations. On the other hand, Morocco received $70 million in grants and $43 million in loans and fell behind $27,736 in its 1961 assessments and $343,866 in its 1960 assessments for the Congo operations.

Thailand received $24.8 million in grants and is current in its assessments. Afghanistan, on the other hand, received $35.8 million in grants and still is in arrears.

These nations should not be treated alike. We cannot say to all of them, "Practice fiscal integrity," and then in administering our foreign aid program, say that it does not make any difference.

As I said, I believe it is high time for the United States to gear its foreign aid program into support for the United Nations as a matter of policy. Such action would tie in well with our national policy as exemplified in the Alliance for Progress. Our policy under the Alliance for Progress is that we will extend foreign aid to Latin American countries in order to enable them to engage in self-help programs for the betterment of their peoples. But we have attached a string. The string is that those nations must institute programs to reform their economic, political, social, and tax structures so that in fact there will be a self-help program which will result in a better standard of living for the people. That is a sensible approach. I have not heard any criticism of that string on the floor of the Senate. And yet someone may suggest that the pending amendment would tend to coerce nations into practicing fiscal integrity. I have not heard any statement about coercing the Latin American republics into practicing fiscal integrity so that they will not have inflation.

I do not think that "coerce" is the proper word. It is not a word applicable to the amendment, and it is not applicable to the Alliance for Progress. The proper word is "encourage" or "leadership." It seems to me little enough to encourage the recipients of our foreign assistance to practice fiscal integrity before the United Nations.

I can in clear conscience vote for the substitute amendment or for the main bill if my amendment is a part of those measures. I can in clear conscience go to the taxpayers in my State and ask them for their hard-earned tax money to help promote our foreign aid program; I can ask them to use their hard-earned tax money to buy bonds before the United Nations, provided they have the assurance that we will not pay lipservice to fiscal integrity before the United Nations and do something about exercising leadership to encourage other nations to practice fiscal integrity before the U.N.

But absent such assurance, it is asking a great deal of our taxpayers to pay millions of dollars in foreign aid to nations that will not even pay a few thousand dollars to practice fiscal integrity before the United Nations.

I believe that nations which are keeping up with their payments before the United Nations and practicing fiscal integrity should receive our help. Nations which are unable to do so because of economic situations might well continue to receive our assistance. My amendment would give the President of the United States the opportunity to make such a determination. I have provided in my amendment that if the President determines that exceptional or unusual circumstances exist which from an economic standpoint prevent a nation or government from paying its obligations to the United Nations, there will be no problem about its receiving foreign aid from the United States.

My amendment would also give the President further discretion by providing that if the President should determine that a nation which is in arrears has given reasonable assurance of becoming current in its payments, we will continue to give that nation foreign aid. I believe these are reasonable discretionary powers to give to the President.

I do not favor a meat-ax approach by saying, "Cut off all foreign aid." I favor giving the President some discretion on this subject. At the same time, I do not think we ought to give the President carte blanche authority to give foreign assistance to nations which are not practicing fiscal integrity before the United Nations. For example, if a nation is not willing to pay its bills before the United Nations, how can we possibly give our taxpayers the assurance that such a nation would repay loans that we might make to it? I think it is time for us to cease paying lipservice, no matter how dedicated and conscientious it may be, to fiscal integrity before the United Nations, and implement the principle by taking a little leadership, which my amendment would provide.

Mr. President, I shall be very happy to yield for the purpose of answering questions.

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

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield such time as the Senator requires.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the distinguished Senator from Iowa with reference to the pending proposal. It seems to me that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is in the spirit of the philosophy that has been urged upon us in the consideration of the main bill, which is to promote ways and means of compelling all of the participants in the United Nations to make their proper contribution, to eliminate the free riders, and to bring down the percentage that is paid by the taxpayers of the United States to support the United Nations. The amendment seems to me to be very reasonable. If I ever had any criticism of the amendment, it would be the fact that it contains too many loopholes. The distinguished Senator would take from the bill the provision by which we could exercise the encouragement of which he speaks on the members of the United Nations in the way of "military assistance, supporting assistance, or assistance from the President's contingency fund," which is a very considerable portion of the so-called mutual aid foreign assistance program.

It would also give the President very wide discretion, under which he could exclude the application of the amendment to any country that happened to be in arrears in its payment to the United Nations.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The distinguished Senator, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, knows that there are times when, from the standpoint of military necessity, other factors might well be overlooked. I should like to point out that this was the reason why the Senator from Iowa excepted military assistance and supporting assistance from the coverage of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand the reasons behind it. As the Senator has stated, there are times when military assistance is important. I might suggest that that could have been put within the President's discretion, as in the other instance. In any event, the Senator's amendment is in keeping with the whole purpose of the program before us, and that is to compel all members of the United Nations to contribute to its support. We have been told time and again that the bonds would become an obligation of the entire United Nations, and that the payments by the several member states for the retirement of the bonds would be put in the same category as the maintenance cost of the United Nations. Certainly the Senator's amendment is no more coercion than the other practice, because they freely admit that they intend to coerce the member nations into the bond issue by making the payments on the bond issue a part of the operating cost of the United Nations, about which there is no question with respect to a member being suspended if it does not pay its dues over a period of 2 years, I believe.

It seems to me that the authors of the bill should accept the amendment. It is in keeping with the purposes of the bill. It is an effort to encourage all member nations to recognize their obligations to the United Nations, as well as their right to participate in its affairs and to enjoy such protection as it affords.

I shall support the Senator's amendment. I hope the authors of the bill will accept it.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his kind remarks and for his additional observations. I point out that during the debate on the foreign aid bill in the previous session, a similar amendment was offered by me to the foreign aid bill. One of the points raised against it was that the amendment did not belong in the foreign aid bill. The amendment was defeated, as I recall, when 66 Senators voted against it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Iowa will probably be told that the amendment does not belong on the pending bill either. When measures of the kind now pending are brought to the floor of the Senate they are considered sacrosanct, and it is almost sacrilegious for any Members of the Senate to suggest an improvement on the handiwork of those who prepared the original bill. During my service in the Senate I have seen hundreds of essential amendments killed under the stress of that argument. I have been in the Senate long enough, however, not to be impressed by that argument.

Mr. MILLER. There is probably more germaneness in my amendment to the main bill or to the substitute than there was with respect to a certain bill that was passed in the Senate last week, when a constitutional poll tax amendment was added to the Alexander Hamilton bill.

Last year we were told that the amendment should not be added to the foreign aid bill. I do not know what we will be told today. We may well be told that it does not belong on the pending bill. I am quite sure that it belongs somewhere. The sooner we nail it down somewhere the better. I believe that the pending bill is the appropriate vehicle on which to set forth this policy, because the only reason for the pending bill is the fiscal crisis of the United Nations, and the pending amendment seeks to do something about it. Does the Senator from Georgia agree with me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I congratulate the Senator on seeking to find an appropriate place to enforce simple morality on the part of our associates in the United Nations. I hope he will continue to pursue his efforts with zeal. There ought to be a place somewhere for an expression of encouragement of morality and living up to responsibility by people everywhere in the world.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the time situation?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to know the situation with regard to the time on the amendment or on the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time did the Senator from Iowa consume?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa has consumed 47 minutes. The Senator from Alabama has a full hour remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Chair.

I appreciate the spirit in which the Senator from Iowa has offered his amendment. I know that he is interested in fiscal integrity as to the member nations of the United Nations. I know that is the purpose for which he has offered his amendment.

I do not agree with the Senator from Iowa as to this being the proper way to obtain fiscal integrity. I go along with the Senator from Iowa in the feeling that sufficient effort has not been made in the past in the United Nations to get the nations to pay up. I say that on my own. I must admit that I do not know how hard the U.N. has worked on it, but I have the feeling that a better record could have been made than has been made.

Yet I believe we must be practical. We recognized this problem in the Foreign Relations Committee, and we discussed things that we might do after we had disposed of the pending measure, first in trying to get our delegation to inform us as to certain things that were going on, and second, to urge our delegation to get the Secretary General to exert greater effort toward the collection of dues.

I invite the attention of my friend from Iowa to the fact that most of the figures he quoted were from 1961. The 1961 year of the United Nations has just ended. A great many nations pay their dues on the basis of a fiscal year. Many fiscal years have not run out. I do not know, but it is possible that an up-to-date showing would indicate that the United States is in arrears, because we conduct our business on a fiscal-year basis. Our fiscal year ends on June 30. The United Nations conducts its affairs on a calendar-year basis. I recall that the Senator from Iowa has used the 1960 figures. I believe we could find a better guide in the year 1961.

I am not saying this for the purpose of belittling the fact that certain nations are behind in their payments. In my presentation on the opening day of the debate I gave the number of nations that were behind, and how much they were behind. Every effort ought to be made to have them catch up.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before I yield, I remind the Senator that in the letter from the President which I read into the RECORD yesterday he makes this statement. The Senator will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 5906. I will give the Senator time to turn to the letter, in order that he may follow me. I hope he will read the whole letter. I ask the Senator to refer to the third paragraph, in which the President says:

> I am also in agreement with the intention stated in section 4 of the substitute that this Nation use its best efforts to strengthen the pattern of U.N. financing in such a way as to make unnecessary any future large-scale borrowing.

Now follow the details:

> Steps to be taken in pursuit of this goal would include efforts to improve the administration of fiscal affairs in the Secretariat

and constituent agencies and bolster the existing fiscal office and officers.

Then the President goes on to say that he will submit to Congress a semiannual report on all the fiscal affairs of the United Nations. I mention that because while the Committee on Foreign Relations did not follow the method *suggested* by the Senator from Iowa, we decided on one which I believe will produce results. This is borne out by the statement of the President himself. I certainly would not use coercion in condemnation of the Senator's amendment, but I do not believe that the method proposed by the committee would be as coercive as this.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator from Alabama realize that when I was referring to the arrearages in 1961 and 1960, the source of my figures was the statement of the United Nations Secretariat on the collection of contributions as of February 28, 1962; and that for the year 1961, the period runs only from January 1 to October 31, 1961; it does not cover November and December?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to have that information; I did not realize that that was true. But the point is that if a payment was due to the United Nations during fiscal 1961, that amount might be payable, so far as the nation is concerned, in a fiscal year that is completely different from that of the U.N. That is true of the United States. If an assessment against us was payable in 1961, the appropriation would have been made for the following fiscal year—that is, fiscal year 1962. Sometimes the second half of our assessment is not payable until the second half of our fiscal year. For that reason, there have been times when the United States has been shown as delinquent because of the inconsistency between the fiscal year of the United Nations and the fiscal year of the United States.

I do not make a point of that. Some nations are behind in their payments; there is no question about it. As the Senator from Iowa has said, this question was raised in connection with the foreign aid bill last year. There was a yea-and-nay vote on it, and the vote was 66 to 24, as I recall. I stated at that time something that certainly is true at this time: that by this method we would be penalizing the very countries which we seek to help.

The Senator has a provision at the end of his amendment this year which he did not have in the amendment last year. It gives the President the right to exempt countries if he finds that for some reason they have not been able to meet the requirements. We are really dealing with the collection of U.N. debts, and by this amendment we would be making the President of the United States the bill collector for the United Nations. I do not believe we ought to follow that course. I think the course which is outlined in the President's letter is a much better method.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, if agreed to, would penalize the very countries which most need help. It would let go scotfree Russia and all the other Communist countries. The amendment would not touch the Communist countries, except perhaps Poland, which the Senator from Iowa mentioned. I am not sure it would even affect Poland. Our relief for Poland was given largely under Public Law 480, and probably included some equipment. The Senator simply referred to the relief as a grant. I do not know if he has a breakdown to show what the grant consisted of.

Also, his proposal would let France go scotfree. France is one of the great powers that have declined to pay the assessments; although it is believed that if a favorable decision is handed down by the World Court, France will pay the special assessment, just as it pays its regular assessment.

Another country that has disagreed with the operations in the Congo is a very good friend of the United States. I think the Government of that country has become more realistic recently, and I hope someday it will be back in step. The country is Belgium. The proposal of the Senator from Iowa would not affect Belgium, because we do not extend aid to Belgium. It would not affect the richer countries of the world, because we do not extend aid to them. The Senator's proposal would affect only the countries to which we extend aid; and they are the very countries we wish to help. His proposal would go after those countries hammer and tongs, but would not touch the other, bigger countries, such as those I have named. I simply do not believe that his proposal provides a realistic approach. I do not believe it is as good an approach—and I say this in deference and with complete recognition of the absolute sincerity of the Senator from Iowa—and I do not believe it seeks to solve the problem in a realistic manner.

The proposal of the Committee on Foreign Relations is a much better approach. This is confirmed in the letter of the President, which I read a few minutes ago. I think the Senator from Iowa will see a much better record a year from now. I think he will then be able to place in the RECORD a much better showing than is true today.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I echo the sentiments of the Senator from Alabama about what we are seeking to achieve. I know he is sincere in his statements. I know he was sincere last year in the debate on the same subject with respect to the foreign aid bill. Certainly we are all sincere. The only trouble is that we are not getting action.

The Senator from Alabama suggests that a year from now we will have before us a report which will show a great improvement so far as the fiscal position of the United Nations is concerned. I pray that we will. But we do not have a better one today than we had at the time of our last debate on this issue.

I am not quite as sure as the Senator from Alabama that an all-out effort has not been made by the U.N. and its officials and our delegation to the U.N. As I said earlier, Acting Secretary General U Thant is engaged in an intensive effort to try to have the laggard nations pay their bills, but the results have been most disappointing.

I have read the letter from the President, to which the Senator from Alabama has referred. I am pleased to note that the President is in agreement with the policy set forth in the substitute bill. But the point I made earlier in my argument is that there is nothing new about this policy. It is a policy that every President and every Congress have followed since the formation of the United Nations. I do not see that a thing has been added. It is said that steps to be taken in pursuit of the goal of a sound fiscal situation would include efforts to improve the administration of the fiscal affairs of the U.N. Secretariat. I am not certain what that means.

I am not sure that merely a reshuffling of the administrative officials within the U.N. Secretariat would change the attitude of the government of a nation in some other part of the world with respect to paying its bills to the United Nations. Perhaps more billings would be sent out; I do not know. But I cannot see that this would change the position of any nation in that connection.

The President's letter also says that we shall bolster the existing fiscal office and officers of the United Nations. I am not sure what that means. I hope the Senator will spell out what it means. Does it mean that, in effect, more revenue agents for the United Nations will be going around, attempting to collect its bills? I do not know what it means. But I suggest that even if a whole army of revenue agents for the United Nations were sent all over the world to collect its bils, they would not be able to collect one additional cent if the Nations concerned did not want to practice fiscal integrity. Certainly that would not happen even if the President of the United States himself were to proceed to visit the various countries in an endeavor to collect the bills for the United Nations; and I am sure the Senator does not contemplate having that done.

All we seek is authority for one of our foreign aid administrators, when dealing with some other nation, to determine whether this nation can, while maintaining its economic integrity, pay its bills to the United Nations. If it cannot, the negotiator would send to Washington his determination to that effect. But if it can, the negotiator would advise that country that the taxpayers of the United States—those in Alabama, those in Iowa, and those in other States—are not going to send any of the U.S. foreign aid to such a country until it begins to practice fiscal integrity before the United Nations. In other words, we mean to have such nations engage in more than lipservice in connection with the Charter of the United Nations. We want more than that; we want action, and we want it soon. In fact, it is long past due.

So, Mr. President, I close by stating that I appreciate the fact that the Foreign Relations Committee has considered this matter and has recognized the seriousness of the problem, and I

also appreciate the fact that the President of the United States wants something done about it. But I suggest that unless something other than what is called for by the substitute or by the main bill is done, we shall not be taking action to cure the evil which exists. I believe we have a great opportunity to practice some leadership in connection with our foreign-aid program, by encouraging nations in arrears to "get right" with the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. COOPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I had promised to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be glad to wait, if the Senator from Kentucky prefers to speak at this time.

Mr. COOPER. Not at all.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. What time is now to be yielded?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to both the amendment of the Senator from Iowa and the Russell amendment. I should like to discuss first the Russell amendment—and I say this with all due respect to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa—because the Russell amendment goes to the very heart of the bill, whereas the Miller amendment deals with problems existing in the United Nations—problems which I shall discuss in a few minutes.

Mr. President, the Russell amendment goes to the very heart of the bill which relates to the proposed $100 million loan to the United Ntaions; and the vote to be taken on the Russell amendment has very properly been regarded as a most important vote, and undoubtedly it will set the climate in this Chamber for the other votes which will ensue.

Mr. President, the reason why the Russell amendment is so very important is that it deals, in effect, with the very existence of the United Nations itself—a subject which, basically, has not been under consideration in this Chamber since the time when the United Nations Charter was confirmed by vote of the Senate. Once the charter was confirmed, normally that would have been the end of Senate consideration of that basic subject. But by means of the Russell amendment we are now confronted with an opportunity to act directly in relationship to the United Nations itself, by means of a contract which in effect calls for a loan by the United States to the United Nations; and in that connection the Congress would make funds available by means of a regular appropriation. In that way the United States would give assistance which could help save the United Nations itself.

Mr. President, I believe the entire Nation will watch with great care the votes cast by Senators on the Republican side of the aisle when the Russell amendment is voted on, because as the debate has developed there have been, on this side of the aisle, expressions which might give rise in the country to a fear that stirrings of the old attitude of isolationism may be occurring. However, it is my deep conviction that such an attitude has been removed from political life in our Nation, and does not today represent the main body of American political opinion. Therefore, I hope very much that Senators on this side of the aisle will show that decisively when the vote is taken; and I hope very much that a majority of the Republican Senators will back the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] in the arrangements which have bene made, which have resulted in the fundamental issue which is before us.

Mr. President, I believe that many Senators in considering the Russell amendment have failed to realize the size of the issue it involves, as compared with the actual direct action which would result if the amendment were adopted. The Russell amendment really involves the issue of whether the United Nations itself will be sick financially or whether it will be reasonably well financially. That is a very important issue; and certainly the Soviet Union would like nothing better than to be able to put the United Nations into a position of fiscal bankruptcy. In fact, as I shall show in a few minutes, the Soviet Union is directly responsible for the fiscal problem of the United Nations which now exists.

So, Mr. President, it will not be enough for our country to give the United Nations a slight blood transfusion—which is what the Russell amendment would do—so as to enable the United Nations to live from today until tomorrow, but continue to be in financial difficulty. Certainly that would be the result, because even if the United States were to forgive this debt, the United Nations would still be in financial difficulty. In short, what is needed is to have the United Nations place its feet on a solid road for at least a year or two, so as to be able to deal adequately with its finances, which right now constitute its major headache, and at the same time have an opportunity, through a finding by the World Court and by means of action by its members, to bring itself abreast of its financial responsibilities.

So, Mr. President, the Russell amendment suffers by reason of the fact that it would still leave the United Nations in an emergency financial condition; and, as I view the matter, such a situation would be very inimical to the interests of the United States. In my opinion, by granting the United Nations what is—in view of the size of our budget and the importance of the issues at stake—a very small sum of money, namely, the difference between $38 million and $100 million—and, Mr. President, mind you, most of that would be handled on a matching basis, happily, as the Foreign Relations Committee has worked out that matter, and as I, myself, sought to have it worked out—the United Nations would thus be freed of its fiscal emergency problems, and then would be able to face the particular issues being raised by various Senators, regardless of whether they favor or oppose the Russell amendment. In short, as a result of such action the United Nations would then be able to deal in a far more effective way with problems such as those of the General Assembly, the mounting of troop movements in various parts of the world, such as in the Congo, and so forth.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if the Russell amendment is defective on that ground—and I believe that is a fatal defect—the Russell amendment is even more defective in section 2, because that part of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would require Congress to declare war every time the President wanted to help the United Nations in any of the very necessary ways in which it would from time to time be likely to need help. Section 2 of the Russell amendment would require that the Congress take favorable action on a resolution stating that it is the desire of the Congress to help the United Nations; and such a procedure would play directly into the hands of the very techniques which have been used at various places in the world in order to embarrass and cause difficulty to the United Nations. Certainly we wish to avoid such situations—for instance, those in Laos or in Vietnam, where the Communists have used methods of infiltration and subversion, although without causing a general war. Certainly we must be in a position to counter such developments. We do not wish to be thrown into actual war every time a situation similar to Vietnam or the Congo or Berlin develops. Yet section 2 of the Russell amendment would compel Congress either to act to that extent in such situations, or else be powerless.

So it seems to me the question involved in the Russell amendment is a much larger one than the question of making a loan to the United Nations; and I believe that the decision reached by the Senate in regard to the Russell amendment will, indeed, be a very fateful decision, insofar as the United Nations is concerned. In fact, favorable action by the Senate on the Russell amendment could well be a fatal decision, in my opinion, for it could well gravely endanger our entire posture in connection with international affairs, and could do so to a much greater extent than could possibly occur in connection with any question involved in making a loan of $30 million or $160 million or $200 million to the United Nations. That is the real force of the Russell amendment, and that is the real reason why in voting on it we shall be voting on a fundamental question, and not by any means a question of small import to the usefulness of the United Nations.

I have respect for the argument of the need for having in the General Assembly an effective body if it is going to be the principal forum of the United Nations, and I have a great respect for the criticisms and analyses made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from Washington, and other Senators, with respect to the imperfections and deficiencies of the U.N.

All those discussions have a part in showing this country where it is going, or how it operates, or where it should go.

But in my opinion that is an extremely different thing from adopting a section which will commit the responsibility of Congress very much against the kind of foreign policy we have to pursue now in view of the constant Russian and Chinese Communist threats in terms of limited war and actions.

The very thing we do not want Congress to do is pass a joint resolution every time one of these incidents requires cooperation or activities in the U.N. Once Congress passes a joint resolution of that kind, then these incidents cannot be confined to their proper limits as incidents, but they will become major emergencies as between our country and the Communist bloc.

So, Mr. President, I think the Russell amendment should be rejected very decisively for the reason that it extends the ambit of this debate far beyond its proper compass and commits it to a course of action gravely inimical to what ought to be the bipartisan policy of our country, by general agreement.

Now I desire to comment on the Miller amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he goes to the Miller amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand the Senator advocates committing American men into military actions instituted by the United Nations without Congress participating in any degree.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think the Senator from New York recommends any such thing.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought he did.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to answer, if I may, because Congress can always act if it wants to stop the President, either by censure resolution, or not providing the money, or otherwise asserting its power.

I am against passing a law which will make the President come to Congress for a joint resolution, which is tantamount to an American declaration of war, every time this country wants to participate, in the interest of international peace, in some U.N. action.

The Senator from Georgia does not confine his amendment, as I read it, to manpower. It extends to military material as well. So it does not affect just manpower. It may very well be that manpower forces of our Nation will not be committed at all, but, if the amendment is adopted, committing military equipment or materiel will also require a joint resolution, as I read it. I think that to commit us to a policy of that kind would be inimical to our best interests.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is entitled to his opinion. The Constitution gives Congress very broad power in committing American men to battle. Is the Senator familiar with section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act passed in 1945?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not remember it offhand. Will the Senator read it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the section which provides for participation of American Armed Forces in conjunction with others in the United Nations. Section 6 reads as follows:

> The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate Act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

In 1945, when we implemented our approval of the United Nations Charter, we said the President could not commit men or facilities or materiel to combat with the United Nations without appropriate act or resolution of Congress.

I have offered the amendment in the language I have employed to bring to the attention of the Senate how far we have gone in abdicating our responsibilities and our sworn duties. It is practically the same language as exists in the 1945 act. It has the same effect the existing law has. Yet the Senator finds some horrendous threat to the peace and security of this country in letting the Congress of the United States, when it is in session, participate in the action of the Chief Executive in sending the young manhood of this Nation to their death or to be maimed in any quarter of the globe.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, the Senator from New York has advocated no such thing, because the Senator from New York has pointed out that the amendment would cover materiel or equipment as well as manpower.

Mr. RUSSELL. The original bill does that.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York will get to the Senator's statement with respect to the United Nations Participation Act. The United Nations Participation Act, in section 6, referred to the scheme of organization of a permanent U.N. police force which was to be negotiated among the nations, and which is something that has never been done. It is that over which the Congress wished to keep control, and the Congress is quite right, because that is not an incident similar to the condition in the Congo, or Vietnam, or some other place. That is a basic commitment, of a permanent character, of forces of the United States to the United Nations on a general basis. I agree with that. This is not the same thing the Senator from Georgia is providing for.

This section is tied in with section 7, or at least chapter 12, of the United Nations Charter, which provides for action by the United Nations, on an open basis, whatever may be decided as proper action by it with respect to threats to peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression.

In short, it is one thing to have Congress retain control as to what shall be done in devoting an element of the American military forces to a permanent type of police force to the United Nations. This is another matter. It deals, on a case-by-case basis, with individual incidents such as have occurred in Vietnam and the Congo, and may occur elsewhere.

In one case, that of section 6, this is a major, deliberate decision by the United States to commit, on a permanent basis, as a fundamental basis of policy, some of its forces.

In the other case it is an exercise by the President, on a foreign policy basis, which we could stop at any time, of participating with other nations in some actions adapted to a particular incident affecting the foreign policy of the United States.

Though it is ancient history, I may mention that in our gunboat diplomacy in Latin America and other parts of the world our President did not come to Congress to ask whether it wanted that particular thing done. The President acted under his power as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

It is all right to make lurid statements about the fact that we may send American boys here or there to their deaths, but would we rather send them en masse, in the millions or in the hundreds of thousands? Or, instead, would we prefer to adopt the policy, which may cost some lives—and of course we understand that, and it breaks our hearts to even think of it—which is designed to minimize the danger by localizing and minimizing incidents, instead of leaving it up to the Congress to pass joint declarations that we wish to engage in massive participation.

What would we expect the Russians to do if the Congress of the United States should pass a joint resolution to send American troops to the Congo? Should we expect the Russians to sit and twiddle their thumbs? I should say not. They would consider it to be a major element in the mobilization of our country's forces.

It is a great thing in the United States that any Senator—and certainly a Senator as distinguished and important as our colleague—can present any amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is very important for us, as Senators, to carefully examine what is proposed in all of its implications, in the face of world events, and to address ourselves to the problems, as I did this morning.

I am deeply moved by the implications of the amendment. I think it is an extremely important amendment, worthy of extended debate on the floor of the Senate, if Senators feel they wish to be enlightened on it further, because I think it would commit the United States to a very major policy which could lead us into very, very serious labyrinths, dead ends and dangers. I should be remiss in my duty as a Senator if I did not say so.

Mr. President, I now wish to take a minute or so on the Miller amendment.

The Miller amendment, in my view, presents certain difficulties. I know the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] yields to no one, and he need not do so, in regard to deep concern about doing the right thing with respect to the United Nations financial situation. I do not question his good faith or his sincerity in making any statement. I do not feel that he is trying to embarrass or to encumber any element of our relations with the United Nations.

The point I wish to make is that the Miller amendment would require mandatory action by the President, since it uses the word "shall" on page 1, line 5, whereas the President does have today, as evidenced by his letter, a complete discretion in regard to a matter of this kind. The President could, if he so chose, withhold economic aid from a nation, if the President felt that nation was outrageously refusing to honor its United Nations obligations, as a matter of the policy of the United States. I think that is the best way to leave the situation

I remind Senators that the World Court has not yet acted, so if we should adopt the Miller amendment we would be giving the President a mandatory directive before the advisory opinion comes from the World Court; we should be tying the President's hands with respect to many other nations than the ones which are really causing the problem. If we examine the arrearages in respect to the special operations in the Congo, we see that the ones which are really causing the problem are those in the Communist bloc, which owe over 50 percent of the total arrearages. Those include the Soviet Union, Poland, Rumania. France and Belgium are also involved, and they would not be reached by the amendment.

If we take the two groups together, they account for a large portion of the arrearages. I have tried to make a quick calculation, and I am perfectly willing to have it corrected. In respect to the 1961 Congo assessments of something like $35 million, some $25 million or $26 million is accounted for by the Communist-bloc nations, which are not going to be reached, and by France and Belgium, which are not going to be reached.

The amendment would tie the President's hands in a mandatory way, with respect to many nations, quite apart from the main ones which are causing the difficulty, and this will cause us difficulty. It is really something like shooting at a relatively small target with a very big gun.

The President has discretion. He has indicated in his letter that he proposes to use it and to use it effectively. In my view, with the greatest of respect for the sincerity and desires of the Senator from Iowa, which I know are of the highest in this regard, I think it would not be wise—and I use that word advisedly—to agree to the amendment.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the nice comments made by my good friend from New York. I wonder if the Senator could perhaps tell us what he has in mind when he says that the President would be taking certain action.

I asked the Senator from Alabama what the President's letter entailed. I cannot see anything specific in it. It talks in terms of enlarging the Secretariat and constituent agencies and of bolstering the existing fiscal office and officers.

I know the President is deeply concerned about this whole problem, but he has been deeply concerned ever since he took office. President Eisenhower was deeply concerned. The arrearages have gone up. They are particularly acute now.

I wonder what the Senator has in mind by way of action by the President, other than what he has been discussing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes from the time on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that yielding of time? I am glad to yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New York from the time on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I did not control that time, or I would have yielded it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Two points are involved. The first point is that the President is now committed, as shown by his letter, to see to it that every 6 months the Congress is given a report on arrearages, which will make those arrearages public and call them to the attention of the Congress. Because the President will report to the Congress, it will give Members of Congress an opportunity to do what we are so expert at doing, to protest very vigorously if we feel the program is not being handled properly.

Second, I think the whole purport of the President's letter is that the United States will do what it has not done before, that it will interest itself in a diplomatic sense in the matter of the payment of assessments, arrearages, et cetera to the United Nations. The President will not use any of the money he may lend to the United Nations to bail anybody out. He makes that clear.

The clear implication is present in the letter that the United States will address itself as a nation, with all the great facilities it has, toward seeing to it that a much better record is made. There is a commitment to do better, on our part, in a diplomatic sense, which is contained in the agreement to make reports to the Congress, which is important, I think, first, as giving to us a window on the situation, and, second, a platform from which to protest if we feel the program is not being handled properly.

For those two reasons I made the statement I did.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate "the window," and I appreciate the reports, but I have not had any difficulty in getting reports heretofore. It seems to me there has been a widespread coverage of the fiscal crisis before the United Nations by the press, going back to 1960. In fact, in the fall of 1960 many of the leading newspapers and magazines pointed out that by the fall of 1961 there would be a desperate crisis before the United Nations.

I appreciate the opportunity to receive more reports more often, but I am not concerned about the fact that we shall be able to make speeches on this subject or that we may become exercised about the situation; I am more concerned about the attitude of the member nations to whom we are giving assistance. I am particularly concerned about those nations to whom we are giving assistance who are practicing fiscal integrity, who will wonder why they receive the same kind of treatment that some other nation which is not practicing fiscal integrity is receiving.

If we had some assurance from the President of the United States that in our foreign aid program this would be a policy it would be helpful. If the President would indicate that this would be a policy, I would not necessarily feel inclined to push my amendment, but we have received no assurance like that whatsoever.

In this situation, I suggest to the Senator from New York that, although we may have high hopes, a year from now we shall not be in a much better situation than the one in which we find ourselves today.

I am interested in some practical results. I know the Senator from New York is interested in practical results.

I cannot see anything in the proposed legislation before the Senate—and, frankly, I cannot see anything in the President's letter—which would assure me or my people that there will be any practical results from the proposed bill or the substitute, because I believe the President, the Congress, our delegations to the United Nations, and our foreign aid administrators have already, long since, been trying to get something done in this regard. I am confident they have been doing their best. I think it will require a more positive policy to be enunciated by the Congress and that is the purpose of the Miller amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I say to my colleague that since we have gotten the letter from the President, I think Congress has made itself very, very clear on the positive policy.

Our debate constitutes a very strong record in the direction of positive policy, but I think we would be shooting with a very big gun at a relatively small target

should we mandatorily require the President to end aid, unless he accounts for it in some better way than he is now doing, to countries with respect to which our whole national interest may strongly dictate that we should give aid, notwithstanding U.N. arrearages. He has that discretionary power anyhow.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would it be in order for me to use any time on my substitute amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa would have to be disposed of first before time on the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from Georgia could be used. However, time on the bill could be used.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the amendment to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, yesterday I heard the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] say that he felt some trepidation in addressing the Senate on the subject we are considering because it was one which was primarily within the cognizance of the Foreign Relations Committee.

If the Senator from Georgia, with his long record of distinguished service, felt trepidation, it is evident that, in increased measure, I would also feel trepidation. Yet all of us must represent the people of our States, regardless of the committee on which we serve, and because the subject is so important, I have interested myself in it and wish to express my views on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

I have the greatest respect for the Senator from Georgia. We may talk about arrearages, and the methods that should be used to secure payment of the assessments owed by members of the United Nations, but the basic issue that is really before the Senate, it seems to me, is this:

Will the Congress reject the recommendations of the President of the United States, and make it impossible to solve the financial crisis in which the United Nations finds itself?

I think that it must be admitted that we can meet the present crisis by loaning the U.N. $100 million, and yet another crisis may arise again 2 years from now. We may again have to decide whether support of the United Nations is more important than the loan of several million dollars. But today we must face the question, Will we provide the loan, without which it will be impossible for the U.N. to continue its security operations in the Mideast and the Congo? Failure on our part would lead, if not immediately, inexorably, to the liquidation of these U.N. operations.

If we do not furnish support we must remember what will be at stake. It is possible that the operation in the Mideast may fail, and the United Nations operation in the Congo.

Perhaps some people would like to see these U.N. operations ended. But speaking as a Republican, I know that the U.N. operation in the Mideast goes forward partly because President Eisenhower made in 1956 his historic decision that the United States would not join with its historic allies—the United Kingdom, France, and a great friend of this country, Israel—in the use of force. He declared that the United States would support the principles of international law, and the Charter of the U.N. to which we have adhered, and that the Mideast problem must not be solved by force. The U.N. operation was enlarged in the Mideast because of this decision of President Eisenhower.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. As much as the question has troubled many people, I ask Senators to consider the alternative if the United Nations had not decided to act in the Congo at the request of its Central Government, the only government which had been established by law. If the United Nations had not acted in the Congo, it is possible that the Soviet Union might have intervened. If this had occurred, the United States might have been required to face a much more difficult decision—whether the United States should intervene with arms and force.

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

M. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that at the time of the creation of the new government of the Congo, the Soviet Union did, in a sense, intervene? Did not the Soviet Union send its diplomats, planes, and equipment to that country in an effort to play a very significant part in the affairs of the new country, but eventually was forced out of that country by the central government?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

I believe the full story of the establishment of the government of the Congo is not widely known. Before the Congo became independent, the leaders of its provinces, including Tshombe, met in Brussels and agreed to the establishment of a central government. The basic law under which the Congo operates today is one that passed by the Belgian Parliament, which declared the Congo would be unified under a central government. Its Parliament was elected as a central government. Then the secessionist movements began in Katanga and other provinces. But under the basic law there is no legal government other than the central government. But whatever it is, if the United Nations had not intervened, it is wholly possible that the Soviet Union, which had tried to intervene, would have remained in the Congo and would have encouraged and supported the secession.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that after the Soviet Union was in effect forced out of Leopoldville, the capital of Central Congo, it returned to the eastern province in which Gizenga, the follower of Lumumba, was in power, and the Soviet Union was implanted in that area?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. It was the Central Government which forced the Soviets to leave.

I do not think it is known that at one time the cabinet of Tshombe asked, or made a decision to ask, that, with Gizenga, the aid of the Soviet Union be sought. I do not mean to say that Tshombe participated in the decision, but his cabinet once determined to seek the support of the Soviet Union.

If the Congress refuses to aid the U.N. and if the Congo operation fails, it is possible that the Soviets will be back, as they were before they were forced out by the Central Government.

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

Mr. COOPER. The pending amendment is critical. If the amendment of the Senator from Georgia were adopted, its practical effect would mean the death knell of the operation in the Congo, and perhaps in the Mideast. Perhaps I should not say that it would mean the end so far as the Mideast operation is concerned. Its adoption would seriously cripple the United Nations. We may not agree with everything it has done—and we do not—but I cannot conceive that any of us would want to weaken, and witness the deterioration or death of, the United Nations.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It has been repeated time and again that the Communists were preparing to take over the Congo apparently by some kind of military coup. However, no evidence whatever has been presented, other than the flat statement of Senators, that conditions in the Congo were greatly different from those prevailing in any of the other African countries. The Russians have sent large missions and have sought to infiltrate all of them. So far as I am advised, the situation in the Congo was not different from that in any other African country. The Communists are ceaselessly infiltrating the whole world in maintaining large numbers of people in their missions, which are always used for the purposes of propaganda and subversion.

I cannot understand the constant inferences that the Soviets had singled out the Congo on the west side of Africa as their target of military attack. Such intelligence sources as are available to me do not indicate that the Russians were preparing to send military force into the Congo any more than into any of the other African States.

Mr. COOPER. I did not mean to say that the Soviets would send in military forces. I meant to say that the Soviet Union could bring great missions into the Congo, with the purpose of support-

ing secession and a broadened civil war. That would be to their liking.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield some time to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would be glad to use my own time, but under the Parliamentarian's ruling, I am precluded from using my own time.

I wish to say, in answer to the Senator from Kentucky, that apparently he and I have been reading different official documents. I do not believe there is any question that the Communists were trying to support the separatist movement of Gizenga in Oriente Province, and that they were demanding every day in the United Nations that steps be taken to crush Katanga and Tshombe. I have before me a transcript of the proceedings of the meeting of the United Nations Security Council of November 26, 1961, when the final resolution was adopted to direct military forces into the Congo to crush Tshombe and Katanga Province. It shows that the mover of the resolution was Mr. Valerian Zorin, who, as the Russian representative, was the author of the resolution. It shows that our own representative, Mr. Stevenson, tried to amend it to include Gizenga. That proposal was vetoed by the Russians. Our representative voted for the resolution, stating that he did so reluctantly. I have before me the statement that our representative made. This is the final statement before the delegates proceeded to vote on the Russian resolution for military action to destroy Katanga and Tshombe. Our representative, Mr. Stevenson, said:

> Before proceeding to a vote I should like the privilege of saying a word in explanation of the position of my Government. We will vote for the three-power resolution, as amended—with great reluctance—so that the Foreign Minister of the Congo, Mr. Bomboko, will not return to his tormented country emptyhanded after all these days of talk. We appreciate the efforts of so many delegations, and virtually all of the members of this Council, to get unanimity on a satisfactory comprehensive mandate for the Secretary-General. We deeply regret the Soviet vetoes and are disturbed by what they imply for the future of the Congo. In spite of these vetoes of paragraphs desired by the representative of the Congo, and clearly defining the authority of the Secretary-General, we will vote for this resolution because we believe that the Council should take a firm stand against the activities in the Katanga and specifically in support of the Central Government.

Mr. President, I say to his credit that our representative offered an amendment to bring Gizenga within the purview of the same resolution. He received the vote of every member of the Security Council except Russia. Mr. Zorin voted against it and stated that, this being a vote cast by a permanent member of the Council, the resolution was lost.

My objection all the way through to the Katanga military action has been that it was ordered by this resolution. I have heard the statement made over and over again that this was a great defeat for the Russians.

Mr. Zorin followed up the resolution with a letter to Mr. U Thant, demanding that the U.N. move immediately into Katanga with all the military forces at its command. The Soviets feed on confusion and dissension within nations and between nations everywhere. That is always grist for their mill. My primary objective to the brutal assault on Katanga was that it was done by the United Nations, an organization which was represented to Congress as one which was to undertake to solve problems by mediation and negotiation. In this case it moved with the utmost expedition, with overwhelming force, and with unnecessary brutality, resulting in the death of women and children, the destruction of hospitals, and the death of people driving ambulances on the streets of Elisabethville. They moved in without exhausting all the possibilities of mediation and negotiations, and they did so on the motion of the Soviet Union.

Yet Senators tell us that the Soviet Union suffered a great defeat when Katanga was conquered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been reading the proposed amendments which are printed and are on our desks. I find some of them have a great deal of merit. They contain provisions which I would like to see written into the act. However, we must face facts. I do not believe that any of these amendments would get enough votes to be adopted. That was the case of the amendment which was proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and myself. Had we had the votes to adopt the amendment, we would not have agreed to any compromise. We have agreed to a compromise, and we did so because we did not have the votes. If we had offered the amendment and if it had been defeated, the bill which would have been approved by the Senate would have carried the directive to the President to buy $100 million worth of bonds at 2 percent interest. I do not like that either.

When we do not have enough votes to accomplish what we seek to do, we should do that for which we can get the votes. The compromise proposal was as far as we could go. The compromise does vest great power in the President; but unlike the original bill, it does not direct him to buy $100 million worth of bonds at 2 percent. It leaves the question with the President, and he has the power to do what the proposed amendment would write into the bill. For instance, he can determine the interest rate on the loan. He can determine the duration of the loan. He can use this power of authority to lend $100 million to require the United Nations to make a real and determined effort to collect assessments before letting them have the money. He would have the power to do what the amendments which do not have votes enough to be adopted would require him to do.

In effect the compromise bill warns the President to use this power wisely.

I do not know whether the President will use this power wisely or not. I hope he will use it wisely, because he can go a long way toward improving the financial condition of the United Nations if he uses the power provided in the compromise bill as he will have the authority to do.

Having helped to work out the compromise amendment, I shall stay with it. I say again, though, that several of the proposed amendments are meritorious from my point of view. Nevertheless, we must face the fact that we do not have enough votes to adopt them. Therefore, let us adopt the compromise amendment.

The bill will then go to the House, where I understand the hurdle will be somewhat higher than in the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it correct to state that the proposal on which the Senate is about to vote is not the Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute but the Miller amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 78, as follows:

[No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Butler	Eastland	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Russell
Capehart	Johnston	Stennis
Cotton	Miller	Thurmond
Dworshak	Murphy	Tower

NAYS—78

Aiken	Fulbright	Metcalf
Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Bartlett	Hart	Morton
Beall	Hartke	Moss
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Bible	Hickey	Muskie
Boggs	Hill	Pastore
Burdick	Holland	Pearson
Bush	Humphrey	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Prouty
Cannon	Javits	Proxmire
Carlson	Jordan	Randolph
Carroll	Keating	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smathers
Church	Kuchel	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Lausche	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Talmadge
Dodd	Mansfield	Wiley
Douglas	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McClellan	Yarborough
Ervin	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	McNamara	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—7

Chavez	Hruska	Williams, N.J.
Engle	Long, La.	
Hickenlooper	Neuberger	

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the amendment to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and, incidentally, may I say, I am delighted, and I am sure every other Senator is, to see him back on the Senate floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I voted against the amendment offered by my beloved colleague from Iowa primarily because I thought that it could be considered an invitation to some nations to become delinquent in their dues and then expect to come to Uncle Sam to enable them to pay their dues, and thereby create a situation that should not exist.

Mr. President, from what one hears and reads, a speech at this time will change no votes. But as students of today and tomorrow read what is said here, there may be some value in recording one's thought at this time when a vote nears on an issue that has enduring implications.

Although some might see in a vote against the so-called compromise plan a vote unfriendly to the United Nations, for myself I specifically disclaim such an attitude. It was my resolution in the House of Representatives in 1945 (H. Con. Res. 75) which was approved there on December 10, 1945, and concurred in by the Senate on motion by my distinguished predecessor, Senator Gurney, next day, which invited the homeless organization to make its headquarters in the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] will recall he had a similar resolution pending in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but in the interest of prompt action, when the infant United Nations was floundering, he specifically supported prompt concurrence in the action of the House.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the proceedings of the House of Representatives on December 10, 1945, and of the Senate on December 11, 1945, dealing with the adoption of the resolution which I had introduced, inviting the United Nations to make its headquarters in the United States, may follow my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, subsequently I urged and supported the initial appropriation of $75 million to get the headquarters underway.

So, I speak as an early and continuing friend of the United Nations.

The basic reason why I shall not vote for the so-called compromise bond-or-loan proposal is that this falls too clearly within the danger zone predicted for the United Nations when its headquarters was located here, namely, that tendering and acceptance of such a disproportionate share of its financing from one country tends to make the U.N. beholden to that country and establishes a bad precedent for future action.

At the time when it was proposed that the United Nations locate within the United States, many people feared this would tend to make the United Nations subservient to, or dominant in, the foreign policy of the United States.

I may say that a distinguished Member of the Senate the other day, in a speech before the National Press Club, expressed some fears in that regard, so these fears have been brought out to some extent in practice.

If I recall correctly, the then President, Harry S. Truman was among those who felt some misgivings on that score, but he waived them for the sake of getting the organization on to a functioning basis.

The United Nations, Mr. President, should not be in the vest pocket of the foreign minister or secretary of state of any member nation—nor cornered in the portfolio of the treasury of any single country, either. The pending proposal does not go that far, but it does, in my judgment, make the United Nations too largely dependent upon one nation, that is, the United States, and creates for us in future crises a weakening of independent judgment. It also would create a precedent for other members to vote obligations and undertakings while sending the bill to Uncle Sam.

We would become, to a greater extent than I think wise, the bailer-out for unhappy adventures.

Mr. President, the question of the extent to which a society of nations should undertake to pass judgment on civil and internal affairs of other countries came to my attention early. Forty-six years ago this spring, as a sophomore in college, it was my privilege to participate in an intercollegiate oratorical contest held at Lake Mohonk, N.Y., in connection with a conference on international arbitration.

At that, for me, unforgettable experience, I heard an impromptu debate between William Howard Taft and William Jennings Bryan, upon the merits of a League To Enforce Peace. Mr. Taft was the immediate past President of the United States; Mr. Bryan was Woodrow Wilson's recently resigned Secretary of State.

I recall that the point which Mr. Taft sought to make quite clearly, because it was the problem point then, became the problem point for the League of Nations later and is the problem point for the United Nations today.

"Some folks," Mr. Taft said, "object to the word 'enforce.' They think the organization should be merely a League for Peace." Mr. Taft urged retention of the concept of enforcing peace.

But though in idealism the enforcement of peace sounds attractive, the blunt lesson of history is that the enforcer is likely to be regarded as having predatory interests by people against whom the enforcement takes place.

This was so when the Holy Alliance fell apart. It was so when Prince Metternich's theory of legitimacy for the status quo failed. It was the stubborn rock of suspicion on which the League of Nations grounded.

The Senate of the United States refused to adhere to the League unless we retained the right to determine for ourselves whether affairs were internal or external and whether they involved a surrender of national sovereignty. And without the Pepper reservations we would not join the simply named League of Nations, although the enforcement of peace was not a rigid provision of its covenant.

The lessons left by those experiments presumably were solidly learned.

I recall hearing Henry Cabot Lodge, while ambassador to the United Nations, speaking in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on the 10th anniversary of its birth, say that the principles of sovereignty for which his grandfather had contended in the historic debates on the League of Nations had been accepted as the premise on which the Charter of the United Nations was written. This was that major decisions on the use of force rested in the Security Council where the permanent members held veto power.

And, for myself, I am of the opinion that the shifting of such decisions to the General Assembly was an unfortunate resort to expediency.

The current problem as to whether nations delinquent in their dues or assessments may vote might be resolved, I suggest, by requiring, first, that motions to employ the United Nations Emergency Forces in any situation be once and for all declared to be "substantive matters" to pass which a two-thirds majority is needed and, second, that no member be permitted to vote on "substantive matters" unless that nation is current in its payment of all dues and assessments.

It remains desirable, I think, to have as many of these problems of peace enforcement as possible settled in the Security Council. Only when the Security Council lacked sufficient unanimity for effective action should the decision

go to the General Assembly. But there the basic rule should be that any peace enforcement action must be regarded as a substantive matter, that a two-thirds majority must approve it before action is taken. Beyond that, the vote on such matters requiring a two-thirds majority for approval should be taken only among those members whose dues and obligations are paid for the current year.

A matter neither commanding adequate unanimity of support for approval by the Security Council nor commanding a two-thirds majority of the dues-paying members of the General Assembly for effective action would not be a matter for United Nations action, but should be left to such regionally interested powers as might feel compelled by reason of regional interest to take action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the final analysis, a nation whose self-interest dictates that it take police action must answer to the public opinion of the world as to whether its action is right. Such a rule, I submit, would have a salutary effect on problems such as now exist and others that may arise. For, Mr. President, if there is one thing the United Nations needs today it is to learn fiscal responsibilty.

Many of my colleagues will remember the one-man teacher on that subject who used to remind the House of Representatives almost daily that bills incurred have to be paid. His name was Bob Rich, a Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania. His favorite speech had one ringing question: "Where are you going to get the money?"

The United Nations needs nothing more badly today than it needs a lesson on fiscal responsibility; that when expeditions are undertaken, they must be paid for.

And, Mr. President, if there is no other way for the lesson to be learned, it might be the part of wisdom and experience to let the creditors of the United Nations today, including the United States, to continue to carry the accounts until the debts can be retired in a normal set-aside from annual revenues.

At least, I hope that the expression of these observations may help to induce some caution against courses that could carry the United Nations down the road to destruction by over-extension into ill-advised adventures.

Mr. President none of us wants to delay the advent of world peace.

The brutality of war is etched vividly in the memory of every Member of the Senate through some experience or other. Many have seen war's inhumanity on the field of battle itself. Others have seen it in the mountainous cemetery of a million bodies at Verdun and Ypres. Others have felt it in the walled city of Old Warsaw or the reminders of Hiroshima. All have known the anguish of broken families and orphaned children. A hundred place names remind us of the supreme sacrifice of young Americans from the bloodied beaches of Normandy to the bitterly won islands in the Pacific, sacrifices that touched every home in America.

Our response to the call of people for peace should employ the lessons of experience in molding and developing international organization and action. It is my judgment that in this area we should move forward but not too rapidly.

We must not forget that were there no right of revolution our own country would not have been born; that where there is no opportunity for peaceful change there will be change by force; that young nations may be expected to have some growing pains even as we did under the Articles of Confederation before we adopted a Constitution to form a more perfect union; that even so lovely a thing as the United Nations needs to learn the lessons of fiscal responsibility and to adapt its programs to its pocketbook and its commitments to its capabilities.

This generation is seeing a new age born—the age of space—but there will remain for all time the nature of men and nations. By applying the lessons of history to the problems of the present, and by recognizing the place of the Infinite in the shaping of events, we shall reach the true grandeur of the United Nations.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House of Representatives, Dec. 10, 1945]

PROCEEDINGS ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 75

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the morning press reports that the vote of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations Organization on whether or not the headquarters of the United Nations will be in the United States is to take place by the middle of the week; but reports over the weekend indicate that there is some uncertainty among the members about voting because there is lacking an official statement on the part of the United States as to its desires in the matter. Naturally the United Nations want to have an official expression to indicate that the headquarters will be welcome here.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the leadership to the fact that on the 5th of September I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 75 which proposed that the United Nations be and hereby are invited to locate the site of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America. In view of the pendency of this question in London by the middle of the week, I hope the leadership will call for immediate consideration of the resolution.

[From the RECORD of House proceedings later in the day, Dec. 10, 1945]

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 75.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the United Nations be, and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America."

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED NATIONS INVITED

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. 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 South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, by the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 75 unanimously, the House of Representatives gives to the United Nations an official and hearty expression of welcome to place the headquarters of the new world organization in the United States of America.

As I stated in my remarks earlier today, the United Nations' Preparatory Commission sitting in London will vote by midweek on item No. 1 of its executive committee proposals which recommended that the headquarters of the new world organization be placed in the United States. The press reports this morning indicated a hesitancy on the part of some members of the Preparatory Commission to vote since there has been "lacking an official statement of the United States desires on a UNO site."

Adoption of the resolution should settle any uncertainty on that score, and I feel certain that it represents the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States in saying: "That the United Nations be and hereby are invited to locate the site of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America."

This resolution was introduced in September following the unanimous action of 44 of the Nation's 48 Governors in adopting a similar statement when meeting at Mackinac Island. The only reason congressional action has not been taken earlier, it may be said, is that shortly after the resolution was introduced, a subcommittee of the Preparatory Commission voted overwhelmingly to place the headquarters in the United States, and it was here thought that any formal action by the Congress might be considered out of place as dealing with a matter already acted upon by UNO.

In the past 2 weeks, however, representatives from various communities of the United States appearing before the Preparatory Commission in London have reported that some of the Commission's members were under the impression that the headquarters were not wanted in the United States. When the press, this morning, carried such a suggestion, with the vote of confirmation pending this week, it occurred to me that an official statement should be made at once, and could be made by the adoption of the resolution which I had introduced.

Upon consultation, I found that the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCormack, and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Martin, and the Speaker the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Rayburn, were of the same opinion, provided immediate action was agreeable to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

That committee was just adjourning its session when I reached the committee room and presented the matter to the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Bloom, and the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Eaton. The chairman immediately placed the resolution before the committee, which promptly and unanimously voted approval.

The action of the House of Representatives now in passing the resolution by unanimous consent adds further to the wholehearted character of the invitation extended and will be appreciated, I am sure, by the members of the United Nations Organization and its Preparatory Commission.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss any particular site. I merely wish to say that there are many suitable places in this vast country for a headquarters, and to the one that the United Nations chooses, the United States bids a hearty welcome in the earnest hope that such a location will contribute to the great purposes of the United Nations Organization.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. Jonkman asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

[From the proceedings of the Senate on Tuesday, Dec. 11, 1945]

INVITATION TO LOCATE SEAT OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there has just been messaged over from the House of Representatives House Concurrent Resolution 75. I ask that the concurrent resolution may be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 75), as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United Nations, be and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America."

Mr. HILL. I inquire if the Senator from South Dakota is going to request immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GURNEY. It was my intention to make a short explanation and then ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from South Dakota is a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I wonder if he has had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the chairman of that committee.

Mr. GURNEY. In answer I may say I not only had a chance to discuss it with him, but it was also considered by the committee, and I received permission to ask that it be considered on the floor of the Senate this morning, if I could get unanimous consent to that effect.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I was a little late in getting to the Committee on Foreign Relations because I had to attend first a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs and I did not hear the discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee, but, as I understand the Senator from South Dakota, the committee authorized him to call up the resolution and ask for action by the Senate at the earliest practicable moment.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator's statement is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Preparatory Commission is now sitting in London and intends to vote tomorrow on a site for the United Nations Organization. Therefore, while this is a concurrent resolution and is not intended to do more than to convey the sentiment of both Houses of Congress, still it will be a semi-official invitation that the United Nations Organization's capital be located in the United States.

I wish to say that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations this morning approved the concurrent resolution and authorized me to ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the resolution which was adopted by the House yesterday. I therefore express the hope that the Senate will concur in the resolution.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted for House Concurrent Resolution 75, inviting the United Nations Organization to locate the seat of the Organization within the United States of America. This afternoon the Senate is about to adopt this resolution which was agreed to in the House yesterday. The concurrent resolution was introduced on September 5, 1945, by Representative CASE, Republican, of South Dakota.

I am, indeed, happy that in a few moments this resolution will have been adopted by both Houses. For the benefit of the RECORD, however, I should like to note these facts.

On July 12, 1945, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, designed for the same purpose, namely, to invite the United Nations Organization to locate its headquarters in the United States of America. House Concurrent Resolution 75 is identical in wording with my own Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, submitted a month and a half previously. I spoke on the floor of the Senate on this subject on July 12 and also a week later on July 20, 1945.

May I call attention to the fact that this was long before the conferences had reached the final stage for the making of the decision as to where the seat of UNO was to be located? Today the decision hangs in the balance as to whether the seat of the Organization will be located on the free soil of America or on the strife-torn soil of Europe.

I humbly feel that if the Senate had taken action on my own resolution in the period following its introduction there would have been less doubt as to the final decision of the United Nations in this important matter. Instead, the Senate did nothing for 4½ months.

Representative CASE submitted his resolution on September 5, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported it on December 10, the same day that it was adopted by the House.

It is good that the resolution has now cleared both Houses, but I feel that I would be remiss in my responsibilities if I did not point out the fact that the unfortunate delay in acting on my own resolution has left the issue of the location of the seat of the United Nations Organization in doubt at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the House concurrent resolution.

The resolution was concurred in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise primarily to welcome my distinguished colleague [Mr. CASE of South Dakota] back to the Senate after his recent illness. I rejoice, with the rest of my colleagues, to find him recovered, answering roll calls again and to know that we shall continue to have on the floor of the Senate, the benefit of his able mind and his active participation in the serious counsels with which we shall be confronted. It is good to have my distinguished colleague back on the job again.

I also compliment my colleague on the very penetrating address which he gave on this very difficult question. I emphasize one point he made in dramatizing the implied dangers in blank check legislation of any kind pointing up especially the dangers of blank check legislation in the field of international relationships.

It seems to me my colleague stressed a point which has not been sufficiently considered in the debate so far; that is, he has called attention to the position in which this kind of blank check financial concession would place the United States vis-a-vis the United Nations. Once there is given to any nation, including our own, the power to tend to dominate the activities of the United Nations—by veto, by dilatory tactics, or by the power of the purse—I think there is a tendency to destroy the activities and to defeat the ideal of the United Nations. If we pass this so-called substitute without refinement, without spelling out guidelines—and thereby through approving the substitute give to our President the right to negotiate, to dicker, and to jockey with the United Nations as to how much money they would get, under what terms they would get it, the length of time involved, the amount of interest to be paid—at least those who oppose our way of life on the other side of the curtain would have some evidence and substance by which to charge that we are preparing to try to push the United Nations around. To give our President the power to convey or to withhold loans, to give him the power to determine whether the interest rate is exorbitant or almost nonexistent, to place him in position to bargain and barter——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. To give the President the power to negotiate with the U.N. on the basis of whether he will extend the U.N. loan for 100 years, for 25 years or for 5 years would provide those who would do us in with propaganda a Pandora's box of arguments that the Congress of the United States has given to its President the right to try to control, to determine, and to direct the activities of the United Nations by the power of the American purse.

I salute my colleague for emphasizing that argument. I think the U.S. Senate, before it finally approves supplemental financial aid to the United Nations—which I hope it will appropriately and prudently do—should recognize we do damage to the United Nations if we give any individual in the United States an undefined bargaining power which our critics can say can be used by the United States to pervert the United Nations policy, to direct it or to control it.

At least partially in the direction of trying to restrict that kind of latitude, of trying to limit that kind of blank check legislation, of trying to let the whole world know on what basis we propose to aid the United Nations, I have submitted an amendment designated

"4-3-62—A" which, at the appropriate time, I expect to call up and to discuss. My amendment limits the proposed unlimited latitude of the President and prescribes that the United States shall provide this supplementary assistance on the same basis that we provide our regular contributions to the United Nations; namely, that we provide 33⅓ percent of the total.

But I think we have a senatorial responsibility if we are going to prevent the accusation accompanied by a substance of evidence that we are building here a great big American ramrod by which to push the United Nations around or let it starve. In lieu of that, we had better legislate in the open with precision and with detail, so that friend and foe alike will know precisely what kind of fiscal relationship we expect to establish with the United Nations. It should not be an effort which can be distorted by propagandists in unfriendly areas of the world as conveying the authority to bribe or to browbeat other countries to do our bidding in the United Nations or suffer the financial consequences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senate should assume the responsibility of writing a precise, clear and understandable financial arrangement with the United Nations. I would hope that the U.S. Senate should long ago have outgrown the tendency to write blank-check legislation even on domestic affairs. I shudder to think that we may today start initiating at this time a tendency to write blank-check legislation in the international sector.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I allot myself 10 minutes. I had hoped to have voted on my amendment ere this. I had not planned to make any other statement with respect to the amendment, but I walked into the Chamber when the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] had the floor. I listened to him for a while. I wondered what he was discussing. At one stage in his remarks he said that he was referring to the Russell amendment. I did not recognize it from his description.

Since the description was so distorted as to confuse me, I am sure it would confuse the readers of the RECORD. I am therefore compelled to make a brief statement and point out some of the inaccuracies in the Senator's argument.

Among other things, he strongly implied, if he did not say, that if the Senate agreed to such an amendment as the one I have proposed, American troops would be illegally in Vietnam. The Senator knows or he ought to know that the American forces in Vietnam are not there under any ruling, order, law, or regulation that is even remotely connected with the United Nations. They are there under a law that was passed by Congress with respect to military training missions under the Mutual Assistance Acts many years ago. Their presence in that country has no connection whatever with the United Nations. The question as to the size of the mission and other questions of that character are not spelled out in the law. My amendment would have absolutely no effect on such missions as that in which we are now engaged in Vietnam.

The Senator undertook to brush aside section 6 of the bill, which clearly states that no troops, military facilities, or equipment shall be furnished except pursuant to an agreement made by the President and approved by the Congress. He said that provision would have nothing to do with sending them in, if a fire broke out in a country.

I wish to read briefly from Report No. 717, 79th Congress, of the Committee on Foreign Relations when they reported the bill to determine whether there was any restriction placed on the President of the United States:

USE OF ARMED FORCES

Section 6 of the bill concerns the important question of the supply of armed force to the Security Council. It deals with two problems in this respect which were the subject of considerable discussion during the course of the consideration of the charter in this committee and in the Senate last July.

The first part of section 6 would authorize the President to negotiate a military agreement or agreements with the Security Council for the purposes and within the limits prescribed by article 43 of the charter. While in constitutional terms, the prior authorization of the Congress is not needed to enable the President to negotiate an international agreement—particularly when such an agreement is necessary in order to give effect to existing treaty obligations—the committee believed it desirable that on a matter of this scope and importance the Congress should record its views in advance. In this way the President may proceed with full assurance that the Congress as a whole desires an agreement to be entered into on this subject. At the same time the bill, by providing that the Congress shall approve any such agreement or agreements as may be negotiated, insures that the Congress will have full opportunity to pass upon the terms and provisions thereof.

The bill provides that such approval by Congress shall be expressed by appropriate act or joint resolution. During the debate in the Senate on the charter last July, there was considerable discussion as to whether the military agreements should be considered as treaties or whether they might be approved by the Congress through the joint resolution procedure. The preponderant view was that the latter procedure was preferable since the agreements would be entered into for the purpose of giving effect to the obligation assumed by this country under article 43 of the charter to make available to the Security Council the armed force necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Under this view, the precise details of the obligation—such as the exact amount of the forces to be contributed and the places where they are to be stationed—is not a matter for treaty consideration but for legislative sanction by the Congress under its constitutional powers to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces (art. 1, sec. 8, pars. 12, 13, and 14 of the Constitution). There were those who expressed a preference for the treaty method of considering these agreements, but all were agreed on the basic proposition that the military agreements could not be entered into solely by Executive action. On the last day of the debate in the Senate, July 28, the President, then attending the Potsdam Conference—

And that refers to President Truman—

sent a message to the Congress in which he stated that "When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated, it will be my purpose to ask the Congress by appropriate legislation to approve them." The committee believes that it is desirable to determine this question once and for all, and that it is appropriate to specify that the military agreement or agreements should be submitted for approval to the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first paragraph appearing on page 9 of the committee report to which I have referred likewise be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

In order that there may be no doubt about the availability of our Armed Forces, the committee believed it wise that the Congress should in this legislation confirm its view that the President has the power and obligation, in compliance with our undertaking under the charter, to make the forces provided in the agreements available to the Security Council. This act on the part of the Congress will contribute not only to public understanding within the United States but will also serve notice upon the world that as a nation we are prepared to carry out our obligations promptly and effectively. At the same time the committee felt it important to make it clear that nothing contained in the statute should be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purposes, armed forces in addition to such as may be provided for in the military agreements.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from New York then referred to the proviso in section 7. It so happens that the proviso was added by amendment in 1949. With respect to that language the committee said:

MAIN PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENTS

The main purpose of the amendments is to add greater flexibility to the U.S. representation in the Security Council and to strengthen our representation to meet the increased volume of work handled by our United Nations mission at Lake Success.

I ask Senators to listen to the following statement:

A new section 7 reaffirms and clarifies the authority of the President to authorize the detail to the United Nations of a limited number of personnel of the armed services for noncombatant purposes and the furnishing by the National Military Establishment of equipment and assistance in connection with the activities of the United Nations.

All of this statement makes interesting reading. I refer to page 5, and I read the following sentence:

The committee also notes that the assistance provided by section 7 is limited to U.N. activities directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes under either chapter VI or VII of the charter, but does not apply to activities involving the employment of armed forces by the U.N.

In other words, the committee at that time said that unless these agreements had been made and approved by the Congress, nothing could be furnished in the event armed forces were employed by the United Nations, unless the act had been approved by the Congress. I direct the attention of the Senate to the

language of the committee report, which reads as follows:

EFFECT OF NEW SECTION 7

The new section 7 is designed, therefore, to clarify the authority and the terms under which services and supplies may be made available to the U.N. by the United States, so as to eliminate any question regarding control, the right of personnel to receive allowances, and the right of the United States to seek reimbursement. Nothing in this bill obligates or commits the United States to detail personnel or to lend equipment in any circumstances; that is a matter entirely in the discretion of the President. The President may comply with a request by the U.N. for personnel and equipment upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be appropriate, and only when he finds that it is consistent with the interests of the United States to comply with such request. The committee also notes that the assistance provided by section 7 is limited to U.N. activities directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes under either chapter VI or VII of the charter, but does not apply to activities involving the employment of armed forces by the U.N.

DETAIL OF PERSONNEL

The bill limits to 1,000 the number of U.S. military personnel which may be detailed to the U.N. at any one time. In the past, the maximum number detailed at a given time was about half this figure, but it appears desirable to anticipate the possible needs of the foreseeable future.

While assigned to the United Nations, and subject to the control of the United Nations for the purposes of a particular operation, military personnel detailed retain all their rights as members of the Armed Forces of the United States. The bill assures that the individual will suffer no loss from being assigned to the United Nations, that he will retain the rights and perquisites which pertain to his status as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States acting in the capacity to which he is assigned by the United States, including ordinary military allowances, insurance, and disability benefits. At the same time the bill would permit administrative arrangements whereby the United Nations might undertake to pay some of the allowances directly to the individual.

LOAN OF SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

The bill also provides for the loan to the U.N. of the fair share of the United States of any supplies and equipment needed in connection with the activities of the field commission. The equipment contemplated by this provision includes transportation and communication equipment used by the Armed Forces. No combat equipment would be supplied pursuant to this section. It is also contemplated that the United States might offer services of a noncombatant character, such as the furnishing of transport facilities to carry personnel and equipment or to maintain liaison. It should be noted that the bill establishes that the United States shall supply a fair share of equipment and supplies contributed to the U.N. in a particular operation. This is not intended to impose a strict limitation, but only to assert the principle that assistance to the U.N. is an obligation of all members. The committee is aware, of course, that in some instances, the United States might have to be or even wish to be the primary source of such assistance.

REIMBURSEMENT TO UNITED STATES

Ordinarily, assistance rendered to the U.N. under these provisions will be on the basis of reimbursement to the United States for any direct and additional expenses which the United States may incur as a result of granting such assistance. This is not intended to include a charge for the loan of equipment, or other costs not attributable to the U.N. operation, such as the salaries of the military personnel which the United States would have paid even if these individuals had not been assigned to the United Nations. The committee also recognized that there may be exceptional circumstances in which a requirement of reimbursement might impede the operation of a commission, or be otherwise contrary to the interests of the United States. The committee decided, therefore, that reimbursement shall not be an absolute condition and that the matter can be left to the discretion of the Executive.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE BY UNITED STATES

It should be reemphasized that the assistance contemplated under section 7 of the amended bill relates solely to the peaceful settlement of disputes and does not relate to the use of armed forces as contemplated in chapter VII of the charter. This limitation is specifically stated in the first sentence of the new section.

The House committee report contained practically identical language.

So I say that the language which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] denounced as being such a violent limitation on the President is not any stronger than the law has provided since 1945, at a time when Congress had some self-respect, when it was willing to assume its duty to maintain our Armed Forces and to meet its constitutional duty to commit those forces to combat, and before it had become so supine and spineless as to delegate every portion of our constitutional authority to almost any little bureaucrat who may come in here and ask for it.

I said there is a limitation on the President. I wish to point out this very carefully worded language in my amendment:

SEC. 2. From and after the enactment of this act, no official of the United States or any other person acting in behalf of the United States shall be authorized to permit the use of any military equipment or materiel belonging to the United States or to order the participation of any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in any military action instituted by the United Nations unless and until such use or participation has been authorized by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States if the Congress shall be in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield myself an additional minute.

There is nothing new in this provision which will circumvent the power of the President any more than the existing law does. To be perfectly frank about it, I put this provision in the amendment to see how many Senators and how much of the press would rise up and say, "Here he is, trying to tie the President's hands," when it has been the law of the land ever since 1945.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee, on the Russell substitute.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the pending amendment has introduced into the debate matters upon which I feel I should address a few remarks to the Senate.

Before doing so I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact I have just had delivered to me on the floor of the Senate a rather lengthy cablegram from Mr. Moise Tshombe, President of the provincial government of Katanga. I do not believe it has any particular bearing upon the pending issue, or that any such bearing was intended. However, lest someone think I am trying to suppress a message from Mr. Tshombe, I will leave it here on my desk for all my colleagues in the Senate to read.

First I should like to say a few words with respect to the amendment offered by the distinguished and able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Then I should like to express a few sentiments with respect to the United Nations action and the U.S. support of those actions in the Congo.

The amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia contains two sections. The first section proposes to abolish or to waive the $30 million debt which the United Nations owes to the United States. This is entirely unnecessary. Under the original United Nations Participation Act of 1945, the President of the United States has the authority to waive this obligation on the part of the United Nations.

Adoption of the amendment would, in my opinion, constitute an outright refusal of the United States to participate in the United Nations bond issue. It would repudiate the United Nations bond plan. It would preclude the purchase by the United States of any United Nations bonds, and this at a time when 53 other nations as of April 5 have either bought, agreed to buy, or pledged almost $62 million of the proposed issuance of United Nations bonds.

Second, the amendment would not permit the lending of any money to the United Nations. It would provide no money whatever to the United Nations to relieve its financial difficulty.

I hope that the Members of the Senate will realize the gravity of the amendment if adopted. It would not provide $1 of new money for the relief of the financial predicament of the United Nations. It may be that the Senate, after careful consideration, wishes to do that. I submit that it would be a serious step.

As is true with many other Members of the Senate, certain United Nations actions, both in the Congo and otherwise, have not been to my liking. However, let us consider the alternatives. Suppose that the United Nations falters and falls into bankruptcy over the Congo. What are the consequences? First, the Prime Minister of the Congo, Mr. Adoula, and the head of the provincial government of Katanga, are now in the midst of delicate negotiations, as attested to by the cablegram to which I have just referred. If the Senate should today refuse to provide a single dollar in assistance to relieve the financial predicament of the United Nations, I venture to suggest that such action would torpedo the negotiations now underway in Léopoldville.

Serious as that consequence might be, the amendment also provides a repeal of a portion of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, I believe, in 1949.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has addressed some remarks to the Senate regarding the power of the

President to use U.S. troops. I call to the attention of the Senate that the amendment of the distinguished Senator not only applies to the use of troops of the United States, but goes further than that. Let me read from page 2 of the amendment:

From and after the enactment of this act, no official of this Government or any other person acting in behalf of the United States shall be authorized to permit the use of any military equipment or materiel belonging to the United States.

The materiel and equipment now in use by the United Nations in the Congo is largely of U.S. origin. So let no one be misled: The adoption of this amendment, if finally written into the law, would foredoom the United Nations program in the Congo.

What would the consequences of such action be? Perhaps our memories are a little short. Perhaps we should review, even briefly, the reasons for the presence of the United Nations in the Congo and the U.S. support of that program.

The leading Belgian statesman of today, M. Spaak, conceded in a speech to the United Nations that Belgium had not properly prepared the people of the Congo for independence before independence was granted. To whatever degree one may assess the onus for that, the fact stands that almost immediately after the granting of independence to the Congo under a provisional constitution, rioting broke out, law and order broke down, and insurrection of the armed forces occurred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Not only was there insurrection in the armed forces of the so-called central government in Léopoldville; there was insurrection in Katanga, where several blocks of Elisabethville were burned and pillaged and razed. Rape, murder, pillage, theft, and rioting broke out rather generally throughout the Congo. Tribal warfare became bitter and bloody. Perhaps the most serious threat was from the so-called armed forces themselves.

What happened then? The Government of the Congo cabled an emergency appeal to the United Nations to send forces to reestablish law and order. But not only did the Government of the Congo petition for intervention by the United Nations; the Government of the Congo several days later also sent the following cablegram to the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev:

We have to ask the Soviet Union's intervention should the Western camp not stop this aggression.

This was in response to the return of Belgian troops. I do not wish to criticize Belgium for returning troops, because the lives and property of Belgian citizens were in danger. Indeed, Belgians were already losing their lives, not only in Léopoldville, but also in Elisabethville and other places. Nevertheless, there was a violent reaction in the Congo to the return of Belgian troops.

Former President Eisenhower rejected intervention by the United States. He said:

Any assistance to the Government of the Congo should be through the United Nations and not by any unilateral action by any one country, the United States included.

So the decision was made—and I think rightly—that the United Nations should undertake the mission to restore law and order to those people so newly independent, but found so unqualified for it.

But the Soviet Union did not feel that way. Lest Senators forget, soon after independence the Soviets were pouring equipment, men, political agents, and money into the Congo. Every Ilyushin arriving was loaded with political agents and instruments of subversion. There they hoped to establish a beachhead of communism in the heart of Africa.

What followed? The late Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, called upon the Soviet Union to stop its political aggression and subversion. The Soviets refused to stop. Mr. Hammarskjold, in an act of courage, but an effective action, closed all the airports in the Congo to all air traffic except that of the United Nations.

Then the President of the Congo, Mr. Kasavubu, who, in my opinion, has not been given sufficient credit for the courage of his acts—and I think the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] will concur with me in this statement—went to the radio station and fired Lumumba. It was President Kasavubu, acting on his own, who directed Colonel Mobutu to tell the agents of communism to get out of the Congo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate to review the situation in detail. Permit me to conclude by saying that I believe the relative success of the United Nations operation in the Congo—tragic as that operation has been in a number of instances, with its mistakes, with its heartaches—has been the greatest defeat administered to Khrushchev in a decade. The Congo is not now a beachhead for communism in the heart of Africa.

We have not supported the secession of Katanga; we have opposed it. There is no legal basis, there is no moral basis, there is no practical basis for the secession of Katanga, any more than there is a legal, moral, or practical basis for the secession of northern Katanga, where some Balubas have wanted to secede from the Province of Katanga; any more than there is a supportable basis for the secession of Oriental Province or Kasai Province. We have supported the unity of the Congo; we have supported the peace of the Congo; and we hope ultimately that this will result in the economic prosperity of the Congo.

The Congo operation has not been without bloodshed, without mistake, or without blame; but, overall, it has been more successful than we had any right to expect. It is a program which has been supported by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. It is a program which has been endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Nations.

Now we have come to the pass where the United Nations will become bankrupt without additional funds. The U.S. representative to the United Nations proposes a bond issue as a means of financing; it is a borrowing of money. Fifty-three nations have now agreed to buy their reasonable proportion, their reasonable share, of the bonds. It is proposed that the United States do likewise.

The pending amendment would forbid the lending of a single dollar, the purchase of a single bond, or the furnishing of any new money whatsoever.

Mr. President, let us make no mistake about it: We are about to vote on the question of stopping or continuing the program of the United Nations in the Congo and in various other parts of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am authorized to speak for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in connection with allotment of the time.

I now yield myself—for the Senator from Georgia—10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, first I wish to commend and compliment very highly the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for the preparation of his amendment, for the preparation he has made on this subject, and for the presentation of the points involved in his amendment in the course of the very fine speech he made yesterday. Unfortunately, at that time I was unable to be in the Chamber, due to the pressure of other duties, although previously I had made a firm statement to the effect that I would be here on the floor.

Mr. President, it has been quite a number of years since I first came to the Senate; that was in 1947. But from that time until this, there has not been a real debate on the floor of the Senate in regard to the United Nations. From that standpoint alone, certainly this amendment has served a good purpose. During that period of time the United Nations has greatly increased the size of its membership. At first its membership comprised only 51 nations. Since then we have passed various statutes dealing with it and we have formulated various policies in regard to it.

The original plan was that the United Nations would operate primarily through the Security Council. Since that time the membership of the United Nations has increased, until today it includes 104 nations. Thus, its membership is now more than double what it originally was.

As an illustration of how little the legislative branch of our Government—including the Senate—has had to do with the United Nations, I point out that we have had virtually nothing to

do with it during the period when its membership has more than doubled, although our country has paid, now pays, and is assessed with, approximately half of its operating costs. However, I am not complaining about that.

I shall speak quite briefly, and I wish every Senator might have a chance to state exactly how he feels about the problems involved in the United Nations—problems which, as we know, have no absolute answers.

Certainly I do not favor destruction of the United Nations. After all, I was one of its original sponsors—at a time long before I became a Member of this body; and I then shared, with so many others, too many illusions about how much the United Nations would be able to accomplish. Along with the others, I am disappointed because the United Nations has not been able to accomplish more—even though I realize that originally we expected too much of it. We know that a large part of the responsibility for its limited accomplishments is due to the failure of the Russians to go along with its real purpose.

But the point I make at this time is that our entire group of laws dealing with the United Nations needs to be reviewed and reevaluated in view of the changing world conditions and the changing membership of the United Nations, and the better knowledge we now have of that Organization.

The financial matter under consideration is, I believe, incidental; but if we now pass over and more or less sweep under the rug all the problems to which I have referred, which definitely affect the United Nations, by merely agreeing to a bond issue, and if we thus postpone to some uncertain future time the making of these necessary evaluations, I believe we shall lend uncertainty to the future of the Organization, and shall tend to weaken it, rather than strengthen it.

So it is my plea that we evaluate these matters now—not only the financial problems, but also others which go with them.

Today we are operating, insofar as the United Nations is concerned, under laws which no longer apply, and which do not meet the problems which have arisen.

So I welcome the debate, as far as it goes; and certainly the Russell amendment stops things as they are now, and provides that such problems can be dealt with, so that the United Nations can continue.

The Russell amendment will solve the financial problem in part, and will throw all the other problems into an issue subject to reevaluation.

Let me refer quite briefly to the pertinent laws to which I have referred—for instance, section 287(d) of title 22 of the United States Code. It provides certain authority with reference to special agreements worked out with the Security Council. However, that law does not function today, because there can be no such agreements with the Security Council.

The same section also states that an agreement is necessary in order to make it applicable. Therefore, we have to disregard that part of section 287(d).

So, Mr. President, after all, we are forced to rely on one rather obscure part of section 287(d) of this title of the code—one which provides that the President has authority to make available, upon request, personnel in a noncombatant capacity, not to exceed 100 troops at any one time, and certain nonmilitary facilities. It seems to me that the slimness of that authority constitutes one of the best arguments which can be made here in favor of a reappraisal of the entire matter, in view of the new problems, so as to provide modern law which will apply on a sounder basis.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield briefly to the Senator from Arkansas, although I am speaking in limited time, and I have another appointment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know the Senator from Mississippi has great respect for the traditional procedures of this body. Is it not proper for an amendment of this seriousness to be presented to the appropriate committee? Yet, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, it has not had any committee consideration, and it does involve, as he has pointed out, a very serious question. Will he not agree that such a question should be subjected to committee consideration, committee hearings, and testimony in committee, before the Senate acts on it?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; it would suit me much better if the matter had been presented to the appropriate committee, and certainly I do not mistrust the committee or anything of the sort. I assume that if the Senate were to adopt the amendment now, such action would very quickly result in some extensive hearings and studies, not only by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but also by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I also assume that no such proposal would become law until it had received more extensive study by very fine, capable, and well-qualified minds.

I point out that this is the first time, during all the years since Senate ratification of the United Nations Charter, that there has been substantial debate on the floor of the Senate in regard to the United Nations. I do not favor killing the United Nations. I think someday we may have to build up an outside organization, in order to try to take the place of the United Nations in the free world. However, I do not want to try to cripple the United Nations now, in the least.

But the Russell amendment constitutes a way to consider the subject; and we shall not do so if we proceed otherwise from year to year, and thus sweep the problems involved under the rug.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield further, let me ask whether he agrees that section 2 of the Russell amendment is quite irrelevant to the new subject matter of this measure?

Mr. STENNIS. At the beginning of my remarks, I believe, I said that two questions are involved. One of them is the financial question. The other is a reevaluation of our laws which relate to the United Nations. The Russell amendment touches both of those subjects, and puts both of them squarely at issue.

The Senator from Mississippi thinks they should have far more extensive consideration and determination than the bond issue solely will have, particularly in its present form.

Mr. President, my time is limited. There is one further point I wish to mention. The Senator from Mississippi has been greatly impressed by the experiences of certain members of our Armed Forces who have been sent out on United Nations missions. They were not intended to be truly combat missions, but those men have been shot at. They have been under fire indirectly, but they are shot just the same. I still cling to the old-fashioned opinion that when any man is in one of the U.S. services and wears an American uniform, the American uniform is supposed to go with him and protect him wherever he goes, or whatever his mission is.

When we abandon that policy, we show weakness all over the world, and we lay the groundwork for a much more serious situation.

Only 18 months ago, two fine Air Force captains, one of them being from the State of the Senator from Tennessee, personally told me in my office, at my request—it was not as a result of their complaint—about flying a United Nations cargo mission, in a U.S. plane, into one of the places of trouble. As they went into the area, they learned that the rest of the crew had been captured. They, too, were captured and thrown into prison. As they lay huddled on the floor, soldiers came in to where they were, sticking their bayonets into the latrine, where they were imprisoned, and cursing and hitting them. A little Korean nurse intervened, and, through her influence, they were saved. They were not killed, but were brought back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield myself 1 more minute.

We vote into law a Selective Service Act that puts these men in the service, and then we send them all over the world. We should affirm, with more definite agreements than are now in effect, and before this situation goes any further, certain positive policies within the United Nations, or preferably within the United States, that the power of the United States will follow these men wherever they go, so long as we put a button with the letters "USA" on their uniforms, and assure them that they are entitled to the absolute protection, in any way it can be given, of the power of the United States and of its fighting forces.

My plea is for a reevaluation of the applicable statutes and policies, as well as financial features of the law. The Russell amendment puts them in issue.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, when the Senator from Mississippi completes his statement, I should like to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Mississippi is chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. I am very much concerned over a statement in the paper today concerning the National Guard. I was about to ask the Senator if he cares to say whether his subcommittee is to hold hearings on the order which was issued by the Army. I will not press the question if he has not given it any thought.

Mr. STENNIS. I read the headlines in the newspapers. That is as much as I know about the subject. I would naturally consult with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services to see if he intends to take up the question.

Mr. BUSH. I discussed it with the chairman of that committee [Mr. RUSSELL]. He suggested that I ask the Senator from Mississippi the question. I shall not press the Senator for an answer. I suggest that the Senator consider holding hearings.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I know of his interest in the subject. We shall review the situation, and I shall confer with the Senator from Connecticut.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield me some time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Not more than 5 minutes. I was hoping the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would be present in the Chamber. I have sent a page boy to find him.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Perhaps the Senator from Arizona can start speaking, in the hope that the Senator from Georgia will later come into the Chamber.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I live in eternal hope; and, knowing the Senator from Georgia, I am sure he will come.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the Senator from Arizona wish?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] entering the Chamber. I wished to address myself very briefly in support of his amendment and to point out a news release that came to me from my hometown newspaper, the Arizona Republic, carrying the dateline Geneva, UPI, March 31.

I shall read first from the amendment itself, and then from the release, and ask the Senator from Georgia if he is not fortified even more than ever in the conviction that his amendment should be adopted.

The amendment of the Senator from Georgia reads, in section 2:

> From and after the enactment of this Act, no official of the United States or any other person acting in behalf of the United States shall be authorized to permit the use of any military equipment or materiel belonging to the United States or to order the participation of any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in any military action instituted by the United Nations unless and until such use or participation has been authorized by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States if the Congress shall be in session.

Mr. President, I discussed the news release to which I have referred earlier on the floor with the distinguished majority leader and with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is handling the bill on the floor; and both of them admitted, as I had to admit, that all they know about it is from the clipping I received.

Before I read it, let me say that this morning I asked both Secretary Rusk and Mr. Foster, who is Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, if there is any truth to the story. It is now 3:15 in the afternoon, and I have received no answer. I have been told that they are trying to get an answer. I suggest that such a major pronouncement as this should be pretty well known to the Agency.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me read the article first. Then I shall be happy to yield.

The article reads:

> The United States will submit to the Geneva disarmament conference a plan calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years and their replacement by a United Nations force, reliable sources said yesterday.
>
> The American plan is to be submitted to the 17-nation group to counter a Soviet draft treaty for general and complete disarmament within 4 years, introduced when the conference opened here 2 weeks ago.

I shall not bother with the rest of the article, because I put it in the RECORD earlier today; but the thing that disturbs me, if there is any substance to the UPI statement coming from Geneva, is that not only is the amendment of the Senator from Georgia needed, but the Congress should take a hard look at any suggestion that the United States abandon its military forces within 9 years in favor of their conversion into a United Nations force.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is the first I have heard of such a suggestion by an official of the Government. I admit that the Constitution of the United States has lost its appeal to a great many people, particularly Members of Congress and some of the judiciary, but such an aim could not be accomplished without still further distorting or forgetting the Constitution, or winding up by putting it in the Smithsonian Institution along with other abandoned articles, without its being changed.

The Constitution says that is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States. I can assure the Senator that, as one Member of this body, I shall oppose with all my strength any proposal which would disband the Armed Forces of the United States, which, after all, are what is maintaining world peace. We can talk all we please about the various agreements—and I have supported most of them, and support them now—but the element which is maintaining peace and preventing a major war today is the armed might of the United States of America, led by the Strategic Air Command. If ever we were to subscribe to any such theory as that, the world would be quickly taken over by the Communists, who teach, as they do, that it is a noble thing to tell a lie if it serves the purposes of the Soviet Government.

I would rather approve the 4-year disarmament, if it carried complete inspection, than to adopt any such policy as the Senator has read.

The number of those who favor one world and one government, who proudly proclaim themselves as being very liberal when construing the Constitution of the United States, is increasing considerably, but I do not believe that the people of the United States would tolerate any such thing as that for 5 minutes, anywhere along the line, if made by any man in public life today—and we have some very popular figures. Our people do peculiar things at times, but, after all, basically they are very sound. If we were to submit the American people to any such agreement as that, it would put this country at the mercy of the Soviet Union, and to do so it would be necessary to transform the way of thinking of the majority of the people of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Georgia. He gave the answer I expected him to give.

I wish to reiterate my statement that if the statement to which I have referred is true—and I am not saying it is, though it is stated that it came from a reliable source—we should know about it. It is now 3:20 o'clock in the afternoon. I have had no notification from the State Department or from the Disarmament Agency that the story is incorrect. I suggest again that any policy of a major nature such as this should be known all down through those organizations, and we should not have to wait for Mr. Rusk or for Mr. Foster to return to his office.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would think that the executive branch might believe it to be of advantage to take some one Member of the Congress into its confidence on a matter as momentous as this. Some years ago Congress was a coordinate and equal branch of the Government. Of course, it is not today, because we have surrendered so many of our duties, responsibilities, and prerogatives. However, I find it difficult to believe the executive branch would have embarked on any such scheme as that without at least having told our distinguished majority leader something.

Mr. MANSFIELD rose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have stated earlier in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Arizona that I knew nothing about this story. The Senator's pronouncement on the floor is based on a UPI dispatch, which is based in turn on reliable information. This

morning was the first I had heard about it.

I can assure the Senator that he will receive an answer to his request both from the State Department and from the Disarmament Agency before the afternoon has passed. I have not talked to them directly, but I have asked the people on my staff to do so, and they have received that assurance. I am sure that if the communication comes direct to the Senator, he will get it. If it comes to me, I shall see that he gets it right away.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had a call from the Assistant Secretary of State a short while ago. He told me he had heard about this as a result of the colloquy on the floor of the Senate, and that an endeavor was being made to get us an answer as soon as possible.

I thoroughly disbelieve the report. It is not only unthinkable, I say to the Senator from Georgia, that the United States would do away with its Army, but it is also unthinkable that almost any other country in the world would not maintain some kind of a force for the preservation of law and order, at least from an internal standpoint. I do not believe any disarmament plan would go to the extent of disbanding national armies.

Mr. RUSSELL. When the Armed Forces got down to the point of including only those sufficient to maintain law and order in this country, it would be a force far short of providing protection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The report refers to the disbanding of national armies. I thoroughly disbelieve it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator. Will the Senator yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator 2 more minutes from the time on the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am encouraged by the reports from both my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I hope this is a false report. It would be uncomfortable for me or for any American to believe that the State Department or the Disarmament Agency is willing to give away the military power of the United States within 9 years.

However, I must say that this has been a government pretty much illuminated to the people by the leaking of information from reliable sources. This has been a government in which we find out about things from favorable leaks from the White House over a cup of tea.

When the UPI—which is certainly not an irresponsible news-gathering agency—uses a reliable source, I suggest that even if the story is incorrect there must be something back of it, because nobody who acted in such an irresponsible manner or suggested such an irresponsible thing would be believed by a reporter who knew the irresponsibility of the individual to whom he was talking.

Mr. President, again I invite the attention of my colleagues to this story. I hope before the afternoon has passed we shall have some denial of it, because I intend to speak either today or tomorrow, and I shall address myself to the subject again.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have no more time. Will the Senator from Alabama yield me more time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator another minute from the time on the bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Arizona for bringing this story to the attention of the Senate. It is completely unthinkable that such a plan should be advanced. I certainly hope the story is not true. I shall be much interested in hearing the answer of the State Department.

Last fall I made an address in which I said that the State Department had a plan to turn over our nuclear weapons to the United Nations. The State Department denied that they did have such a plan. It is contained in Department of State Publication 7277, released in September 1961.

I shall be much interested to hear what the State Department says about this story. The plan to which I referred called for the retention by nations of armies sufficient only to police themselves internally. The nuclear forces and armies to be used outside of a nation's boundaries were to be under the United Nations.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. THURMOND. I commend the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the time on the Russell amendment I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to use much time on this question. Of course, we all have the greatest of respect for the Senator from Georgia, not only as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, but also as probably the outstanding Parliamentarian of this body. Ever since I became a Member of the Senate I have looked to him as an authority on the rules of the Senate.

The first part of the Senator's amendment is of course pertinent and relevant to the bill which the committee considered, and I think it should be considered on its merits. I am opposed to it, but it is relevant. That is not the part of the amendment which has aroused most of the interest.

I think the Senator from Georgia is in a very strange role in bringing to the Senate an amendment which is irrelevant to the subject matter of the bill reported by the committee, and asking the Senate to take action on it without any consideration whatever other than the floor debate, under a limitation of time. I think the Senator should submit the proposal as a bill, so that it can be referred to the proper committee, studied, and testimony taken on it in the regular order. I have heard the Senator time and again make this plea with respect to a number of bills in regard to all kinds of matters of deep importance to this country, especially those involving the powers of the Executive, and his amendment, as the Senator himself has indicated in his statement, raises some constitutional problems.

The interpretation of section 7 of the Participation Act of 1945, as amended, is not a simple matter. It is quite possible to have honest differences of opinion as to what authority that section confers and what the President might do under it. I believe it is quite clear that the section would authorize the President to utilize limited numbers of our Armed Forces in noncombatant capacity and to furnish supplies in support of the United Nations. What we did in the Congo operation is clearly within the authority of section 7. If we should adopt section 2 of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, it seems to me that it would be a direct repeal of that authority. Such action would be an unwise restriction upon the authority of the President which we would regret.

The theory of the Senator from Mississippi that by debating this question we would raise the question and force its consideration by the other body seems to me to be quite strange and faulty. I say to the Senator, as I have already said to the Senator from Georgia, that if he wishes the Committee on Foreign Relations to consider the subject, I am sure that the committee will be more than glad to have hearings on it and make recommendations.

With my limited knowledge of the proposal at the present time, I would not suggest that it would be a wise thing to adopt. The authority provided by section 7 of the United Nations Participation Act is a proper one, because as emergencies arise, for example, in the Congo, the President should have discretion to utilize some military strength, whether planes or personnel, under the limitations of section 7, in an effort to preserve the peace.

There has been some confusion between section 7 and section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act. It was contemplated that a permanent United Nations armed force would be created. Such an organization never came about, largely, I believe, because of the veto of the Russians. The Russians objected to the proposal, so no standing army was ever created for the United Nations. Section 6 referred to that plan.

Section 7, on the other hand, clearly covers the question of providing military aid to the U.N. in situations like Lebanon and the Congo where it is not a problem of combating international aggression.

I submit to the Senate that under all good practices of this body we should not take action on a proposal that would severely alter the existing power of the Executive to act in emergencies such as those contemplated without hearings or consideration by a committee, and without giving the Executive himself an opportunity to express himself. We should have the views of not only the President, but also the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and all others who have a legitimate interest

in the subject. It would be very improvident and unwise to act without such advice.

With regard to the last point that was brought up by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I have not had any previous notice of any such disarmament agreement. From his reading of the report in the Senate, I should say that, if it contains any truth at all, it probably pertains to the negotiations now going on at Geneva, where offers and counteroffers are being made, many of which are influenced by the immediate propaganda value of one offer or the other. Whatever may be finally agreed upon in Geneva will be subject to final approval by the Senate, since a disarmament agreement would be in the nature of a treaty in any case.

I regret that a conjecture of that kind, dealing with negotiations, has precipitated broad statements of opposition by responsible Members of this body. It is a subject concerning which our understanding is very superficial. I have no idea as to what the facts are in relation to the proposal. At the present time I am not prepared to pass judgment on it and commit myself either for or against it. I hope that press reports and notices will not be issued to the effect that certain responsible Senators have already prejudged this question, and that any kind of agreement relating to the limitation of armaments will not be approved by this body. Within the last month or two Congress agreed to the creation of a rather elaborate Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. We have agreed to set up an agency which will include a large body of experts and require large expenditures.

I hope that we shall not now leave the impression that we are not interested in any kind of disarmament. I do not know what kind of disarmament will be proposed. But I hope that some statements will not be interpreted to mean that the Senate is in no way interested in any kind of limitation of armaments. I do not interpret that kind of press release to mean that we intend to engage in any unilateral disarmament. If, on the other hand, disarmament should be mutual, with provision for inspection and in accord with that sort of proposal which has been discussed in this body and in the press for years, we should consider it carefully.

I have thought that the country and this body were interested in some kind of limitation of armaments under proper supervision and inspection.

I believe that press speculation made in this connection is irrelevant to the very simple question which is before this body.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have made it abundantly clear that I did not put any credence in the report. But I do not believe that the Senator should argue that the report should not be brought to the attention of the Senate. It did not appear, to my knowledge, or at least from my examination, in the local press. The report came to me from the Far West. If there has even been any thought along the lines contained in the report, the Senate should be warned. I believe I adopted a proper procedure in asking the Secretary of State and Mr. Foster to inform me whether or not the report is true. If it is not, I would be the first one to rise in the Senate and inform the United Press-International that it made a mistake. But leaks from trusted sources, so to speak, are usually to be looked upon with some kind of credence, because lately they have been more right than wrong.

I do not feel the least regret in having brought this report to the attention of this body. The subject should be before the Senate in view of the vast powers that we are asked to confer upon the President at this time, powers which could be exercised through the natural avenues of legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not criticize the Senator from Arizona for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate. I was only making the point that the particular item is irrelevant to the main subject which is under consideration by the Senate, which is a bill to finance a deficit in the United Nations.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 additional minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senator's position is that the entire amendment of the Senator from Georgia is irrelevant.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, only the second part. The first part is clearly relevant and bears on the question.

The second part contains a new element that was not considered by the committee. It is a perfectly proper subject for consideration at some time by the Senate. But I say it is of great importance and should be the subject of hearings. We should have an opportunity to hear testimony. That is the only point I make.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, since the Senator from Arkansas feels as he does about the second part of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, I feel that my remarks were relevant. The part referred to pertains to the Armed Forces and the power we would refrain from giving to the President to enlarge our activities in the United Nations military field. I have voted for a limited United Nations police force. One of the few ways that this body can be successful is with that kind of force. But I am in complete disagreement with the argument that we should, under any treaty, even within a matter of years, abandon our military might to the United Nations.

I can understand the feeling of the Senator from Arkansas that my remarks are irrelevant, even though I feel they are relevant, because I happen to believe in the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know why the Senator insists on interpreting what I have said as critical of him. I meant no criticism of him at all. The Senator knows well that I believe in free speech. I had no intention of criticizing the Senator from Arizona. It is his right to say anything he wishes on the floor of the Senate. The only point I make is that the second part of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is irrelevant. It is an important subject, but it is irrelevant to the bill.

The Senator from Arizona has a perfect right to make those remarks, and they are perfectly proper. However, they relate to the second section of Senator RUSSELL's amendment and not to the question of whether it is an efficient and sensible way to finance the deficit in the United Nations in the manner provided by the proposal which is before us.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am in agreement with the Senator's statement. I was in no way trying to imply that what he had said affected me one way or another. I merely felt that, following his remarks, an answer was due, in order to set the record straight as to why I injected the United Press International article into this discussion. I made it perfectly clear that it was quoted as coming from a reliable source. The Senator and I have disagreed on many occasions. It is always a very enjoyable disagreement. I did not mean anything other than what I have stated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sorry the senior Senator from Georgia is not in the Chamber, because my remarks are addressed to him. I have the very greatest respect for him. Any proposal he makes deserves consideration. That is why I wanted to say a few words about it. However, I believe it should be seriously considered in committee, so that we may have an opportunity to receive testimony. I do not believe that this kind of measure should be passed upon under procedures that we have on the floor of the Senate. As anyone can see now, the attendance is very slim. Committees are meeting. This is not a proper forum for the development of a piece of legislation which relates to the constitutional powers or any other powers of the Executive.

I hope the Senate will not accept the amendment of the Senator from Georgia particularly not the second part of the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield me some time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to direct my remarks to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. For some time I have been giving thought to the serious conditions that might eventually arise in the General Assembly, consisting of 104 members, each member having 1 vote.

My concern deals primarily with the commitment of our troops and money to perform sundry functions in various parts of the world.

Together with the staff I have been trying to analyze the charter of the United Nations. I have concluded that ultimately the General Assembly, with 104 members, has not only the power to make commitments in the matter of social and welfare operations, but also in the matter of maintaining peace and committing troops of the United Nations supplied by the member nations. Under the charter the General Assembly can determine what social and welfare programs shall be promoted. The General Assembly also has the ultimate power to fix the budget and to allocate the cost to the member nations in the amounts that the General Assembly sees fit.

Coming to the second phase of possible operations, we consider the peace enforcement practices, such as are now being undertaken in the Gaza Strip and in the Congo. In the first instance, the Security Council has the power to determine whether troops shall be committed. If one nation in the Security Council vetoes the action, that commitment cannot be made. It can then be taken up by the General Assembly. On the basis of past precedents we must accept the fact that the General Assembly, consisting of representatives of 104 nations, can make a commitment when two-thirds of those nations vote in favor of it. The General Assembly can also fix the budget and determine how the budget shall be proportionately borne by the member countries.

What does that mean?

In 1945, when the United Nations was established, there were 51 members. Today there are 104. Togo, Mali, Ghana, and Senegal, as well as other nations of comparable size, have an equal vote with that of the United States. That very statement declares and indicates the inequity of the situation as it prevails in the casting of votes in the General Assembly.

Various students of the United Nations have recommended certain methods of curing this inequity in the General Assembly. No progress can be made because the Soviets will not allow the question to come to a disposition. Therefore, I say that a review of this subject must be had. A great deal of talk has been heard about the question being brought before the World Court on the question of the mandatory nature of the obligations that will be incurred in these special operations. I say to my colleagues in the Senate, "Do not rejoice too much over what the World Court is going to declare. If the World Court declares that each nation is mandatorily bound to pay for the operations in the form of social and welfare programs and to pay for the operations of military use to achieve peace, what will be the position of the United States in the General Assembly, with 1 vote out of 104?"

That question is likely to arise in the future. For that reason I say that a revision and review of the whole organization will have to be made.

I now come to the proposal of the Senator from Georgia. My feeling is substantially in accord with his. I cannot, however, feel that this vital issue should be determined upon the basis of a discussion such as has taken place on the floor of the Senate in the past 2 days. I am positive in the judgment which I have expressed. The subject is so crucial that I become frightened when I say that I am sure.

I think that review was needed. It ought to be held with full-scale committee meetings, arguments, and the submission of proof. Then we can decide upon a proposal which will not leave us in the helpless position of having a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly and committing our money and our troops, although the United States votes against the commitment.

Now to summarize: I am thankful to the Senator from Georgia for raising this issue. I had not known that he had examined into it. However, I had asked the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations to prepare answers to certain questions which I propounded on the subject of the power of the General Assembly and the power of the Security Council. I think the questions are pertinent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the questions I submitted and the answers received, because I believe they are informative and reflect correctly the powers of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

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

QUESTION 1

Does the Security Council or the General Assembly, or both, have the power to determine what peace projects—such as the Gaza and the Congo operations—and what aid projects shall be undertaken and financed by the U.N.?

Answer

All economic and social questions, including aid projects, are under the authority of the General Assembly. Peace-keeping operations, on the other hand, may involve the Security Council as well as the General Assembly, since both have some power under the provisions of the U.N. Charter to consider situations which threaten peace. The Security Council has primary responsibility and jurisdiction in such cases.

Article 39 of the charter provides as follows:

"The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Action by the Security Council, however, has often been stymied by the Soviet veto and, as a result, the General Assembly has assumed a greater importance in peace and security questions. Its authority for this role is contained in article 10 of the charter, which provides:

"The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present charter, and except as provided in article 12, may make recommendations to members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters." [1]

You may recall that after the Korean aggression the General Assembly adopted the uniting for peace resolution by a vote of 52 to 5 and 2 abstentions. It provided that if the veto prevented the Security Council from exercising its responsibilities for maintaining peace the General Assembly: "shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security." [2]

QUESTION 2

Does the General Assembly or the Security Council, or both, have the power to fix the budget and allocate the share that the member nations shall contribute?

Answer

Article 17 of the charter gives the General Assembly exclusive power to fix the budget and allocate each member's share. Article 17 provides as follows:

"1. The General Assembly shall consider and approve the budget of the organization.

"2. The expenses of the organization shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly.

"3. The General Assembly shall consider and approve any financial and budgetary arrangements with specialized agencies referred to in article 57 and shall examine the administrative budgets of such specialized agencies with a view to making recommendations to the agencies concerned."

QUESTION 3

If the World Court decides that the cost of special operations are mandatory obligations of the member nations, and if the U.N. Charter gives the power to the General Assembly to determine what special projects shall be undertaken and to fix the budget for the financing of such special operations, what protection does the United States have against being an unwilling participant in an operation to which it does not subscribe?

Answer

The World Court opinion on this matter would, of course, be advisory; the Court has no power to enforce its rulings. Its opinion, however, would be an authoritative statement of international financial obligations.

There are a number of safeguards which the United States would have against being an unwilling participant in an operation recommended by the General Assembly to which the United States did not subscribe:

1. The primary safeguard is that such an operation could not be recommended by the General Assembly without approval of two-thirds of the members present and voting. In other words, the United States would need only one-third of the votes plus one to stop such an operation. It is difficult to envision such an occasion in which the United States would not be able to rally at least this much support.

2. Secondly, the United States could not withhold funds for such an operation. The effect of this action, of course, would be that the United States would eventually lose its vote in the General Assembly. In the meantime, however, a substantial portion of the funds for the operation would not be available unless other nations assumed United States obligations.

3. As a last resort the United States could withdraw from the organization.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this subject should be reviewed. I do not believe it ought to be disposed of in the manner that has been proposed on the

[1] Art. 12 prohibits the Assembly from making recommendations on any matter while the Security Council is functioning in respect to it, unless the Council so requests.

[2] The General Assembly shall be called into session for this purpose "if requested by the Security Council on the vote of any 7 members, or by a majority of the members of the United Nations."

floor of the Senate. Therefore, I shall reluctantly not join with the Senator from Georgia, although I think he has performed a notable service in bringing this issue before the Senate.

One more word, because I think this situation will prove to be significant in the future. Do not rejoice if the World Court decides that levies made by the United Nations are a mandatory obligation upon each member nation. That decision may be a sword with a two-edged blade, and it may eventually become under the present powers of the General Assembly, a bane instead of a balm.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to say in his presence that I believe the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has rendered a noteworthy service to the Senate. It was not possible for me to hear his entire address on this subject; but subsequently he was kind enough to point out to me some of the sections in the law which are applicable. Not only is the Senator from Georgia probably the most brilliant parliamentarian in the Senate; but in my opinion, he is one of the most courageous Members of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to leave the Chamber, but before I do so, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his compliment.

Mr. ALLOTT. I mean it from my heart. I find myself in this particular instance torn between the desire to vote for the amendment and not to vote for it, because we seek the accomplishment of certain objectives which I do not believe the amendment will quite achieve.

On many occasions within the last year I said I thought it was time for the United States to reappraise its relationship to the United Nations. I said this despite my continuing feeling that the United Nations represents the last instrument on earth at present by which a real world order may be achieved, an order of principles and perhaps an order of law, outside of our own strength.

While I cannot support the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, I can understand the reasons for his offering it. I should like to cite two examples that have occurred in the last year in the Government of the United States with relation to the United Nations. They are examples of why we in Congress need to have extensive hearings and extensive debate, not only upon our relationships with the United Nations, but upon what the role of the United Nations is.

In the early part of last year, our representative at the United Nations committed the United States to a contribution of $100 million for the Congo operation. It was a substantial assessment, and it was proposed while Congress was in session, while the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and the Senate were here. Yet nothing was said either to the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations or to the Committees on Appropriations themselves about this commitment.

When the subject arose before the committee in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill last year, the answers of the State Department were, indeed, feeble. First they said, "Well, we felt we had a right to make the commitment, because the money could be taken out of the President's emergency fund." But when the commitment of $10 million a month from January through October was carefully considered, it was learned that not enough money was left in the President's emergency fund to fulfill the commitment. When the Department recognized that fact, Congress later supplied the money by way of a regular appropriation.

Another explanation given by the State Department representatives at that time was that the United Nations understood the proposal was not a commitment; but the fact is, according to my understanding of the situation, that while we may be formally asked to recognize appropriations that have been made later, for all practical purposes our representative in the United Nations has made a commitment for $100 million which Congress must back up. This was later extended. We provided more than $120 million up until the first of this year.

This is not to say, nor do I say or imply, that I do not approve of the United States and the United Nations backing the Congo operation. I feel that that operation has resulted in a net benefit to us and to the world. However, I do say that it is high time the State Department recognized the fact that it cannot bypass Congress when Congress is in session. There can be no justification for not at least keeping the Committee on Appropriations informed when such commitments are made.

Another example occurred later in the year, at Punta del Este. The senior Senator from Georgia cross-examined the representatives of the State Department at great length when we had learned the outcome of the conference. Senators know what appeared in the newspapers. They will recall reading that the United States had committed itself to giving the South American countries, under the Alianza Para Progresso—the Alliance for Progress—$20 billion in the next 10 years. The Constitution provides that an appropriation of $20 billion or any other amount must come from Congress. Under our system of government, only Congress can appropriate money.

So far as I know, the type of commitment that was made at Punta del Este was never discussed with any member of the Committees on Appropriations, even though Congress was in session at that time. So last year, while Congress was in session, and while the members of the Committees on Appropriations were here, these two large commitments were made, commitments which bound, for all practical purposes—I say that again: bound for all practical purposes—the participation and the activity of Congress. I leave out of the discussion, only for the time being, the question whether the money which will go to South America will ever produce benefits for the United States, because at the rate and in the manner in which it is being expended, I do not believe it will.

I must say in all frankness that when the representatives of the State Department came before us, they said that it was not a $20 billion commitment to South America and Latin America; that it was only a $12 or $14 billion commitment. But the fact is that it was published all over the world that the commitment was for $20 billion; and in the eyes of the world, that is the amount for which the United States is committed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks the Senator from Colorado has made.

Personally, I should like very much to support the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia; but I do not feel that I can do so at this time.

The United Nations should be made the subject of a thorough study by the Congress; but the subject is of such great importance that we should not attempt to act on it this afternoon.

About 2 weeks ago, at Wichita, Kans., I attended a meeting at which our former Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, spoke; and on that occasion he stressed the importance of the bond issue to the United Nations, and also stressed the question of whether the United Nations should or could continue as an instrumentality for peace.

I think the remarks of the Senator from Colorado are very important and timely, and I thank him for them.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from Kansas recalls that at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, after the discussion of this question, I suggested that the committee do what has been suggested; namely, study the problem and hear again from our chief delegate to the United Nations and from others involved, and hold sessions of sufficient scope to explore these questions thoroughly. I still feel that that should be done, and I am rather hopeful that it will be done.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, in conclusion, if this amendment has served no other purpose, at least it has served to focus the concern which I believe most of us feel about whether the United States has the correct relationship with the United Nations. It has also served to focus attention upon the format of the United Nations, as it now exists, and to suggest that this format is due for a good hard look.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] will hold such

hearings, because in that case, if this amendment results in nothing but such hearings, at least the presentation of this particular amendment will have been of great value to us.

I believe the time has come, in connection with the relationships between the State Department and the Congress, for the State Department to take Congress into its confidence, and even once in awhile, to pay heed to Congress as a coequal branch of the Government, especially if the State Department is to make long-term commitments involving the funds of the United States. We have seen a great sufficiency of examples where the Congress has been skirted. It is high time that the executive branch recognize that it is the duty and responsibility of Congress to appropriate funds in advance, not to approve, after the fact, commitments made for us.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I congratulate the Senator from Colorado for his statement. I have supported the United Nations down the line, and I hope to be able to continue to support it. However, the Senator's last remark is most apt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado may proceed for 1 more minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield further to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, apparently the United Nations or certain of our representatives have undertaken to arrogate to themselves the privilege of committing the United States without consultation with the Congress, and sometimes without consultation with the executive branch of our Government. This is one example of such self-authorization which seems to have been assumed by our representatives to the United Nations. So I believe we should seriously consider a review of the increasing and expanding separation of the activities of our country's representatives in the United Nations from the Congress and from the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Iowa. I thoroughly agree with him.

I now yield back the remainder of the time made available to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. RUSSELL. So am I, if we may have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to my amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as a substitute for the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 72, as follows:

[No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Bennett	Goldwater	Smith, Maine
Butler	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Hickey	Talmadge
Capehart	McClellan	Thurmond
Cotton	Murphy	Tower
Dworshak	Robertson	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Russell	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—72

Aiken	Case, N.J.	Fulbright
Allott	Case, S. Dak.	Gore
Bartlett	Church	Gruening
Beall	Clark	Hart
Bible	Cooper	Hartke
Boggs	Dirksen	Hayden
Burdick	Dodd	Hill
Bush	Douglas	Holland
Byrd, W. Va.	Ellender	Humphrey
Cannon	Engle	Jackson
Carlson	Ervin	Javits
Carroll	Fong	Johnston
Jordan	Metcalf	Proxmire
Keating	Miller	Randolph
Kefauver	Monroney	Saltonstall
Kuchel	Morse	Scott
Lausche	Morton	Smathers
Long, Mo.	Moss	Smith, Mass.
Long, Hawaii	Mundt	Sparkman
Magnuson	Muskie	Symington
Mansfield	Pastore	Wiley
McCarthy	Pearson	Williams, N.J.
McGee	Pell	Yarborough
McNamara	Prouty	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Hruska	Neuberger
Chavez	Kerr	
Curtis	Long, La.	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, are there further amendments to be offered?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I have an amendment. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, lines 4 and 5, of the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment in the nature of a substitute, it is proposed to strike out "or agreed to be made."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall use very little time in explaining the amendment and why it was offered.

In the committee there was considerable discussion about whether the United States should buy $100 million worth of bonds outright or whether it should begin at a base of a $25 million purchase and then agree to match dollar for dollar purchases made by other countries. I offered an amendment which would have achieved that objective.

When the amendment in the nature of a substitute was finally drafted, instead of providing for matching dollar for dollar the purchases actually made by other countries it was written into the amendment that the United States would not only match dollar for dollar the purchases actually made but also the purchases agreed to be made.

My amendment contemplates striking out that language which declares that the United States will match dollar for dollar the purchases agreed to be made but not executed.

Yesterday I made inquiry about the status of the prospective purchasers, pledgers, and those who promise to be pledgers. The figures submitted to me showed that three countries have made purchases. They are Denmark, Norway, and Finland. Those three countries purchased $5.7 million worth of bonds. That fact is fixed and unchangeable.

There were 20 nations, as of yesterday, which had pledged to purchase $43,785,000 worth of bonds.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That statement now should be 22 nations, and the amount pledged should be $52,755,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The figure has changed since yesterday.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. Italy came in, with a subscription of $8,960,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concede that is, in all probability, the fact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield for the purpose, I ask unanimous consent to have a table which shows bond purchases by other nations as of April 4, 1962, printed in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 5, 1962.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: An up-to-date list of U.N. bond purchases by other countries is attached. It adds an $8,960,000 purchase by Italy as informally made public at a press conference by Fanfani March 29 and learned here just this week.

Total purchases and pledges by 35 other nations now is $61,704,354.35.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

Bond purchases by other nations

As of April 4, 1962, we have been advised as follows about other nations' plans to purchase bonds:

Actual purchases:	
Denmark	$2,500,000
Finland	1,480,000
Norway	1,800,000
Total (3 nations)	5,780,000
Publicly announced pledges:	
Austria	900,000
Australia	4,000,000
Burma	100,000
Canada	6,240,000
Ceylon	25,000
China	500,000
Congo (Leopoldville)	50,000
Ethiopia	200,000
Germany	10,000,000
Iceland	80,000
India	2,000,000
Ireland	300,000
Israel	200,000
Italy	8,960,000
Liberia	200,000
Malaya	340,000
Pakistan	500,000
Sierra Leone	10,000
Sudan	50,000
Sweden	5,800,000
United Kingdom	12,000,000
Venezuela	300,000
Total (22 nations)	52,755,000
Specific but unannounced pledges (10 nations): Nations that have notified us confidentially that they plan to buy bonds in the amount of	3,169,354
Grand total, purchases and pledges (35 nations) (both announced and unannounced)	61,704,354

In favor of issue—no specific amount (18 nations): Nations that have indicated a favorable response, without signifying an amount.

Issue being actively considered (21 nations): Nations that have the question under active consideration.

Do not plan to subscribe (10 nations): Nations that have indicated that they do not plan to subscribe.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The figures given to me by the State Department showed that as of yesterday the aggregate of bonds actually purchased, pledged to be purchased, or promised to be pledged to be purchased later, was $52,755,000. Of the $52,755,000 in the aggregate, $5,780,000 worth of bonds actually had been purchased by Norway, Denmark, and Finland. Twenty nations had pledged to purchase $43,785,000.

Many of those 20 nations have soft currencies. At least 10 of the 20 do not have hard currencies, but have soft currencies. Those nations cannot execute their pledges. They will not be able to execute them, according to their statements, until 1963, when, through some business operations, they will acquire hard dollars as a substitute for their soft currencies.

In addition to the two items that I mentioned, pledges in the amount of $3,179,354 were to be made. That statement brings us to the following proposition: The purpose of the proposal that we buy on a matching basis was to insert in the bill an instrumentality that would act coercively upon the members to buy. We did not want the member nations to think that in consternation and panic we would pick up the tab regardless of what the other 103 nations did. The State Department admits that there are nations that have pledged but will not be able to execute their pledges until 1963. What I suggest is that our purchases of bonds in excess of the $25 million of bonds be tied dollar for dollar to the amount of bonds in dollars bought by other nations, and that we do not tie our subscription into a future promise.

I point out further to the Senate that many of the member nations that have pledged and do not have the necessary hard dollars to meet their pledges are now substantially in arrears in the payment of their obligations to the United Nations. If those nations could convert their soft currency into hard dollars in 1963, under my amendment we would match their purchases in 1963.

As now written, the bill does not at all conform to the arguments that were made in the committee. The agreement was that we would match dollar for dollar the purchases actually made. But as the bill is now written, we would buy and match not only on the basis of purchases actually made, but on the pledges and the promises of pledges.

I should like to leave with the Senate a further thought. In the committee we added up what would be the prospective amount that would come into the United Nations under my amendment. The figures are as follows: We would purchase $25 million worth of bonds absolutely. At that time there was in prospect $43 million of actual purchases by other member nations. We would match those $43 million of purchases, and in the aggregate we would double the $43 million and produce $86 million. So we arrived at the conclusion that, at the least, the United Nations would obtain $111 million.

Since that discussion there has been the disclosure that some countries would like to buy but will be unable to buy. I suggest that for the good of the United Nations and the character of the members we ought to match dollar for dollar the purchases actually made and not dollar for dollar the purchases promised to be made.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Senator from Ohio that I thoroughly agree with him on his amendment. I see no reason whatsoever for including in the amendment the words "or agreed to be purchased." As I interpret the provisions before us, we would buy the first $25 million worth of so-called bonds without any matching. At the present time $5,700,000 worth of bonds have been purchased by other countries. If the proposal should pass, we could, immediately thereafter, buy an additional $5,700,000 worth of bonds, and as rapidly as other countries bought bonds, we could buy bonds.

But under the present language of the bill, which provides for pledges to buy bonds at some future time, we would proceed to buy bonds merely on the promise of other countries that at some time in the future they would buy bonds when, as, and if they had the necessary money to do so.

I do not believe that such procedure would protect the financial integrity of the situation at all. I thoroughly agree that the words to which the Senator's amendment is directed should be stricken from the amendment. I know there is great sentiment for the United States to continue to finance the United Nations willy-nilly every time it gets into a hole. We are expected to pick up the tab. But it is time for us to take a very careful look at the question and begin to safeguard the interests not only of the United States, but actually the interests and the integrity of the United Nations itself, by requiring some fiscal soundness and responsibility in that organization and in most of the countries that make it up. So I will support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am grateful to the Senator from Iowa for his encouraging words. We ought not to put the State Department in the position of saying to other countries, "You do not have to purchase. All you have to do is promise to purchase; and if you promise to purchase, the United States will put up an amount equal to the amount you promise to buy."

I think that is a dangerous situation and ought not to be tolerated. I do not think my statement can be challenged. The discussion in the committee was that we should buy on the basis of what the other nations would actually buy, and not on the basis of what they might promise to buy.

Probably a situation has arisen in which it is feared that many countries cannot now buy but would buy if they

could. We ought not to tie our kite to such an unstable situation.

I have described my amendment, and I now ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I rise in opposition to the amendment. It sounds on its face as if we certainly ought to adopt it. We might say, "Why not?"

When the amendment is examined into carefully, we find there are some good reasons why it should not be adopted. Without in any way knowing what was in the mind of the Senator from Ohio—and I had no way of knowing because he had not caused any amendment to be printed—I caused to be printed, on February 15, 1962, an amendment to the bill in precisely the words which were contained in the bill as reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and which are contained in the bill now, except that the amount I fixed was $20 million instead of the $25 million in the bill.

So at the very least I claim the right to share in the parentage of the amendment.

I point out that the State Department, notwithstanding its original opposition, finally took a pretty good view of the amendment and indeed said—and I have asked the permission of the Senator in charge of the bill to repeat the statement which I am about to quote from the report of the State Department:

> In some respects the concept of matching plus an additional amount which may be used to purchase bonds at the discretion of the President may be advantageous in our continuing efforts to reaffirm the principle of every member responsibility in the United Nations.

I emphasize the words "at the discretion of the President." When I drafted the amendment, the idea was to leave $75 million in the discretion of the President to match other purchases, because the amendment provides that we shall buy at present an amount not to exceed $25 million, unless additional purchases are matched by others.

Obviously, the President has discretion. If that is not enough, we now have double discretion, because the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment itself is a completely discretionary amendment so far as the President is concerned.

Therefore, there is discretion, first, in the language of section 2 of the bill itself, and, second, there is added discretion because the whole thing is discretionary with the President of the United States.

So, Mr. President, why do I object to these words being taken out? I will tell the Senate why I object. They were in my amendment, and they are in the bill now. I am a businessman, too. I have met payrolls, and I understand what an obligation means.

I understand that there are countries which perhaps may not be able, exactly on the minute or on the hour, to deliver their checks to the Secretary General.

We talk about the U.N. and the dignity and importance to its members. We talk about the dignity and importance of the State Department of the United States. I say two things in that connection. First, we have no right to doubt the intelligence or the good faith of the State Department or of the President in shopping around and approaching countries to make commitments which the State Department and the President know will not be performed by these countries. I refuse to believe that any President of the United States or any Secretary of State of the United States will do any such thing. I have no right to assume anything like that. I do not know of any Secretary of State or any President who in his right mind would do any such thing.

Second, and very importantly, we are talking about small nations and about their dignity and their responsibility, and the fact that we want them to believe that they are important people, and that we want to give them a sense of nationhood and a sense of importance.

Yet, Mr. President, it is proposed that the Senate now doubt their good faith to meet their commitment by striking these words out of the bill.

If the bill had come to the Senate without them, I would not have argued to put them in. However, they are in the bill now. It is proposed that we strike them out, because, it is argued, some nations will not honor their commitments. It would be a great mistake on our part to strike these words. I do not believe it will make a difference of as much as $10,000. I do not believe that the President or the State Department is softheaded. The words are in there now. Whether they should have been in there in the first place is immaterial. The whole thing is not that important. It will not make a great financial difference. They are there now. We must bear in mind what the implication is of striking out those words. It is a very serious reflection on the small nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. This would be a very unwise course to take by the Senate at this time, especially when it is such a serious matter to the small nations.

I respect the Senator from Ohio enormously. In my opinion this was a very wonderful thing for him to do. He told me in advance what he had in mind, even before I filed my amendment. I think it is great. I am very pleased that it is here. It is hardheaded, and it should be here. However, as long as the language has come out of the committee this way, I would say to my friend from Ohio to himself consider the implications which we would raise by striking out those words with respect to commitments. I do not believe it is worth doing it. In all deference and respect and honor, I do not think it is worth it. I believe we would be taking something out of the bill which has significance and importance. We would be indicating our doubt as to whether a particular country would keep its commitment. We can safely leave all that to the discretion of the President and the State Department. I have criticized them before, and no doubt I will again. I do not believe there are any angels. But this is a very hardheaded thing, and they are not going to lead us into any cul-de-sac on an issue of this character. We can safely leave it to the doublebarreled discretion that we now have established. We should not give any idea to some person who will get up in the United Nations and say, "You see what these Americans are like. You have to give them cash on the barrelhead. They will not trust a nation who is a member of the United Nations."

I say it is not worth it. I ask my friend from Ohio to think it over. He did a great thing when this went through the committee and when it survived in the Dirksen-Mansfield substitute, which I believe should be adopted overwhelmingly. Let us not do anything to spoil what is already a good thing, when, in all sincerity, it will not make any material difference.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe there is an aspect involved here which transcends what has been mentioned by the Senator from New York. Many people in the United States are complaining very sincerely about the burdens that we are assuming. I believe we should assure them that we are trying to perform our duty by asking every other nation to meet its corresponding responsibility. I believe a mistake is made when we give to the world the idea that, regardless of what they do, the United States will pick up the tab. That is the actual fact. If we look at the testimony given before the Foreign Relations Committee, we find that there are probably 75 nations which are delinquent in their payments, and have been delinquent for some time. I am not the one who is creating these facts. These facts exist. They stand as granite, and neither the Senator from New York nor the Senator from Ohio can change them. The overwhelming evidence is that the nations will not pay. The people of the United States know that to be a fact. My mail is overwhelming in asking me to repudiate the whole thing.

I do not believe that it would be a sound procedure to follow. I believe the world would be worse off if we did not have a United Nations. It has served a useful purpose, and its service can be intensified to greater richness if we show a purpose to perform our obligations and at the same time anticipate that the other nations will perform their obligations.

I believe the Senator from New York implied that there may be some strength in what I propose. However, he argues that it will be productive of no good. On that subject both of us are looking into the future. Neither one of us can foretell what will happen. However, I believe that, as good a lawyer as the Senator from New York is—and I hold him in high respect—if he were drafting a document in his own law office, would he tell his client to accept the kind of loose language that is now in the bill?

I would wager that he would say to his client, "This language creates a problematical situation. It requires no certainty of action. The other party can do whatever he wants to do after committing himself to make the purchase. However, you must pay."

I venture to say that he would call his client into the side office and say to him, "You cannot obligate yourself on this kind of uncertain and nebulous basis."

That is all I am asking that we do. We will buy $25 million worth of bonds to start with. We will match dollar for dollar up to $100 million on purchases made by other nations, not the promises made by other nations.

That is my case. I am ready to vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment. I hope the Senate will not agree to it. This language was contained in the bill which was considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was included in the amendment proposed to us by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] this morning. It was in the proposal for the loan of $25 million and the matching above that point. It has been a part of the language all the way through the consideration of this subject. It is in the language of the substitute offered by the two leaders of the Senate. It was in the bill and in the substitute and in every consideration which came before the various conferences which were held to negotiate a settlement of the question.

It was understood and agreed when we left the last conference that we would stand on the substitute offered by the two leaders, without amendment. I do not believe the substitute should be amended.

First of all, if the language is stricken, it will mean that instead of the United States making a substantial purchase, as it could do now on the basis of the $62 million which has been publicly pledged, it would have to make bond purchases of relatively small amounts, or at least bits and pieces, as we moved along. I do not favor that kind of operation. I believe the amendment of the Senator from Ohio should be defeated.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time, and I do yield it back.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. On this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 36 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Allott	Fong	Pell
Butler	Goldwater	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Russell
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Hill	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Talmadge
Curtis	McClellan	Thurmond
Dodd	Miller	Tower
Dworshak	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Murphy	

NAYS—64

Aiken	Hart	Monroney
Bartlett	Hartke	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Morton
Bible	Hickey	Moss
Boggs	Holland	Muskie
Burdick	Humphrey	Pastore
Bush	Jackson	Pearson
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Prouty
Cannon	Johnston	Proxmire
Carlson	Jordan	Randolph
Carroll	Keating	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smathers
Church	Kerr	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Dirksen	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Douglas	Magnuson	Wiley
Ellender	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ervin	McGee	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McNamara	
Gore	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Hruska	Young, N. Dak.
Bennett	Long, La.	
Chavez	Neuberger	

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute is open to further amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The amendment to the amendment was read, as follows:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "Act" insert a comma and the following: "including amounts obtained through the sale of United Nations support bonds under section 5,".

On page 2, line 5, before the period insert the following: "and shall in no event exceed $100,000,000".

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) For the purpose of providing an opportunity for the public to provide support for the activities of the United Nations, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue special obligations of the United States, designated as "United Nations support bonds", in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the United States savings bonds except that United Nations support bonds shall mature not more than twenty-five years from the date as of which issued, and shall be issued on a discount basis such as to afford an investment yield not in excess of 2 percentum per annum, compounded semiannually, when held to maturity.

"(b) United Nations support bonds shall have a face value of $25, $50, $100, $500, and $1,000 when held to maturity, and may be issued in such other denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time determine.

"(c) Payments by the United States Government to the holders of United Nations support bonds shall be made only out of amounts deducted by the United States under section 3 from annual payments of its assessed share of the budget of the United Nations. Payments by the United States Government to United Nations support bond holders shall be contingent upon the maintenance by the United Nations of the state of assessment upon the United States at a level not in excess of 32.02 per centum of the total ordinary budget of the United Nations as established by the United Nations General Assembly at its sixteenth session in 1961.

"(d) Amounts realized by the Secretary of the Treasury from the sale of United Nations support bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, and shall be available only for use in making loans to the United Nations pursuant to the authorization contained in the first section of this Act."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to authorize and direct the issuance of special obligations of the United States to be designated as United Nations support bonds.

The purpose of the bonds issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, which would have a face value of $25, $50, $100, $500, and $1,000, when held to maturity, is to permit individuals to contribute to the cost of this phase of support of the United Nations.

There is a limitation in my amendment, as follows:

Payments by the United States Government to United Nations support bond holders shall be contingent upon the maintenance by the United Nations of the state of assessment upon the United States at a level not in excess of 32.02 per centum of the total ordinary budget of the United Nations as established by the United Nations General Assembly at its sixteenth session in 1961.

(d) Amounts realized by the Secretary of the Treasury from the sale of United Nations support bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, and shall be available only for use in making loans to the United Nations pursuant to the authorization contained in the first section of this Act.

The limitation or contingency of 32.02 per centum of the total budget in the form of U.S. assessments is inserted to make sure that assessments shall not be increased against us. As is generally well known, over a period of time, our assessments have decreased, beginning with 40 percent, to an amount of 32 percent.

In view of the great increase in the membership of the United Nations, it is my view that the contributions of the United States should not be increased, but reduced.

Mr. President, the administration has recommended that the Congress authorize the U.S. Government to purchase United Nations bonds and appropriate the necessary funds to do so in the amount of $100 million. The Committee on Foreign Relations after extensive consideration of this request reported a variation of that request and now the distinguished majority and minority leaders have offered a substitute proposal. The provisions of that proposal are well known to the membership and it is not here necessary to dwell on them.

In order to place this request in some perspective, it is well to review the contributions which the United States has already made toward the establishment of this world organization. It is generally recognized that during the years of World War II, our Government devoted considerable effort toward the drafting of the principles which were finally accepted, first at Dumbarton Oaks and later at San Francisco, as the Charter of the United Nations. The United Nations Yearbook for 1946–47 reviews the origin of this organization. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this official U.N. document may be printed at this point in the RECORD:

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

In a resolution the Inter-American Conference suggested that the following points be taken into consideration in the formulation of a definitive charter of the proposed international organization:

(a) The aspiration of universality as an ideal toward which the Organization should tend in the future;

(b) The desirability of amplifying and making more specific the enumeration of the principles and purposes of the Organization;

(c) The desirability of amplifying and making more specific the powers of the General Assembly in order that its action, as the fully representative organ of the international community may be rendered effective, harmonizing the powers of the Security Council with such amplification;

(d) The desirability of extending the jurisdiction and competence of the International Tribunal or Court of Justice;

(e) The desirability of creating an international agency specially charged with promoting intellectual and moral cooperation among nations;

(f) The desirability of solving controversies and questions of an inter-American character, preferably in accordance with inter-American methods and procedures, in harmony with those of the General International Organization; and

(g) The desirability of giving an adequate representation to Latin America on the Security Council.

The Government of the United States, on behalf of itself and the other sponsoring governments, on March 5, 1945, invited the governments that had signed or adhered to the United Nations Declaration and had declared war against Germany or Japan to send representatives to the San Francisco Conference, officially known as the United Nations Conference on International Organization, beginning on April 25, 1945.

Mr. SCOTT. The United Nations came into being with the support of all of the American people regardless of their party affiliations. Many of our own citizens, say nothing of those in other lands, may be unaware of the role our Government played in providing a permanent home for the United Nations in this country.

The Republican 80th Congress, sometimes referred to by some as a "do-nothing Congress," cooperated with President Truman in enacting the necessary legislation to make it possible for the present headquarters building to be located in New York City. Once again, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the 1947–48 yearbook may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The General Assembly, during the second part of its first session, on December 14, 1946 (resolution 100(I)), decided to locate the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in New York City and to accept a gift of $8,500,000 from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for the purchase of the site bounded by First Avenue, East 48th Street, the East River, and East 42d Street. The Secretary-General was requested to report to the members on or before July 1, 1947, on plans, requirements, and costs relating to the headquarters. A headquarters advisory committee was set up to advise the Secretary General. The Secretary General, with the advise of the committee, and the New York City authorities shortly thereafter reached a general understanding regarding the development which the city and the United Nations would carry out both inside and around the site.

On February 26, 1947, the President of the United States signed a bill providing for the exemption of the Rockefeller gift from the Federal gift tax. The next day the Governor of New York signed a series of bills, drafted according to the recommendations of the United Nations, authorizing the Governor to cede jurisdiction over any land required by the organization to carry out its functions, exempting the United Nations property from taxation, authorizing the city of New York to purchase or condemn any property necessary for the headquarters and to regulate advertising devices and amusement enterprises in the areas near the site, and making it a criminal offense for any person to possess or use an identification card issued to another person by the United Nations.

On March 25, 1947, the United Nations received the Rockefeller gift and on April 13 the Secretary General accepted formally, in a public ceremony, the contributions of the city of New York. The city's gift included, among other concessions, the transfer of several plots of land and exclusive rights to the waterfront between 42d and 48th Streets. Later, in August, the city transferred the New York City Housing Authority building on the site to the United Nations on lease-purchase.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, still a further contribution toward the establishment of the United Nations was provided by the authorization of an interest-free loan from the U.S. Government to finance the cost of construction of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations. An agreement between the Secretary General and the U.S. representative, Warren R. Austin, was signed on March 23, 1948. It set forth the terms of this loan by our Government of $65 million which would provide payments starting July 1951 through July 1982. Of this entire sum of $65 million, only $20 million has fallen due, and the United States will await payment of $45 million before this loan is completely discharged in 1982.

I quote directly from the Yearbook of the United Nations, which states:

All amounts payable to the United States under this paragraph will be paid out of the ordinary budget of the United Nations, to the Secretary of State of the United States in currency of the United States which is legal tender for public debts on the date such payments are made.

Inasmuch as approximately one-third of the ordinary budget of the United Nations is paid by the U.S. Government, we are, in effect, making a gift of at least $21 million to the world organization, assuming that other countries finally pay their regular assessments, by the time this loan is discharged in 1982.

Mr. President, I cite these facts to show that the American people have always placed great faith in this world organization in the hope that humanity would be spared the horrors of a holocaust such as we experienced during World War II.

At the time the United Nations Charter was signed, its membership was comprised of 51 nations; today it includes 104. We are now confronted with a strange spectacle of a world organization of 104 nations with 44 of them, each having the same voice in the General Assembly as the United States, in arrears of either their special or ordinary assessments. I might add, Mr. President, that it has been said that a citizen of one of the new nations has a voice equivalent to 400 Americans.

Furthermore, the Congo operation which is the cause of the present difficulty is largely being financed by the U.S. Government, which has assumed approximately 47.5 percent of the cost largely because the Communist bloc—as well as some other countries—have refused payments of their duly assigned assessments because they disagreed with the United Nations action in the Congo.

Although the U.S. share of the 1947 budget and working fund apportionment was established at 39.89 percent of the total, the 1962 budget with many new nations included in the U.N. membership, still provides that we be assessed with 32.02 percent, or roughly one-third of the total ordinary budget of the United Nations. The Soviet Union which has been responsible for so many of the difficulties that have been experienced in making the United Nations an effective instrument for world peace, has been assessed with 14.97 percent of the total budget.

Over and above the ordinary United Nations budget, a number of special programs are financed by voluntary contributions of member nations rather than by regular assessments on all the members. The generosity of the American people, which has been suported by the Congress and the executive branch, shows that we have consistently borne the major share of these activities.

For example, in the case of the United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program—ETAP—and Special Fund, the United States is assuming 40 percent of total government contributions. In the case of the United Nation's Children's Fund—UNICEF—in 1962 we are to assume 44 percent of the cost. As we consider the special funds for limited areas of the world, such as the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees—UNRWA—we find that our Government is assuming 70 percent of total government contributions. Another special activity outside of the ordinary budget is the United Nations Emergency Force—UNEF—which was first mobilized during the Suez crisis in 1956. Here again, U.S. contributions represent 45.98 percent of the total.

By the end of 1961, the United States had assumed $23 million of the $34 million actually contributed to the United Nations operations in the Congo merely to provide economic assistance. This represents 68 percent of the total. United Nations costs for its military program in the Congo from July to December 1960 totaled $60 million, of which the United States contributed 49.94 percent. From January to October 1961, the costs were $100 million, and again we contributed 47.51 percent. From November 1961 to June 1962 the military costs are estimated at $80 million, of which we will contribute 46.27 percent. The aforementioned statistics are from information on the operations and financing of the United Nations, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 2d session, February 6, 1962.

In other words, Mr. President, the total military costs of the United Nations operations in the Congo are estimated at $240 million, and 47.7 percent of this expense will be borne by the American taxpayers. It is expected that after July 1, 1962, future Congo military costs will be financed from the proceeds of the proposed $200 million U.N. bond issue.

In appraising the cost of the United Nations to the American people, it is imperative that everyone realize that the various specialized agencies in most cases are financed outside of the ordinary budget. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the estimated 1961 contributions by the United States to each of these activities as well as the percent of the total funds which our payments to the world body and its specialized agencies represent.

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

U.S. contributions to the United Nations, specialized agencies, and special programs, 1961 estimate [1]

[In thousands of dollars]

	Contribution	Percent
A. Permanent organizations assessed budgets:		
United Nations	$22,333	32.51
Food and Agriculture Organization	2,999	32.51
Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization	33	14.14
International Civil Aviation Organization	1,371	32.95
International Labor Organization	2,449	25.00
International Telecommunication Union	324	10.39
United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization	4,677	31.46
Universal Postal Union	29	4.29
World Health Organization	6,070	31.71
World Meteorological Organization	118	19.03
Subtotal	40,403	--------
B. United Nations Emergency Force	7,916	41.66
C. United Nations operations in the Congo:		
Military	47,510	47.51
Economic	18,512	(2)
Subtotal	66,022	--------
D. Special programs financed by voluntary contributions:		
International Civil Aviation Organization, joint support program	658	27.21
United Nations Children's Fund	12,000	46.00
United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—aid to Africa	1,000	66.49
United Nations expanded technical assistance program	17,813	40.00
United Nations High Commissioner for refugees program	1,300	33.33
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East	23,500	67.48
United Nations Special Fund	18,812	40.00
World Health Organization:		
Community water development program	175	100.00
Malaria eradication program	4,000	90.72
Research program	500	100.00
Subtotal	79,758	--------
Total	194,099	--------

[1] Information on the operations and financing of the United Nations, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 2d sess., Feb. 6, 1962, pp. 73–74.

[2] Total pledges from other governments are not complete; therefore, the U.S. percentage cannot be determined at this time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in measuring the true impact upon our own budget of a U.S. loan to the United Nations on the financing of U.N. bonds, it is necessary for us to appreciate that the U.S. Treasury was offering long-term securities in January, 1962, which provided interest payments at a rate of 3.9 percent. The difference between this rate of interest and the interest-free loans which our Government provided to construct the United Nations headquarters will represent a very substantial additional cost to our taxpayers by the time the original loan has been fully repaid.

This same reasoning would also apply to a proposed loan to the United Nations—or the financing of a bond issue—that will yield the U.S. Government less than it must pay in the open market. Those who advocate that the Senate should adopt this measure stress that it will reduce the present U.S. assessment for the United Nations Congo military operations from 47.51 percent of the total to 32.02 percent. This saving is based upon the difference between our present share of the Congo operation and our share of the United Nations ordinary budget. In any event, any sums loaned by the United States, our Government will be required to repay one-third of principal as well as approximately one-third of the interest charges that will accrue over the period of the loan.

Of necessity, U.S. costs will exceed the face amount of any loan or bond purchase because of three factors:

First. The interest rate the United States will receive from the United Nations may be less than it must pay to secure the funds themselves, unless some rate is fixed.

Second. The United States must not only pay one-third of the interest accruing to the United States, but also one-third of that to other lending nations.

Third. In addition to paying one-third of our own loan to ourselves we must pay approximately one-third of repayments to lending nations.

The International Court of Justice, which includes judges from Communist and neutralist nations, has been asked to render an advisory opinion on the question of whether assessments against member states for the Middle East and Congo operations are binding upon member states under article 17(2) of the Charter of the United Nations. If the Court decides that such assessments must be paid as part of the regular budget the nations that are more than 2 years in arrears of their total obligations to the United Nations, which would then include these military activities, could be denied their voting privileges under article 19 of the charter. If such a decision is rendered, a serious question may occur as to whether such nations will accept the inclusion of these operations in the ordinary budget in future years.

It is important to note that 70 states supported United Nations activities in the Congo; yet at the present time, 62 of the 104 member nations have not contributed anything to the cost of these operations. This clearly indicates that many countries apparently believe that the entire cost of maintaining peace should be assumed by the major powers.

If the United Nations adopts such a policy, it would no longer be a multilateral organization.

As President Kennedy stated in his message to the Congress on January 30 urging approval of this bond issue:

For without the bond issue, either the United Nations executive arm will wither or the United States will be compelled to pay a larger share of the costs of operation than is reasonable for any one member of an international organization.

I certainly endorse this view that our financial contribution to the world body must be a reasonable one.

It is my understanding that budgetary matters are decided by two-thirds of the General Assembly present and voting—plenary session. Thus, the Soviet influence could be felt in this body to exclude such assessment as part of the regular budget. The only other alternative to perpetuate the United Nations is to invoke article 6 of the charter which provides that:

A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

Mr. President, any attempt to use article 6 would be vetoed by Soviet Russia, but this much is clear: The United Nations must require its members to meet their financial obligations as well as their moral and political obligations if the United Nations is to retain the respect of the world and the power to exercise even its limited authority. Many countries will not pay if they find that the United States and a few others will foot the bills.

There are grave doubts as to the effectiveness of an organization which is so lax in the administration of its revenues that it cannot secure the universal support of its members. Even the humblest social organization requires its members to keep dues paid up to date or face suspension or expulsion. Now it appears that the loftiest of human organizations has chosen another course, to ask the paid-up members to pick up the bad debts of the deadbeats.

As my colleagues well know, during the Korean crisis the Security Council was deadlocked, and a procedure was devised whereby the General Assembly could supplant the Security Council if a two-thirds majority of the members chose to do so under a resolution which has been described as "Uniting for Peace." Unfortunately, with the admission of many new states which have been unable or unwilling to distinguish between the aspirations of the United States and the Soviet Union for the self-determination and economic development of new countries, it is my fear that the General Assembly has given indications of being an ineffective reed to provide world leadership in implementing the provisions of its charter.

It appears to me that if the peoples of the world in whose name the United Nations Charter was originally drafted are to play an effective role in securing a more reasonable attitude toward the United Nations on the part of their own governments, they should be encouraged to participate in providing temporary assistance to the United Nations in its hour of crisis.

Mr. President, it was interesting to me to find that my distinguished colleague from Vermont, Senator AIKEN, in a report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee brought up a most interesting point. As a member of the U.S. delegation to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the U.N., Senator AIKEN was assigned to the Fifth Committee, which deals with administrative and budgetary matters. The Senator in his report states:

Since the failure of several nations to pay their assessments had seriously impaired the working capital fund of the United Nations, it appeared necessary to authorize the Secretary General to borrow funds with which to carry on.

A resolution submitted to the fifth committee would have authorized the Secretary General to borrow from special funds available for programs sponsored by the United Nations, from member governments, or from other available sources, meaning commercial lending agencies.

The delegate from India moved to strike out the authority to borrow from private sources. He was supported by Russia and several other states. The motion was defeated in committee by a narrow margin. The General Assembly, however, sustained the Indian motion and as of now the Secretary General can only borrow from United Nations special funds at prevailing rates of interest and from member governments.

Because of my concern as to this reasoning and its effect on the bond issue, Mr. President, I mistakenly asked the State Department in a letter dated January 19, 1962, for its interpretation of the reasoning behind the Indian motion. In fact, the Indian motion took place a year before consideration of the bond issue, but it is interesting to note the reply I received from Assistant Secretary of State, Harlan Cleveland, in a letter dated January 30, 1962. I quote:

With respect to your question as to authorizing the Secretary General to borrow funds from nongovernmental sources, this was indeed considered both in the United Nations and by the executive branch of the Government. However, the resolution authorizing the issuance of United Nations bonds restricted sales to state members of the United Nations, its specialized agencies and of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Under certain conditions bonds may also be sold to nonprofit institutions. This appeared to be the wiser course because sales of bonds to individuals involves many problems which could not be carefully evaluated during the pressures of the General Assembly when the organization faced an acute financial crisis.

Yet, Mr. President, the Charter of the United Nations in its preamble states:

We the peoples of the United Nations determined—

To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and

To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and

To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom. (Yearbook of the United Nations, 1946–47, op. cit., p. 831.)

Throughout our own history, whenever our Nation was threatened by external agression and it was necessary to supplement Federal revenues by the issuance of bonds, we always made it possible for every citizen to support our national effort. Even schoolchildren were given the opportunity to buy savings stamps in order that they might feel they were playing a personal role in our country's destiny.

In recent years, billion-dollar appropriations have become so common and intragovernmental transactions have been accepted as the normal order of business that I seriously question whether most Americans are fully aware of the implications of the steps we are about to take.

Mr. President, many of our citizens are understandably concerned that should the U.S. Government subscribe to this proposal we may be setting a precedent for future lending to other United Nations activities of unlimited scope.

This substitute provides under section 3 that the U. S. Government shall deduct from its assessed share of the United Nations ordinary budget each year the amount it is entitled to receive for both principal and interest from that Organization pursuant to the terms of this proposal. I raise the point that some member nations might continually ask for "special reviews" of their rate of assessment in hopes that the U.S. share might be upped so as to circumvent this provision.

The U.S. rate of assessment set at the 16th session of the General Assembly is now set at 32.02 percent of the ordinary budget. At this point, Mr. President, I should like to state for the RECORD the U.S. rate of assessment since the United Nations was established.

In calendar year 1946–49, 39.89 percent.

In calendar year 1950, 39.79 percent.

In calendar year 1951, 38.92 percent.

In calendar year 1952, 36.90 percent.

In calendar year 1953, 35.12 percent.

In calendar years 1954–57, 33.33 percent.

In calendar years 1958–61, 32.51 percent.

In calendar year 1962, 32.02 percent.

The world organization has grown—new countries are securing the benefits of membership including a vote equal to our own. Under such a process eventually there should be a continuing reduction in our share of the United Nations budget. Under no conditions, should our portion of the budget be increased.

American citizens believe that United Nations activities are deserving of their support and accordingly, they should be given an opportunity to subscribe individually to a security issued by the U.S. Government to assist the United States in this financing proposal.

I shall now explain my amendment:

This amendment would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue special obligations of the United States designated as "United Nations support bonds" in accordance with the

provisions of the law applicable to U.S. savings bonds except in the case of these United Nations support bonds they will not mature more than 25 years from the date they are issued and that they will be issued on a discount basis such as to afford an investment yield not in access of 2 percent per year compounded semiannually when held to maturity.

These bonds would have a face value of $25, $50, $100, $500, and $1,000 when held to maturity. It is provided in my amendment that payments to the holders of these bonds will be made only out of amounts deducted by the United States under section 3 of the substitute proposal, which provides that there will be deducted from the annual payment of the assessed share of the United States of the budget of the United Nations an amount equal to the corresponding annual installment of principal and interest due to the United States on account of the loan made pursuant to section 1 of the substitute. My amendment further provides, Mr. President, payments by the U.S. Government to United Nations support-bond holders are contingent upon the maintenance by the United Nations upon the United States of an assessment not in excess of 32.02 percent of the total ordinary budget of the United Nations as established by the United Nations General Assembly.

The reason that I have included this contingency is that it is my understanding that the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1946 decided "the cost of the organization should be shared on the basis of capacity to pay." As I have pointed out the General Assembly fixed the first U.S. percentage contribution at 39.89 percent and subsequently reduced this to 33.33 percent and finally in 1957 decided that the percentage of the highest contributor—namely, the United States—should eventually be reduced to 30 percent. The U.S. percentage of 1962 is 32.02 percent. As the scale of assessments is fixed by the General Assembly and remains in effect for 3 years, it is my understanding that the U.S. percentage of contribution to the regular budget will be reviewed again in 1964. I further understand that the present percentage of assessment for all of the member nations will be subject to a special review this year because of the allegations of the Soviet Union and other countries that assessments were too high.

Thus, Mr. President, it is my feeling that although the Congress should give interested individuals and organizations an opportunity to purchase bonds that would support the United Nations, the U.S. Treasury should not be put in a position of a surety for this loan or bond purchase if the United Nations General Assembly by a two-thirds majority should decide that the United States percentage of contribution should be raised from its percent rate. I have pointed out, Mr. President, that the United States pays more than its share on a general assessment basis and supports many of the operations of the United Nations, which do not come under the regular budget.

I point out that this amendment would not limit the repayment by the United States to these bondholders if the annual budget of the United Nations should be increased because of that organization taking on additional functions or because of higher expenses of conducting its present operations. It only affects the payment of principal and interest on these bonds if the United Nations should increase the percentage contribution of the United States for its regular assessment. I am sure that all Americans feel that we have contributed a fair share to the United Nations, and I am doubly sure that no American would advocate that the U.S. percentage of contribution should be increased. It is for this reason that I have included this provision in the amendment, as I do feel that the purchasers of such bonds would be the strongest advocates of the United States continuing its present rate of contribution.

My amendment also provides that the money realized from the sale of United Nations support bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury and shall be available only for the use in the purchase by the United States of United Nations bonds on a loan to the United Nations.

In closing, I hope that the Senate would favorably consider my proposal. It in no way limits the Executive from the purchase of United Nations bonds or making a loan, but it does give the individual American citizen an opportunity to express his support of the work that the United Nations is doing. It also gives the individual bond purchaser an opportunity to express his desire that the present percentage of contribution of the United States to the United Nations should not be increased. I would hope that the many who have expressed a desire that the Congress act favorably on this measure would welcome such an amendment and that those Members of the Senate who have so strongly advocated the purchase of these bonds or the making of a loan join with me in seeing that my proposal is included in the legislation now before us.

Since we have been discussing measures by which the United Nations could be helped in its financing problems, I would like to call attention to one proposal offered by nine other Senators and myself with reference to peace-keeping operations in the Palestine area.

We have proposed the United States announce its position in favor of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. Should this come to pass, it would relieve the United Nations of one of the most costly of its operations.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a letter sent on March 27, 1962, to the Secretary of State.

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

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: When the United Nations Security Council considers on Wednesday the recent border incidents between Israel and Syria, we respectfully urge that the United States announce its position in favor of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States.

Since the United Nations was founded, the unresolved Arab-Israel conflict has been on the U.N. agenda in one form or another. Each year some specific problem has been considered. Often—as in the case of the recent Israel-Syria border actions—the matter under consideration has involved the loss of human life and the destruction of property.

But the discussions have never been able to bring the disputing parties together around a peace table to settle finally the 14-year-old dispute that has sapped the vitality of the Middle East.

During the past session of the United Nations General Assembly, 16 nations proposed a resolution which called on Israel and the Arab States to settle questions in dispute by direct negotiations.

The United States voted against this resolution, which was defeated. In explaining the U.S. vote, U.S. Ambassador Francis T. P. Plimpton said, in part:

"The United States had made clear from the outset its opposition to anything that might end to divert attention from that simple, direct, and constructive initiative. This, of course, means that we shall be obliged, regretfully, to oppose such other proposals whether in the form of other resolutions or amendments to our draft, as would tend in any way to obscure or cut across that initiative."

Since the U.S. resolution on the Palestine Conciliation Commission passed, there is no longer any tactical reason for avoiding a motion to encourage direct negotiations.

Israel has repeatedly offered to negotiate directly with the Arab States. The Arab leaders consistently oppose this plan because they refuse to take any action that would seem to recognize the State of Israel.

The U.S. position is clear in the matter. An Arab-Israel peace has been stated often as a fundamental goal of American foreign policy.

As recently as 1960, this objective received the endorsement of both major political parties.

The Democratic platform said: "We will encourage direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations."

The Republican platform said: "With specific reference to Israel and the Arab nations, we urge them to undertake negotiations for a mutually acceptable settlement of the causes of tension between them."

This Nation has every reason to implement its stated goal of peace in the Middle East. It is clearly in the interest of all people in that important part of the world.

We hope that the U.S. delegation in the U.N. will be able to assert this position during the Security Council debate.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH SCOTT, JACOB K. JAVITS, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, PRESCOTT BUSH, KENNETH B. KEATING, THRUSTON B. MORTON, CLIFFORD P. CASE, WINSTON L. PROUTY, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

I point out that it had been my intention to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania. He has seen the amendment, and he was perfectly willing to modify his amendment in accordance with my thinking. However, I understand that arrangements have been made whereby hearings will be held on the various amendments which have been submitted, or which

have been under consideration, by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania, and myself.

Let me say at this point that I believe the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania has an amendment which has been offered and which would provide for the issuance of so-called peace bonds at a 2-percent interest rate.

It seems to me that is a very hopeful enterprise, but not likely to be very successful, because I doubt if people would buy bonds of that character which pay only 2 percent.

I had in mind including a 2-percent tax exemption on the bonds. They thereby would have some appeal to quite a number of people, particularly in the high income brackets, who might be persuaded to purchase quite a few of the bonds.

I had in mind a second amendment, more or less in the nature of a "sense" resolution, which would suggest to the President that he conduct a study in order to determine if it is possible for the United Nations to issue its own bonds, which would be salable to the general public, and would also carry the tax exemption feature.

I think that is a more realistic approach. I hope the suggestions may have a hearing.

I understand all these amendments will be withdrawn and will be given consideration by the committee. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am about to yield, but first, commenting on what the distinguished Senator from Vermont has said, I wish to say that if we have certain assurances on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, it will be my intention to withdraw the amendment, subject to the opportunity to have the proposal made at length, and perhaps more carefully, before the committee.

I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

On February 7 Senators HUMPHREY, NEUBERGER, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YOUNG of Ohio, DOUGLAS, LONG of Hawaii, SMITH of Massachusetts, HART, and I introduced S. 2818, to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of a special Treasury issue of "peace bonds."

That bill was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee before the United Nations bond issue proposal was reported from the committee.

I have since been endeavoring, not without success, to obtain administration support for that bill.

When the U.N. bond issue came to the floor, I caused that bill, S. 2818, to be revised in the form of an amendment to the pending legislation.

I had intended to offer that amendment as a substitute for the amendment of my able colleague from Pennsylvania, and I have had some conversation with him about this subject.

I should like to know from the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator in charge of the bill, whether he would be willing to accept and consider either of these amendments and what course of action he suggests.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield to me for the purpose of answering that question——

Mr. SCOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have had the privilege of discussing these amendments, which are very similar, with each of the three authors, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, and the junior Senator from Vermont. I have stated that personally I am in sympathy with the objective of the proposals, but I do not believe that the proposals should be tied to this measure.

I have taken it upon myself to discuss the subject with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and he has assured me that, if the Senators would not press their proposals at this time, the Foreign Relations Committee would be very glad to consider the question as a separate matter, so we could have all three proposals before us.

I have also discussed the question with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who was cosponsor of one of the bills, and who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. We all agreed that, if the Senators would not press their proposals at this time, we would be very glad to take them up in the Foreign Relations Committee as a separate matter.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, whom I see in the Chamber, whether he would be willing to permit hearings on these proposals.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I assure the Senator we shall do it as soon as it is convenient to do so.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for that assurance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment which I had expected to propose may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO S. 2768

(Amendment proposed by Mr. CLARK to the amendment (3-29-6—A) offered by Senator SCOTT to the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of United States by authorizing a loan to the United Nations and the appropriations of funds therefor)

Strike from line , page , to the end and insert the following:

"UNITED NATIONS PEACE BONDS

"SEC. 5. (a) For the purpose of providing an opportunity for the public to provide support for the activities of the United Nations, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed for a period of five years following the date of enactment of this Act to issue special obligations of the United States, designated as 'peace bonds', under Section 22 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, except that peace bonds shall mature not more than twenty-five years from the date of issue, and shall be issued on a discount basis to afford an investment yield not in excess of 2 per centum per annum when held to maturity. The total amount of peace bonds outstanding at any time shall not exceed a face value of $100,000,000. The bonds shall be redeemable at any time in accordance with a preassigned schedule of values. The Treasury Department shall make peace bonds available for purchase through the same market channels as savings bonds, but the Department shall not undertake any promotional efforts on behalf of the peace bonds.

"(b) Peace bonds shall have a face value of $25, $50, $100, $500, $1,000 when held to maturity. No person or business entity may purchase or hold peace bonds with a face value in excess of $10,000.

"(c) Amounts realized by the Secretary of the Treasury from the sale of peace bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, and shall be available for use by the President of the United States in support of the activities of the United Nations."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Arkansas for their willingness to consider this subject. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared not to offer my amendment in view of the strong representations of the leadership and the assurance that the committee is willing to have the proposals considered. Therefore, I shall not call up my amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I conclude by saying that much of the purpose of the colloquy was to clarify the understanding reached by persons of originally different opinions on both sides of the aisle, in order to promote action upon and passage of the United Nations legislation.

I appreciate the courtesy shown to all of us. I have developed, on our side of the aisle, evidence that there is considerable sympathy toward the approach suggested in my amendment.

I thank the Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senators on his side of the aisle who have assured us we shall have a hearing.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of the amendment I had intended to offer.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO S. 2768

(Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROUTY to the amendment (in the nature of a substitute) proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) to the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing a loan to the United Nations and the appropriation of funds therefor)

At the end of the Amendment, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) It is also the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States shall endeavor to make such arrangements as may be necessary to provide an opportunity for the public to purchase

United Nations bonds issued in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in the Annex to the Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 20, 1961 (General Assembly Resolution 1739 (XVI)).

"(b) It is further the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States shall consider forthwith the desirability of exempting from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States all payments of principal and interest received by the holders of United Nations bonds, and shall report to Congress on the same at the earliest possible date."

Mr. PROUTY. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and other Senators.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I withdraw my amendment with the understanding that the proposed substitutes and amendments thereto have also been withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the so-called Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment at the desk, identified as 4-3-62—A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, lines 3 to 5, it is proposed to strike out "shall not exceed by more than $25,000,000 the aggregate amount of loans made or agreed to be made by other nations" and to insert in lieu thereof "shall not exceed $25,000,000 plus an amount equal to 50 per centum of the aggregate amount of loans made or agreed to be made by other nations".

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this is not a very complicated amendment and it should not require much time to discuss it. In two different respects it goes to the very heart of the problem, however, which confronts the Senate in connection with the United Nations bond proposal.

I appeal to Senators who believe that the function of the Senate is to legislate rather than to delegate authority. Senators who believe in that doctrine will wish to have some voice in determining the terms of the loan or gift and the extent to which the United States will participate on a percentage basis in the supplemental financing of United Nations debts, obligations, membership fees, and assessments.

For a long time we contributed to the United Nations 47 percent of the total of its requirements from the Treasury of the United States. After many years of careful consideration by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, aided at times by the Appropriations Committee of the House, we have been able to reduce the U.S. participation from 47 percent to roughly 33⅓ percent.

Sometimes, on some assessments and some contributions, that has been a little less than 33⅓ percent; sometimes it has been a litle more. At least it has come to be recognized as a standard formula that in financing the operations of the United Nations the part which, in the opinion of the United Nations, should rightfully be paid by the United States is approximately 33⅓ percent.

The proposal before us in the nature of a substitute—the ill-named compromise—would change this percentage formula very sharply, and would change it in the wrong direction. What we are asked to do is to pretty well determine whether in the future the United States will continue to participate on the 33⅓ percent ratio and formula which has been so laboriously attained, finally, by action of the Senate Appropriations Committee or whether, by one fell swoop, we shall increase the expectancy of the United Nations, and probably our contributions thereto, to 50 percent or more, which the language of the amendment suggests will be our share in this particular financial effort.

I say "the language" because the arithmetic of the proposal goes far beyond 50 percent, since the United States would contribute an unmatched first $25 million and, after that, 50 percent of what is to follow. Out of the $200 million, if we agree to the substitute, the United States might well find that it is contributing substantially more than 50 percent of the total in supplementary finances to the United Nations.

This is a very simple amendment, which involves two considerations. First, do we in the United States Senate wish to convey and delegate to the President, or to someone named by him, the power to negotiate and determine what is to be the U.S. percentage, with the mandate of the Senate that we have given acquiescence to a percentage formula of 50 percent and, in addition to that, a $25 million initial contribution? Do we wish to spell it out, or do we wish to delegate the authority? Do we wish to legislate the provisions, or simply to delegate the authority to solve the problem? That is the first question. As for me, I want the Senate to legislate—not capitulate.

I believe we have the responsibility to legislate, so that all the world, friend and foe alike, may know exactly what we mean; so that propagandists of unfriendly countries cannot distort our meaning, our purpose, or our proposal; and so that friendly countries will know exactly what we propose to do. Also, I feel the American taxpayer has a right to know what is being done and by whom.

Mr. President, before my time runs out or Senators leave the Chamber, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Secondly, having decided whether we wish to legislate or merely to convey the problem elsewhere, we must ask ourselves what formula we wish to have written into the law; whether it shall be 50 percent plus or 33⅓ percent, on which we have insisted heretofore as being a proper percentage, after cutting a percentage point here and a fractional percentage point there. We have worked long and hard in the Appropriations Committee to come within the formula which the United Nations itself believes to be proper in measuring the U.S. share of contribution.

On both of those points I stand with those who think we should legislate specifically. I stand with those who think we should perpetuate the 33⅓-percent formula rather than knock it out by one quick action, and thereby to find ourselves plagued for many years to come with the precedent established whereby we shall suddenly pick up 50 percent of the tab plus, rather than 33⅓ percent of the tab, which is rightfully our share.

So I ask Senators to approve the amendment. I do so as one who would like to vote financial assistance to the United Nations, provided it can be done within the formula we have developed and by specific terms. However, I do not intend to vote for assistance to the United Nations if it will mean that suddenly the United States is to become the exchequer to the extent of over 50 percent of the U.N. expenditures, and if it means that henceforth, instead of working, as we have in the past, to spell out a percentage formula, we are to convey to a different branch of the Government the right to negotiate, to barter, and to spend money which under the Constitution should be appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I had planned to yield 13 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], but while he is on his way to the Chamber I yield myself 1 minute.

I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief analysis of the effect of the Mundt amendment, setting out some of the variations in amounts that the United States contributes to the operations of the United Nations. Many people have the idea that the United States contributes a very large percentage of all operations of the United Nations. It is true that, when measured across the board, the United States makes a considerable contribution, but with respect to the regular budget our contribution is 32 percent. There are some activities in the United Nations to which we contribute as little as 4 percent.

So the percentage varies from activity to activity. I believe this analysis will be helpful to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MUNDT AMENDMENT (3-23-62—A) TO S. 2768

1. The amendment would change the matching formula in the committee bill so that, after the first $25 million of bonds purchased by the United States the President would be authorized to buy half as much as purchased by other nations instead of an amount equal to the amount purchased by other nations.

2. The effect of the amendment is to put a limit of $58.3 million on U.S. bond purchases instead of $100 million, as provided in the committee bill. This would allow a maximum U.S. share of 29 percent of total bond purchases instead of 50 percent, as proposed in the committee bill.

3. Senator MUNDT's premise is that 32 percent is the maximum share of any U.N. activity which should be paid by the United States; 32.02 percent is the share we are paying of the regular U.N. budget which finances the General Assembly, Security Council, and the Secretariat. U.S. contributions to other

activities vary greatly. We pay 71 percent of the Palestine refugee program and 4 percent of the Universal Postal Union. The United States has paid 47 percent of the Congo costs; 32 percent through assessed contributions and 15 percent in voluntary contributions.

4. The 47 percent which the United States pays of the Congo cost is a negotiated figure. U.S. representatives argue we should pay less; others argue that the U.S. should pay more than 47 percent. Many countries believe that the United States and other big powers should pay higher percentages for peace and security operations than big powers pay for the regular budget because under the Charter the Security Council has primary responsibility for keeping peace. The United States cannot truthfully say that this position is without merit.

5. The bond proceeds will be used for the Congo and Middle East operations. The percentage of the total of bonds that we buy should be somewhere near the same proportion that we have been paying toward these operations. Failure of U.N. efforts in the Congo and Gaza Strip would endanger U.S. security.

6. Even though the U.S. buys 50 percent of the bonds now, over the 25-year period of the bonds we shall pay only 32 percent of the cost of the bonds. This is because the bonds will be repaid out of the regular U.N. budget to which the United States contributes 32 percent.

KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT, ILLINOIS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield a half minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in January 1961, I introduced a bill (S. 520) to authorize the canalization of the Kaskaskia River, Ill. This measure, which has the approval of the Chief of Engineers and the Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, passed the Senate during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. It is now pending before the House Committee on Public Works.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, under date of March 30, 1962, relating to the announcement of plans for the location of five industrial plants in that area of southern Illinois as soon as Congress authorizes this important navigation project.

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

FIVE MAJOR INDUSTRIES WILL BUILD PLANTS IN KASKASKIA RIVER AREA

Plans for construction of five industrial plants along the proposed Kaskaskia River project in Illinois and worth $200 million were to be announced at a Belleville dinner Thursday night.

The plants would be built as soon as Federal authorization for canalization of the river is obtained and would be in addition to the previously announced $132 million construction of a powerplant by the Illinois Power & Light Co. and a Kaiser Aluminum Co. plant.

Emil Burgard, chairman of the Kaskaskia Industrial Development Corp., said representatives of the five industries would disclose detailed plans for the plants at the corporation's annual dinner at Augustine's Restaurant.

The plants will be built in an area about 50 miles from St. Louis in southeastern St. Clair County and in Randolph, Clinton, and Washington Counties.

Mr. Burgard said he could not identify the industries involved prior to the dinner because the announcement was a surprise for persons attending the dinner, including Gov. Otto Kerner, who was to be main speaker.

The canal project is estimated to cost $60 million and is now pending in the U.S. House of Representatives. It has passed the Senate.

It is part of the overall Kaskaskia Valley development program which includes a $40 million dam and reservoir under construction at Carlyle and a $30 million dam and reservoir at Shelbyville.

The Kaskaskia would be canalized 50 miles upstream from its mouth above Chester, Ill., in Randolph County to make it a navigable stream. Dams and reservoirs would make it usable most of the year.

Portions of the acreage needed for the plants already have been purchased by the companies, Mr. Burgard said. The firms have indicated they would start construction soon after the Government approves the canalization, he said.

Mr. Burgard, a Fayetteville real estate dealer, said Kaiser has acquired about 4,000 acres near Chester for plant purposes and coal rights to 50 square miles of land east of Fayetteville.

Mr. DIRKSEN. These five plants are in addition to the construction of a powerplant which was announced some time ago.

Mr. President, it is projects of this nature that provide a positive answer to our unemployment problem. Long after temporary measures have been exhausted, these industrial plants will be providing jobs, providing income, and adding to the econ mic well-being of southern Illinois. A great number of counties in southern Illinois have been designated as depressed areas under the provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act. In view of the excessive high rate of unemployment and the acute need for jobs in that area of the State, it is my hope that the House Public Works Committee will take prompt favorable action on S. 520. Delays mean postponement of jobs for southern Illinois.

It is heartening to note that the Governor of Illinois joins me in my desire for action on the bill. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD an article dated March 30, 1962, from the Illinois State Journal at Springfield, together with an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat dated March 31, 1962, outlining the views of our Governor on this proposal.

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

[From the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., Mar. 30, 1962]

KERNER SEES BOOM WHEN RIVER OPENS

BELLEVILLE.—Gov. Otto Kerner said Thursday night eventual opening of the Kaskaskia Valley to river traffic "should ignite an industrial explosion" without equal in southern Illinois' history.

Kerner said canalization of the lower Kaskaskia River, coupled with construction of reservoirs at Carlyle and Shelbyville, would provide an ideal situation for economic growth and expansion.

The reservoir at Carlyle is under construction and the one at Shelbyville is in the planning stage.

"Once an adequate water supply for domestic and commercial needs is guaranteed and a route for water transportation is assured, southern Illinois will have the necessary material around which it can build a great industrial team," Kerner said.

The governor's remarks were made before the second annual meeting of the Kaskaskia Area Industrial Development Association.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, St. Louis, Mo., Mar. 31, 1962]

KASKASKIA'S INDUSTRIAL EXPLOSION

Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner added to his previous warm endorsement of the Kaskaskia Canal project a prediction that its development will create an "industrial explosion unparalleled in southern Illinois."

Many organizations are to be commended for supporting legislation making possible the $60 million project. The measure has passed the U.S. Senate and is pending in the House. The advantages which will be felt in southern Illinois, through the widened river passage to the Mississippi, will be enjoyed also by the St. Louis area and southern Missouri.

Southern Illinois economic lag and unemployment problem could not help but spread its impact throughout the triangle marked by St. Louis, Terre Haute, Ind., and Paducah, Ky.

Already several large industries from the Middle West have taken options on land in the Kaskaskia River watershed for factories.

Illinois is moving rapidly with the Kaskaskia project—a $40 million dam and reservoir at Carlyle, and a $30 million dam and reservoir at Shelbyville.

Such aggressiveness should provide a prod for St. Louis to get going with development of the Meramec Valley, a project that should have been undertaken a decade ago.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 13 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is not in the best interest of the United States to finance the United Nations to an extent greater than its legal obligations and assessments. The United States is foremost among the members of the United Nations in faithful payment of regular dues and special assessments. The regular share of the United States, as arrived at by the General Assembly, in all operations of the United Nations is 32.02 percent. Not only have we been unfailing in meeting our obligations, but we have gratuitously donated large sums to the United Nations over and above this share. The United States is now contributing approximately 47 percent of the entire budget of the United Nations. When any 1 nation out of a total membership of 104 nations contributes such a disproportionate share to the finances of the United Nations, the need is clear for a reevaluation of the operations of that organization.

The financial crisis of the United Nations is not the cause, but merely one manifestation of the sickness which besets that organization. The fiscal deficit is a reflection of initial defects and the subsequent degeneration of the

United Nations. To adopt a stopgap remedy such as this would contribute little toward its salvation. The need is indicated for a major reorganization designed to get to the root of the problem and prevent recurrences of similar difficulties in the future. Among other things, the prompt payment of dues and minor assessments must be made an absolute condition of continued membership in the United Nations.

In addition, the scope of United Nations activities and purposes will have to be revised so that membership will be worth the pro rata payment of dues and minor assessments. The opportunity for interference in the internal affairs of any state, such as that which occurred in anti-Communist Katanga, must be eliminated.

The United Nation's operations in the Middle East and in the Congo are the primary causes of the financial distress of that organization. I am one of the multitude who protested strongly at the act of blatant aggression committed against Katanga in the Congo. In my opinion the intervention there constituted a flagrant attack upon the integrity and security of a sovereign state. It was an abusive misuse of military might in an effort to force that state into a central government controlled in large part by Communist-inclined leaders. It was a violation of the spirit which the people of the United States and the Senate of the United States assented to when it ratified the Charter of the United Nations. If it was not a violation of the charter itself, then there is an inherent flaw in that document which needs to be altered.

The intervention in the Congo was undertaken in the name of peace. At the end of World War II, when the United Nations came into existence, peace was foremost in the minds of all men. The ravages of war were so fresh in our memory that the word "peace" was the clarion call. The United Nations was envisioned as the vehicle through which the goal of a peaceful world order could be achieved. Now aggression and armed intervention has been undertaken in the name of peace. Freedom and self-determination, which were denied the people of Katanga in the name of peace, would certainly be a more worthy goal for the United Nations to seek.

It must be remembered that peace can be obtained at the same time that all mankind is enslaved. "Peace" and slavery can go hand in hand, but freedom is the antithesis of slavery, and freedom should be the ultimate aim of government by the people everywhere.

A major portion of the funds which would be made available to the United Nations should Congress give its approval would be used to defray the expenses of the Congo operation. The money in excess of that amount, however, would provide a fund to finance future aggression by the United Nations undertaken in the name of peace.

This would be tantamount to giving approval to the U.N.'s actions in the Congo and encouraging them to engage in aggression of a similar nature in the future. This is the equivalent of inviting the United Nations to forcefully intervene in the internal affairs of any country which is determined by the Security Council to pose a threat to the peace. To take such action in the name of peace is to make a mockery of the word "peace."

What then is the proper role for the United Nations? Mutual understanding and trust between nations is a prerequisite for a world in which peace and freedom prevail. Any action or movement calculated to undermine this relationship between nations may be a threat to only freedom and not at the same time threaten the peace. Since the United Nations was not conceived in the idea of securing and extending the blessings of liberty to all mankind, but merely "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" it must play a marginal role in the conduct of the cold war. The threat to the liberty of the portions of the world which remain free is real and imminent, and the United Nations has proved itself to be inadequate to accept the challenge with any degree of success.

In these perilous times, the true measure of the United Nation's role as an instrument of the foreign policy of the United States must be determined by the degree to which it conforms to our needs. The action by the United Nations in the Congo was in direct contravention to the stated principles for which the United States stands. It prevented self-determination for the people of Katanga and therefore deprived them of their liberty in that regard. To lend approval and financial assistance to operations of the United Nations which are in direct conflict with the principles upon which our foreign policy is, or should be, based is a grave error. Our actions in giving support to violations of these principles must speak as loud as our words in advocating them. Such inconsistencies can only result in decreasing the respect other nations have for us.

Mr. President, it is premature for Congress to be even considering such a proposal at this time. The World Court has been asked for an advisory opinion as to whether the assessments for the Middle East and Congo operations are binding upon member states. A decision is expected sometime in the early summer, but the Court could decline to pass on the matter if they determine it to be a political rather than a legal question. Under the United Nations Charter, advisory opinions from the World Court are limited to legal questions, and they may pass on them even though they are presented in the abstract. The question which has been put to the Court involves the interpretation of a treaty provision and will probably, therefore, be considered an essentially judicial task. The World Court advisory opinion may not sustain the United Nations power to collect these special assessments. A ruling of this nature would place the United States in an untenable position in its chances for repayment in the event Congress authorizes participation in the present scheme. The other member nations of the United Nations could justifiably decline to pay that share of their future dues which would be used to repay the U.S. loan. This would necessitate increasing the assessment of every nation with the eventual result of the United States repaying itself the money which they had advanced.

In any event, the prospects for repayment of any advance are dim as long as the United Nations continues to be constituted as at present. As of December 31, 1961, the total arrears in member states' assessed contributions to the United Nations for the regular budget, and for the special operations, amounted to $93,820,856. It would have undoubtedly been greater had not the United States donated large sums above their regular share. The United Nations had net cash resources of $15.5 million and a total unpaid obligation of $129.4 million. The unpaid obligations include rather substantial sums owed to various surplus and special accounts of the United Nations. If these facts paint a rather confused picture of the fiscal affairs of the United Nations, it is but further evidence of the overall confusion which exists in that body.

Mr. President, there have been many proposals advanced to bail the United Nations out of its financial difficulties. With possibly one exception, they fail to get at the crux of the matter in that they offer only stopgap remedies. If it is the judgment of our country that the United Nations has a potential worth saving, we should channel our efforts toward seeking a meaningful and lasting solution for its problems.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from South Dakota is ready to do likewise.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes. First of all, let me say I am happy to have confirmation, as I knew I would have it, from the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that our overall contribution to the major portion of the U.N. expenditures is 32 percent. In reality, my amendment is even a little more generous, because it provides for one-third. It maintains the traditional formula of 33⅓ percent of our contribution to the U.N.

I believe this is a much more serious issue than many of us, perhaps, have stopped to analyze and realize. Sometimes we are imbued with slogans and labels and headlines when we read that a happy compromise has been effectuated. If we do not look into the language of the compromise, it may seem like a happy, propitious, peaceful solution of the problem.

In analyzing the original U.N. bond proposal, and comparing it with the substitute we now have before us, we see that the proposal we have before us belies the description "compromise."

At least, the original U.N. bond proposal had the virtue of being specific, and gave us an opportunity to know for what we were voting or what we were about to amend, or what, perhaps, we might decide to oppose.

The substitute, is, indeed, a congressional capitulation. Rather than a compromise, it could better be described as a cascade of concessions because Congress has retained nothing, but has delegated

everything. We move away from the traditional 33⅓-percent posture to the posture that the U.N. will be costing us more than 50 percent.

I believe we should go further than spelling out that we will retain the 33⅓-percent formula. However, I shall not press the other points at this time.

I believe that prudent and proper parliamentary procedure would indicate that we spell out the interest rate. This Congress has been accused before, with some justification, of being the most irresponsible Congress fiscally in the current century. We manifestly do nothing to refute that indictment when we start appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars, to be loaned to people in other lands at a visionary interest rate to be fixed, we hope, somewhere, sometime, by somebody. We could very well wind up with no interest rate at all. I believe that prudent and proper parliamentary procedure would indicate that if we are to lend this money, at least we should fix the maximum length of the loan.

Taxpayers of America should have a right to insist upon the protection of the Constitution. If we are to enter into the international banking business, we ought to fix the interest rate, at least, and we certainly should fix the maximum termination date. This we do not do in the so-called compromise substitute. We merely say, "Let them have it on the promise that we will learn about it somewhere else when somebody has decided what should be done."

I do not believe that that is the kind of approach a responsible parliamentary body should take. If we were lending a $10 bill to a neighbor in Maryland, that is one thing. However, when we are lending $100 million to an international organization, it seems to me it is a sad reflection upon the attitude we take toward fiscal affairs in this great Congress when we fail to spell out and identify the fiscal guidelines.

Despite the fact that I fear the amendment will be defeated, although I hope it will not be defeated—I know that the skids have been greased, and I know that the clamor is on, and I know it is hard to obtain the attendance of Senators at this hour of the evening—speaking for myself and my conviction, I would indeed be derelict if I did not call attention to what I think is a manifestation of a careless and capricious custody of the public pursestrings on the part of the Senate.

I hope the Senate will approve my simple amendment and retain the percentage formula which traditionally has been considered right by the United Nations.

If my distinguished friend from Alabama will yield back the remainder of his time, I shall be glad to do likewise.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MUNDT. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the compromise substitute offered by the majority leader and the minority leader.

I am glad the issue before us will be resolved on a bipartisan basis and that there is wide backing from both sides of the aisle for the substitute plan. This is the way it should be.

Strong bipartisan support is indispensable if we are going to participate effectively in the United Nations. Unfortunately, some people lose sight of this basic principle. When this occurs we are hurt, and so is our useful role in the United Nations.

I especially want to pay tribute to my able colleagues, Senator MANSFIELD, Senator SPARKMAN, Senator DIRKSEN, Senator AIKEN, and Senator HICKENLOOPER for the sensible and constructive way in which they joined forces in working out the bipartisan substitute.

The funds raised by the United Nations under the loan-bond arrangement will be used mainly to finance the expensive operations of the United Nations in the Congo.

Let us be candid about the situation in the Congo. It is a new experience to have the United Nations conduct a military effort of this type. It is a difficult kind of operation, and there are disturbing and unhappy aspects to it. The situation may deteriorate before it improves.

We are in for much more trouble in the Congo, and there is a long way to go before the effort can be called a success.

Whatever reservations anyone may have about the Congo operations, the United Nations is deeply involved in the Congo. I am sure that no one can seriously want to use the power of the purse to force a halt. There is no good alternative at this time to continued support of the operations in the hope that law and order may be established in the Congo and that the Congo may be given a chance to make a start as a unified and independent state.

Mr. President, I am deeply troubled by the fact that so few members of the United Nations have met their share of the cost of the United Nations operations in the Middle East and the Congo. It is a sign of trouble in an organization when its members refuse to pay their dues. I believe that our Government should make great efforts to change this state of affairs. I am much more concerned about the principle involved than I am about the sum of money. One member should not, as a matter of principle, act as an organization's financial angel.

I intend to vote for the compromise measure to help meet the financial needs of the United Nations in the coming period. However, I hope that this debate will make it clear that the Senate is acting to meet an emergency and that its action does not set a precedent for the future.

I regret that there was not timely consultation last fall with the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe a better way of meeting the financial problem of the United Nations might have been found. But there was a failure to consult, and we now face a condition, not a theory.

Faced with this condition, I believe the compromise before the Senate is the best we can get, and I support it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time and to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The Senator from Alabama has asked for the yeas and nays. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 67, as follows:

[No. 37 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Allott	Eastland	Robertson
Butler	Goldwater	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Capehart	McClellan	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Miller	Talmadge
Cotton	Mundt	Thurmond
Curtis	Murphy	Tower
Dworshak	Prouty	Williams, Del.

NAYS—67

Aiken	Gruening	Metcalf
Bartlett	Hart	Monroney
Beall	Hartke	Morse
Bible	Hayden	Morton
Boggs	Hickey	Moss
Burdick	Hill	Muskie
Bush	Holland	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Pearson
Cannon	Jackson	Pell
Carlson	Javits	Proxmire
Carroll	Johnston	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Jordan	Saltonstall
Church	Keating	Scott
Clark	Kefauver	Smathers
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith, Mass.
Dirksen	Lausche	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Symington
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Engle	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Mansfield	Yarborough
Fong	McCarthy	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McGee	
Gore	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—9

Anderson	Ellender	Long, La.
Bennett	Hruska	Neuberger
Chavez	Kerr	Young, N. Dak.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). 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.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on my own behalf, I call up, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, an amendment originally filed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], on behalf of himself, myself, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. I am calling up the amendment on my own behalf because, as I understand, the Senator from Vermont is not now joining in offering this amendment, and I am not sure whether the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is. So I call up the amendment on my own behalf. It is identified as "3-16-62—A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The amendment submitted by Mr. HICKENLOOPER to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, without fiscal year limitation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not to exceed $100,000,000 which shall be available for the making of loans to the United Nations. Any such loan shall mature not later than June 30, 1965, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be substantially equal to the average rate, as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan, on outstanding marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities.

"SEC. 2. Amounts received from the repayment of principal and payment of interest due on such loans shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing loans to the United Nations and the appropriation of funds therefor.' "

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not intend to take any appreciable amount of the time of the Senate, but I am greatly concerned about the direction which this particular financial transaction may be taking. Originally I felt that the U.N. was in serious financial straits. I joined in the amendment to lend the United Nations $100 million at current rates of interest, or, as stated in the amendment at a rate, "to be substantially equal to the average rate, as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan, on outstanding marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities," and that such loans shall mature not later than June 30, 1965.

The provisions of the pending amendment are well known. I believe it is a method of placing a substantial incentive in the hands of the United Nations to meet its financial straits. It postpones the payment of the debt for the loan for 3 years from June 30 of this year. Three sessions can go by. The various nations can stimulate themselves to put their financial houses in order and pay up their arrearages, at least partially. So far as I am concerned, if the countries in arrears showed good faith and sincerity in paying the arrearages, I would have no objection to an extension of the unpaid portion of the loan for a reasonable period of time after the 3-year period, in order to assist them.

I offer the amendment because a great many Members of the Senate have signified to me that they would like this kind of approach. They consider it to be a businesslike approach to the affairs of the United Nations, as opposed to the long-drawn-out 25-year bond proposal, which a number of Members of this body oppose. They think this amendment would cause the United Nations to tighten its fiscal and financial affairs and cause the various countries to meet their obligations by contributing money to the United Nations if they want to vote in it, and thereby make it a viable organization. I think it is a sound, businesslike approach.

I may say in advance something that perhaps is bad forensics in debating procedure, but I am not unnecessarily deluded into thinking that the amendment will carry. However, I am offering it for the benefit of Senators who want an opportunity to vote on the proposal and who have expressed themselves on it. I am offering it to give them an opportunity to vote to assist, for a period of time, in a substantial, material way, the United Nations, based on a businesslike approach and an approach which I think would stimulate the United Nations to put its house in order, and which would be of material assistance.

The substitute which was offered by the Senator from Montana, the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], was originally designed, I believe, to meet a loan theory rather than a bond theory. The words referring to bonds were deleted in the amendment, but I have been greatly concerned about the interpretation by certain spokesmen close to the White House who have chortled that the so-called substitute was more than the administration originally asked.

I am also concerned by the fact that the President's letter of yesterday, which I looked for with some eagerness and anticipation, said absolutely nothing as to how the transaction would be handled. It was a completely unsatisfactory letter so far as I am concerned.

I still hope that, if the compromise is accepted, the President will exercise his discretion and use the loans on a basis of reasonable and justifiable rates of interest.

However, I have offered the amendment, and do not care to discuss it further.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the Senator from South Dakota correct in understanding that a basic difference between this amendment and the reported substitute is that the Senator's amendment would require the interest rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, to be substantially equal to the average rate at which the United States has borrowed money?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct; and the amendment now before the Senate amounts to a 3-year loan, at the average cost of money to the Government as expressed in the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the Senator give consideration to placing in his amendment section 3, which is contained in the other substitute, which would provide for deductions from the annual payments of the assessed share of the United States of the budget of the United Nations an amount equal to the corresponding annual installment of principal and interest due the United States?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. It was considered, but it was deemed not necessary, because this transaction would be a 3-year loan. If payment were to be deferred for a longer period, I think the annual checkoff of the obligations of the U.N. to the United States to be applied against our assessments would be a desirable addition. I do not think it is desirable in this amendment because it provides for a 3-year loan, and not a long-term loan.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the Senator's proposal, is there anything

mandatory, or is it merely an authorization for an appropriation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is an authorization for the appropriation to the President of $100 million, a part or all of which he may lend.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it would be subject to review by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I shall support the amendment in the full knowledge, as the Senator from Iowa has said, that it will not carry. In substance, the amendment is the suggestion I made last February when the question arose. I feel that something has been accomplished. I feel that the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois is far better than the original measure or the measure as reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There are sections in the substitute proposed by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois which make clear the intent of Congress, and I think give some notice to our colleagues in the United Nations that we are not going down the primrose path of long-term deficit financing or from one crisis to another, and pick up the tab.

I would have preferred the approach taken by the amendment of the senior Senator from Iowa. I realize, however, that we must accommodate ourselves to parliamentary realities.

I shall vote for the amendment, knowing that it will not prevail, and then I shall support the substitute offered by the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I have much the same feeling, I believe, that the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois has within its framework the opportunity for the President to make a realistic, businesslike transaction, without going the 25-year-bond route and without going the 2-percent-interest route.

If the President takes such a position, I shall have no quarrel with his discretionary action, if there is a substantially shorter term than 25 years. If there is a more realistic interest rate than 2 percent, I am willing to trust the President's discretion in that connection. I feel that if the President elects to make a 25-year loan and to buy bonds, and if he elects to loan the money at 2 percent, that will not be in keeping with the substantial view of the Congress of the United States, or the substantial wish of the Congress of the United States.

We must have some trust and confidence in the President. If he does not do things the way we wish, we can criticize his action at a later date. I hope this program will be operated on a businesslike basis and not on such a basis that other countries may expect that they can continually default on their payments to the United Nations and the United States will come along and pick up the check year after year after year, to the detriment, to the deterioration, and to the erosion of the strength and dignity which ought to be a part of the United Nations and of the nations that compose it.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 4 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the hour is late. I am one Senator who rarely takes the time of the Senate for remarks, particularly with respect to measures which do not come from my own committee.

I was one of those who importuned the Senator from Iowa to offer the amendment or the substitute even though it had been discarded, and even though the hope of its being agreed to is very slim. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has offered it.

I am not suggesting that it was not the part of wisdom for those who originally supported this measure to agree to a compromise.

I wished to see it offered because I am one—and I think there are others—who, before the Senate reaches a final vote on the measure before it, wishes to have an opportunity to vote to lend to the United Nations exactly and precisely what the President has indicated the U.N. needs at the present time; namely, $100 million—the exact amount—but to lend it to the United Nations directly as a loan from the United States of America for a time certain and at a rate of interest which would reimburse the United States for the amount it pays for the use of this money.

Mr. President, it has been a long road. I am one who is a liberal in foreign affairs, who has followed this road ever since I came to the Congress in 1947. I voted for and supported the Greek-Turkey aid program. I voted for and supported the Marshall plan. I have voted for and supported our foreign aid policy down through my 16 years of service. I am willing to support and to hold up the hands of the United Nations.

I have stated steadfastly to my people and to everyone else that we should not withhold from the United Nations the full support of the United States of America, because in that Organization, formed to replace war with law, reposes the hope and the dream of humanity.

It is my opinion that we do not aid the United Nations, that we do not build self-respect of the United Nations, that we do not build respect of the world for the United States when we allow our own constitutional methods, our own checks and balances, the safeguards of our Republic to be ignored and to slip through our fingers.

I want to see the loan made, and I wish to vote for a method of making it that will keep the purse strings of this Republic where they belong, in the hands of the Senate and in the hands of our sister body. When the President comes to the Congress, as is his duty, entrusted as he is under the Constitution with the conduct of foreign affairs, and says to the Congress: "It is my opinion that we need so much money for this country, for that country, and for the United Nations," in my belief it is our duty to consider it carefully and to give him, to the best of our ability, so far as our conscience permits, what is required, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican. He is our President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it is a far different thing to hand over blanket authority to the Executive. We have been doing that more and more and more. Those who have studied the course of events in the last few years are painfully aware of the fact that the Congress of the United States and the Senate, with all its tradition, has gotten into the habit of "passing the buck" to the President of the United States willingly, and sometimes even when he hardly asks for it, handing decisionmaking over to him.

I certainly respect the earnest desire of those who have framed what is called a compromise, but if Senators will read through its pages they will see expressions such as "it is the intent of the Congress" and "it is the sense of the Congress." One almost finds "it is the hope of the Congress" that the President or someone else, will cause the United Nations to improve its financial practices. The proposal protests that this action is not to be a precedent for further surrender of the purse strings by the Congress of the United States.

To paraphrase a famous statement:

The substitute doth protest too much, me thinks.

Why did that statement have to go in? It is because in the hearts and minds of Senators who are aware of the traditions of this body there must be the feeling that we are in danger of taking a further long step down the road of releasing control of the purse strings from the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I have gone almost as far as I can go down the road of indiscriminate giving to foreign nations, until they have come to feel they have a vested right in the money of our taxpayers.

I still wish to do the things which are necessary to build and to maintain the free society of nations and to keep the United Nations effective, but from now on I shall insist as far as my vote and influence permits that the Congress of the United States knows exactly how much is being given, for what it is being given, and for how long. I want the Congress to set the ground rules.

For that reason I wished an opportunity to vote for this amendment. For that reason I fear I shall, with great reluctance, be compelled to vote against the so-called compromise. I must say I would rather vote for what the President asked in the beginning than for this vague delegation of authority which, with all respects to its distinguished authors, confers almost unlimited power to the President.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish we had the time and the disposition to discuss these basic issues in the deliberative manner I think they merit.

I shall vote for the Hickenlooper amendment for precisely the reasons stated with such eloquence by my distinguished friend from New Hampshire. Like him, for a long time, I consistently supported the United Nations, the foreign-aid program, the ECA program, the Marshall plan, and all the rest. I have been somewhat active in regard to programs beyond that, dealing with the exchange of people and the development of collective security systems and programs for preserving peace.

It seems to me, however, that there comes a time when Senators who respect their oaths of office and who wish to measure up to their responsibilities should not be asked to buy a cat in a bag in connection with an important issue of this kind.

Senator COTTON's argument is four square with the argument I made in connection with the offer of my amendment, when I suggested that we reduce to one-third our contribution, because such a contribution would be in conformity with our established practice. I am happy to note that well over one-third of Senators voting voted in support of my position on that amendment.

I hope that the Senate will vote for the Hickenlooper amendment. The amendment would provide the aid for the United Nations that it needs. But we would be doing so as a responsible legislative body spelling out the terms. We would know for how long the loan would run. We would know how much it would be. We would know the rate of interest. We would remove from Communist countries the propaganda temptations to say that instead of helping the United Nations, we are building up some kind of blackmail opportunity by our Federal Treasury and the White House to coerce other countries to come our way and to dicker for a better proposition. We cannot buy friends in the United Nations that we are unable to win on the merit of our leadership. It seems to me that unless we are merely willing to vacate the traditional high position that the Senate has in international affairs, we had better accept the Hickenlooper substitute instead of simply delegating everything, without definition, without specification, to another branch of the Government. I hope the Hickenlooper amendment is adopted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall try not to use the 12 minutes. I rise to say that I intended originally to support the Aiken-Hickenlooper amendment to the bill. When the compromise offered by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois was put forward, and we received a letter from the President supporting it and setting forth the course of action he intended to pursue with relation to that substitute, I determined to vote for it.

As I believe both the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] have said, we must always remember that the question will come before the Committee on Appropriations. The Appropriations Committee is limited, to a certain extent, in its discretion if we provide the authority requested at this time. But we shall have an opportunity to look the situation over and then insert provisos if we think that the Executive is not carrying out the purposes of the amendment in the form of a substitute on which we shall now vote.

Several things came to me very strongly in connection with my decision. We must remember that the United Nations is a valuable, if imperfect, force for good in the world and it merits our continued support. When we talk about its role in our foreign policy, it is, of course, necessary to place it in its proper perspective. In this connection there are several underlying thoughts which to me are fundamental.

First, our foreign policy must always be determined on the basis of what is in the best interests of our country. To forward our foreign policy and work out our understandings with other countries we can, and should, work through the U.N. when it is helpful to do so. But we must not permit the United Nations to dominate us in what we believe is fundamental to the best interests of the United States. That is the spirit on which I voted for the original United Nations Charter, and that is the spirit in which I feel we should work with the United Nations today.

The question before the United Nations at the present time is how to finance it. We have found that the United States is now not only paying its share of the 32.5 percent, but by voluntary contributions has raised that amount to almost 50 percent of the cost of the undertakings in the Congo and Suez operations. That situation has come about because while 70 nations voted for the Congo operation, only 25 countries have paid in full their Congo assessment for 1961 and only 12 others have paid part of their obligations. That means that 62 nations have paid no part of their obligations, even though 70 members voted for the Congo operations.

The question before us is a fundamental one: How is the United Nations to carry on? Where is the money coming from to enable it to maintain its missions in the Congo and in the Suez, and to continue its regular activities? There are honest differences of opinion among us as to how that should be done. The original request was for a 25-year bond issue. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr AIKEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] provided for a 3-year loan. On a business basis I believe a 3-year loan would probably be the better proposal if we are not certain what will happen with relation to our financial relations in the United Nations in the future. But at the same time we must realize that the United Nations will not be able to pay up in 3 years, and therefore a long loan is probably advisable.

I believe that the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute is of value because it would leave within the discretion of the President the decision as to how much of the amount should be a bond issue and how much should be a short-term loan or any loan that the President might see fit to make.

In his letter the President has stated affirmatively that he would try to do two things, both of which were contained in the amendments I submitted. I did not offer them because I believe their provisions are contained in the President's letter.

One was to put the United Nations in a better financial status, to have an officer who would be responsible to see that the United Nations lives within its financial obligations in order that it may know how it stands financially at any moment.

The other amendment that I submitted, which I believe would be helpful—and its provisions are also covered in the broad language of the President's letter—would prevent the money that we loan at the present time from being used as a part of a voluntary contribution to pay up the assessments of other nations which may not live up to their financial obligations in future undertakings.

We should remember that we are counting on the fact that the Court of International Justice will make a decision with respect to whether assessments for special operations are, in fact, a part of the regular operations of the United Nations and therefore mandatory. We do not know whether that decision will be favorable or not, but we hope and believe that it will be. So that question is involved in the whole situation. It becomes very important to have the proposed loans in such shape that, if the decision is against us, we can take another look at the problem as it arises at that time, which may be within 3 years.

I therefore say that the compromise, which is favored by the Executive and the leaders in this body, together with the supporting letter of the President, is the means by which we can be most satisfied that the difficult problem of financing the United Nations can be carried out at this time. The President in his letter said:

> It shall be the intention of the executive as well as the legislative branch that the proceeds not be used to relieve other U.N. members of their obligations to make good on past assessments on which they are in arrears. I might add that it is equally clear that these proceeds are not to be used to pay the assessments of other members.

With respect to my suggestion that the fiscal section of the U.N. be strengthened by the designation of a minister of finance, he writes of the intent of this Government to pursue efforts "to improve the administration of fiscal affairs in the Secretariat and constituent agencies and bolster the existing fiscal office and officers." He also set forth his intention to increase the knowledge of the Congress about U.N. finances by asking the State Department to prepare a semiannual report setting forth all the fiscal operations of the U.N., "including

but not limited to assessments, arrearages, and payments on the principal and interest of all U.N. loans."

In view of these assurances I have decided not to press my amendments. These are matters perhaps better left to the discretion of the President, in view of his expressed interest in these goals.

I am pleased by the President's statement that he will seek to follow "legislative guidelines" and exert every effort "to minimize the outlays of the United States, maximize the contributions of others and put the essential operations of the United Nations on a sound financial basis."

This is a serious and complicated problem for which there is no easy solution. In my judgment, however, the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute, supplemented by President Kennedy's letter constitutes the best plan advanced. Therefore, I shall support it.

In closing I would like to emphasize my conviction that our relations with other nations in the world must be based on policies which will protect us and our security and advance future opportunities for peace in the world as we see them, with the futures of our children and grandchildren in mind.

For these purposes we will want the U.N. to be an effective organ for discussions, helpful action supported by all the nations who are its members. If this is to be accomplished, these nations must carry out their obligations to the U.N. and not expect the United States to carry their financial burden. If, in the days to come, the U.N. is to be the working reality for peace which all hoped it would be when it was established, it must have more than the professed support of its members. It must have their financial backing also.

I join with others of my colleagues who believe that this debate has been helpful not only in providing us with a better understanding of the U.N. and its obligations, but also in conveying to other member nations a clearer picture of our feelings toward the U.N.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to one phase of the substitute concerning which I have considerable feeling. We already understand that commitments have been made to buy United Nations bonds of 25-year maturity, at 2-percent interest, in the amount of approximately $62 million. If we were to fix an interest rate, it would be the equivalent of 4 percent at the present time, under the amendment now under discussion.

Other nations would then be tempted to say—and they would be foolish if they did not—"We will lend our money at the cost of the money to us at this time."

What rate is paid for money in Great Britain, Mr. President? It is 6 percent. What is paid for money in Latin American countries? They have already committed themselves to buy some of these bonds. They are paying 11, 12, and 15 percent.

What would we be doing if we were to get away from the 2-percent interest rate? We would be running up the cost of the bond issue to the United States, because we would be paying approximately one-third of the cost of retiring these bonds, and approximately one-third of the cost of the interest. If we say that we will set a 4-percent interest rate, we certainly cannot blame any other nations for saying that they will fix the interest rate at the rate their money costs them.

I would reject this interest rate formula simply on the basis that it is bad business for the United States. We would be much better off with a lower interest rate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I do not like to detain the Senate at this late hour. However, earlier today on two occasions I referred to a statement in a newspaper dated the 31st of March, datelined Geneva. I read from it, and I shall do so again very briefly:

> The United States will submit to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a plan calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years and their replacement by a United Nations force, reliable sources said yesterday.

I recognize that at the time it was attributed to "reliable sources." However, since that time, I wrote to Secretary Rusk and to Mr. Foster, who is the head of the Disarmament Agency. Until a few minutes ago I had not received a reply from either gentleman. However, I do have one from Mr. Foster, which I have just now received.

Because I told both the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who is handling the bill on the floor of the Senate, that I would make the contents of any answer I received known to the Senate, I ask the indulgence of the Senate to read this rather short letter. It reads:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND
DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1962.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER,
New Senate Office Building,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: This is in reply to your letter of today which was brought to my attention shortly after noontime. In it you ask me certain questions concerning the U.S. position at Geneva and ask me to comment upon a UPI story which appeared in the Arizona Republic.

The U.S. position at Geneva is based on the program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world proposed by President Kennedy on September 25, 1961. I am enclosing a copy of this program. It contemplates that disarmament would take place in three stages. It also proposes a U.N. Peace Force which would be established in the second stage and progressively strengthened in the third stage. On March 15, 1961, at the Geneva Conference, Secretary Rusk stated that, given faithful cooperation, the first stage in this program could be completed within 3 years. The United States has not, at this time, made any proposal with respect to the length of the other two stages.

It is anticipated that at the end of stages I and II there would be a transition period in which countries would determine whether to proceed to the next stage. This would depend on whether all countries were complying with their obligations, and whether effective international control had been established. Since countries cannot be expected to disarm unless the international political atmosphere warrants it, the United States would doubtless also want to see whether further evolution had taken place toward a peaceful world in which international disputes were settled without recourse to threats of war.

The executive branch is preparing a draft outline of provisions for a disarmament treaty. Appropriate committees of Congress have already received briefings on the course of the Geneva Conference negotiations and on the substance of the U.S. program which such an outline would follow. Further consultation with Congress is planned before the draft outline is offered to the Conference in Geneva.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER.

Mr. President, I do not consider this an answer, either in the affirmative or in the negative. It is the usual bureaucratic gobbledygook, in which nothing is said. Long ago I discovered that in this Government whenever one gets an answer which is more than one page long, someone is trying to beat around the bush.

There are several interesting statements in the letter that I should like to call to the attention of the Senate this evening. At this time we are considering a proposal involving the United Nations. I am convinced that the United Nations has not always acted in the best interest of the United States, and I do not have the confidence in the United Nations that some of my colleagues have in it. I wish that were not so.

I shall not read the three-stage proposal. Instead, I ask unanimous consent that a booklet containing it may be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

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

FREEDOM FROM WAR—THE U.S. PROGRAM FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

INTRODUCTION

The revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences has produced a crisis in human history. In order to overcome the danger of nuclear war now confronting mankind, the United States has introduced at the 16th General Assembly of the United Nations a program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world.

This new program provides for the progressive reduction of the warmaking capabilities of nations and the simultaneous strengthening of international institutions to settle disputes and maintain the peace. It sets forth a series of comprehensive measures which can and should be taken in order to to bring about a world in which there will be freedom from war and security for all states. It is based on three principles deemed essential to the achievement of practical progress in the disarmament field:

First, there must be immediate disarmament action: A strenuous and uninterrupted effort must be made toward the goal of general and complete disarmament; at the same time, it is important that specific measures be put into effect as soon as possible.

Second, all disarmament obligations must be subject to effective international controls: The control organization must have the manpower, facilities, and effectiveness to assure that limitations or reductions take place as agreed. It must also be able to certify to all states that retained forces and armaments do not exceed those per-

mitted at any stage of the disarmament process.

Third, adequate peacekeeping machinery must be established: There is an inseparable relationship between the scaling down of national armaments on the one hand and the building up of international peacekeeping machinery and institutions on the other. Nations are unlikely to shed their means of self-protection in the absence of alternative ways to safeguard their legitimate interests. This can only be achieved through the progressive strengthening of international institutions under the United Nations and by creating a United Nations peace force to enforce the peace as the disarmament process proceeds.

(There follows a summary of the principal provisions of the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. The full text of the program is contained in an appendix to this pamphlet.)

SUMMARY

Disarmament goal and objectives

The overall goal of the United States is a free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law; a world which has achieved general and complete disarmament under effective international control; and a world in which adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

In order to make possible the achievement of that goal, the program sets forth the following specific objectives toward which nations should direct their efforts:

The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations peace force;

The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations peace force and for maintaining internal order;

The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations; and

The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to insure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations.

Task of negotiating states

The negotiating states are called upon to develop the program into a detailed plan for general and complete disarmament and to continue their efforts without interruption until the whole program has been achieved. To this end, they are to seek the widest possible area of agreement at the earliest possible date. At the same time, and without prejudice to progress on the disarmament program, they are to seek agreement on those immediate measures that would contribute to the common security of nations and that could facilitate and form part of the total program.

Governing principles

The program sets forth a series of general principles to guide the negotiating states in their work. These make clear that:

As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations must be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to assure international security and the peaceful settlement of disputes;

Disarmament must proceed as rapidly as possible, until it is completed, in stages containing balanced, phased, and safeguarded measures;

Each measure and stage should be carried out in an agreed period of time, with transition from one stage to the next to take place as soon as all measures in the preceding stage have been carried out and verified and as soon as necessary arrangements for verification of the next stage have been made;

Inspection and verification must establish both that nations carry out scheduled limitations or reductions and that they do not retain armed forces and armaments in excess of those permitted at any stage of the disarmament process; and

Disarmament must take place in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any state.

Disarmament stages

The program provides for progressive disarmament steps to take place in three stages and for the simultaneous strengthening of international institutions.

First Stage

The first stage contains measures which would significantly reduce the capabilities of nations to wage aggressive war. Implementation of this stage would mean that:

The nuclear threat would be reduced:

All states would have adhered to a treaty effectively prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons.

The production of fissionable materials for use in weapons would be stopped and quantities of such materials from past production would be converted to nonweapons uses.

States owning nuclear weapons would not relinquish control of such weapons to any nation not owning them and would not transmit to any such nation information or material necessary for their manufacture.

States not owning nuclear weapons would not manufacture them or attempt to obtain control of such weapons belonging to other states.

A commission of experts would be established to report on the feasibility and means for the verified reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles.

Strategic delivery vehicles would be reduced:

Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles of specified categories and weapons designed to counter such vehicles would be reduced to agreed levels by equitable and balanced steps; their production would be discontinued or limited; their testing would be limited or halted.

Arms and armed forces would be reduced:

The Armed Forces of the United States and the Soviet Union would be limited to 2.1 million men each (with appropriate levels not exceeding that amount for other militarily significant states); levels of armaments would be correspondingly reduced and their production would be limited.

An Experts Commission would be established to examine and report on the feasibility and means of accomplishing verifiable reduction and eventual elimination of all chemical, biological, and radiological weapons.

Peaceful use of outer space would be promoted:

The placing in orbit or stationing in outer space of weapons capable of producing mass destruction would be prohibited.

States would give advance notification of space vehicle and missile launchings.

U.N. peacekeeping powers would be strengthened:

Measures would be taken to develop and strengthen United Nations arrangements for arbitration, for the development of international law, and for the establishment in stage II of a permanent U.N. peace force.

An International Disarmament Organization would be established for effective verification of the disarmament program:

Its functions would be expanded progressively as disarmament proceeds.

It would certify to all states that agreed reductions have taken place and that retained forces and armaments do not exceed permitted levels.

It would determine the transition from one stage to the next.

States would be committed to other measures to reduce international tension and to protect against the chance of war by accident, miscalculation, or surprise attack.

States would be committed to refrain from the threat or use of any type of armed force contrary to the principles of the U.N. Charter and to refrain from indirect aggression and subversion against any country.

A U.N. peace observation group would be available to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or breach of the peace.

States would be committed to give advance notice of major military movements which might cause alarm; observation posts would be established to report on concentrations and movements of military forces.

Second Stage

The second stage contains a series of measures which would bring within sight a world in which there would be freedom from war. Implementation of all measures in the second stage would mean:

Further substantial reductions in the armed forces, armaments, and military establishments of states, including strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and countering weapons;

Further development of methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes under the United Nations;

Establishment of a permanent international peace force within the United Nations;

Depending on the findings of an experts commission, a halt in the production of chemical, bacteriological, and radiological weapons and a reduction of existing stocks or their conversion to peaceful uses;

On the basis of the findings of an experts commission, a reduction of stocks of nuclear weapons.

The dismantling or the conversion to peaceful uses of certain military bases and facilities wherever located; and

The strengthening and enlargement of the International Disarmament Organization to enable it to verify the steps taken in stage II and to determine the transition to stage III.

Third Stage

During the third stage of the program, the states of the world, building on the experience and confidence gained in successfully implementing the measures of the first two stages, would take final steps toward the goal of a world in which:

States would retain only those forces, nonnuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. peace force.

The U.N. peace force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. peace force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

The peacekeeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and the obligations of all states under such arrangements sufficiently far reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world.

APPENDIX

The nations of the world—

Conscious of the crisis in human history produced by the revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences;

Determined to save present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of the arms race and to create conditions in which all peoples can strive freely and peacefully to fulfill their basic aspirations;

Declare their goal to be: A free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law; a world where adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations; a world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control and where the resources of nations shall be devoted to man's material, cultural, and spiritual advance;

Set forth as the objectives of a program of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world:

(a) The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations peace force;

(b) The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations Peace Force and for maintaining internal order;

(c) The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to ensure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations; and

(d) The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

Call on the negotiating states:

(a) To develop the outline program set forth below into an agreed plan for general and complete disarmament and to continue their efforts without interruption until the whole program has been achieved;

(b) To this end to seek to attain the widest possible area of agreement at the earliest possible date; and

(c) Also to seek—without prejudice to progress on the disarmament program—agreement on those immediate measures that would contribute to the common security of nations and that could facilitate and form a part of that program.

Affirm that disarmament negotiations should be guided by the following principles:

(a) Disarmament shall take place as rapidly as possible until it is completed in stages containing balanced, phased and safeguarded measures, with each measure and stage to be carried out in an agreed period of time.

(b) Compliance with all disarmament obligations shall be effectively verified from their entry into force. Verification arrangements shall be instituted progressively and in such a manner as to verify not only that agreed limitations or reductions take place but also that retained armed forces and armaments do not exceed agreed levels at any stage.

(c) Disarmament shall take place in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any state, whether or not a party to an international agreement or treaty.

(d) As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations shall be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to assure international security and the peaceful settlement of differences as well as to facilitate the development of international cooperation in common tasks for the benefit of mankind.

(e) Transition from one stage of disarmament to the next shall take place as soon as all the measures in the preceding stage have been carried out and effective verification is continuing and as soon as the arrangements that have been agreed to be necessary for the next stage have been instituted.

Agree upon the following outline program for achieving general and complete disarmament:

Stage I

A. To establish an International Disarmament Organization:

(a) An International Disarmament Organization (IDO) shall be established within the framework of the United Nations upon entry into force of the agreement. Its functions shall be expanded progressively as required for the effective verification of the disarmament program.

(b) The IDO shall have: (1) a general conference of all the parties; (2) a commission consisting of representatives of all the major powers as permanent members and certain other states on a rotating basis; and (3) an administrator who will administer the organization subject to the direction of the commission and who will have the authority, staff, and finances adequate to assure effective impartial implementation of the functions of the organization.

(c) The IDO shall: (1) insure compliance with the obligations undertaken by verifying the execution of measures agreed upon; (2) assist the states in developing the details of agreed further verification and disarmament measures; (3) provide for the establishment of such bodies as may be necessary for working out the details of further measures provided for in the program and for such other expert study groups as may be required to give continuous study to the problems of disarmament; (4) receive reports on the progress of disarmament and verification arrangements and determine the transition from one stage to the next.

B. To reduce armed forces and armaments:

(a) Force levels shall be limited to 2.1 million each for the United States and U.S.S.R. and to appropriate levels not exceeding 2.1 million each for all other militarily significant states. Reductions to the agreed levels will proceed by equitable, proportionate, and verified steps.

(b) Levels of armaments of prescribed types shall be reduced by equitable and balanced steps. The reductions shall be accomplished by transfers of armaments to depots supervised by the IDO. When, at specified periods during the Stage I reduction process, the states party to the agreement have agreed that the armaments and armed forces are at prescribed levels, the armaments in depots shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(c) The production of agreed types of armaments shall be limited.

(d) A chemical, biological, radiological (CBR) experts commission shall be established within the IDO for the purpose of examining and reporting on the feasibility and means for accomplishing the verifiable reduction and eventual elimination of CBR weapons stockpiles and the halting of their production.

C. To contain and reduce the nuclear threat:

(a) States that have not acceded to a treaty effectively prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons shall do so.

(b) The production of fissionable materials for use in weapons shall be stopped.

(c) Upon the cessation of production of fissionable materials for use in weapons, agreed initial quantities of fissionable materials from past production shall be transferred to nonweapons purposes.

(d) Any fissionable materials transferred between countries for peaceful uses of nuclear energy shall be subject to appropriate safeguards to be developed in agreement with the IAEA.

(e) States owning nuclear weapons shall not relinquish control of such weapons to any nation not owning them and shall not transmit to any such nation information or material necessary for their manufacture. States not owning nuclear weapons shall not manufacture such weapons, attempt to obtain control of such weapons belonging to other states, or seek or receive information or materials necessary for their manufacture.

(f) A nuclear experts commission consisting of representatives of the nuclear states shall be established within the IDO for the purpose of examining and reporting on the feasibility and means for accomplishing the verified reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles.

D. To reduce strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles:

(a) Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles in specified categories and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be reduced to agreed levels by equitable and balanced steps. The reduction shall be accomplished in each step by transfers to depots supervised by the IDO of vehicles that are in excess of levels agreed upon for each step. At specified periods during the stage I reduction process, the vehicles that have been placed under supervision of the IDO shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(b) Production of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be discontinued or limited.

(c) Testing of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be limited or halted.

E. To promote the peaceful use of outer space:

(a) The placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of weapons capable of producing mass destruction shall be prohibited.

(b) States shall give advance notification to participating states and to the IDO of launchings of space vehicles and missiles, together with the track of the vehicle.

F. To reduce the risks of war by accident, miscalculation, and surprise attack:

(a) States shall give advance notification to the participating states and to the IDO of major military movements and maneuvers, on a scale as may be agreed, which might give rise to misinterpretation or cause alarm and induce countermeasures. The notification shall include the geographic areas to be used and the nature, scale and time span of the event.

(b) There shall be established observation posts at such locations as major ports, railway centers, motor highways, and air bases to report on concentrations and movements of military forces.

(c) There shall also be established such additional inspection arrangements to reduce the danger of surprise attack as may be agreed.

(d) An international commission shall be established immediately within the IDO to examine and make recommendations on the possibility of further measures to reduce the risks of nuclear war by accident, miscalculation, or failure of communication.

G. To keep the peace:

(a) States shall reaffirm their obligations under the U.N. Charter to refrain from the threat or use of any type of armed force—including nuclear, conventional, or CBR—contrary to the principles of the U.N. Charter.

(b) States shall agree to refrain from indirect aggression and subversion against any country.

(c) States shall use all appropriate processes for the peaceful settlement of disputes and shall seek within the United Nations further arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the codification and progressive development of international law.

(d) States shall develop arrangements in stage I for the establishment in stage II of a U.N. peace force.

(e) A U.N. peace observation group shall be staffed with a standing cadre of observers who could be dispatched to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or breach of the peace.

Stage II

A. International Disarmament Organization:

The powers and responsibilities of the IDO shall be progressively enlarged in order to give it the capabilities to verify the measures undertaken in stage II.

B. To further reduce armed forces and armaments:

(a) Levels of forces for the United States, U.S.S.R., and other militarily significant states shall be further reduced by substantial amounts to agreed levels in equitable and balanced steps.

(b) Levels of armaments of prescribed types shall be further reduced by equitable and balanced steps. The reduction shall be accomplished by transfers of armaments to depots supervised by the IDO. When, at specified periods during the stage II reduction process, the parties have agreed that the armaments and armed forces are at prescribed levels, the armaments in depots shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(c) There shall be further agreed restrictions on the production of armaments.

(d) Agreed military bases and facilities wherever they are located shall be dismantled or converted to peaceful uses.

(e) Depending upon the findings of the Experts Commission on CBR weapons, the production of CBR weapons shall be halted, existing stocks progressively reduced, and the resulting excess quantities destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

C. To further reduce the nuclear threat:

Stocks of nuclear weapons shall be progressively reduced to the minimum levels which can be agreed upon as a result of the findings of the nuclear experts commission; the resulting excess of fissionable material shall be transferred to peaceful purposes.

D. To further reduce strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles:

Further reductions in the stocks of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be carried out in accordance with the procedure outlined in stage I.

E. To keep the peace:

During stage II, states shall develop further the peace-keeping processes of the United Nations, to the end that the United Nations can effectively in stage II deter or suppress any threat or use of force in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations:

(a) States shall agree upon strengthening the structure, authority, and operation of the United Nations so as to assure that the United Nations will be able effectively to protect states against threats to or breaches of the peace.

(b) The U.N. peace force shall be established and progressively strengthened.

(c) States shall also agree upon further improvements and developments in rules of international conduct and in processes for peaceful settlement of disputes and differences.

Stage III

By the time stage II has been completed, the confidence produced through a verified disarmament program, the acceptance of rules of peaceful international behavior, and the development of strengthened international peace-keeping processes within the framework of the U.N. should have reached a point where the states of the world can move forward to stage III. In stage III progressive controlled disarmament and continuously developing principles and procedures of international law would proceed to a point where no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. peace force and all international disputes would be settled according to the agreed principles of international conduct.

The progressive steps to be taken during the final phase of the disarmament program would be directed toward the attainment of a world in which:

(a) States would retain only those forces, nonnuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. peace force.

(b) The U.N. peace force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

(c) The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. peace force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

(d) The peacekeeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and the obligations of all states under such arrangements sufficiently far reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There are some very interesting parts included in the first stage. For example, we would reach the point where strategic and nuclear weapons delivery vehicles would be reduced.

I wonder if we cannot find some of the opposition to the B–70 and RS–70 from the administration standpoint in this aim of strategic delivery vehicles being reduced in the first stage.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to read this pamphlet, if they have not read it already. It is entitled "Freedom From War. The U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World."

I ask Sentaors to read it because I am rather fearful that we are already engaged in unilateral disarmament without our knowing it. I cannot think of a better document on unilateral disarmament than this one, which has been prepared by the State Department.

Disarmament is a goal that all of us want to reach. It will probably come at some time. However, in my estimation, for the United States to pursue unilateral disarmament at this time would constitute a bigger favor to communism than a Communist revolution would in this country.

I am not satisfied with Mr. Foster's answer, and I have so informed him. I have asked him for a plain yes or no answer to the question: Was a proposal made at Geneva which would indicate the elimination of national arms within 9 years?

I hope I get it; and if I get it, I will certainly place it in the RECORD. What confuses me is the last sentence, which states:

> Further consultation with Congress is planned before the draft outline is offered to the Conference in Geneva.

This indicates that statements have been made in Geneva to the effect that we have such a program and intend to follow it.

Again I apologize to the Senate for having taken so long to discuss this question; but I was keeping my promise to both the majority leader and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], both of whom agreed this morning, in the Chamber, that this was the first information they had on the subject. Also, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] stated that it was his first information. All of them agreed that it would be an unthinkable procedure. Yet there seems to be in the archives of the State Department—in fact, it has not even reached the archives yet, because no one seems to have obtained it—a rather complete outline for accomplishing exactly what the statement by the UPI says was suggested by our officials.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at the time I offered the amendment which has been called up by the Senator from Iowa in his own name, it was a good amendment. I believe it has served a good purpose. The bill which was before the Senate was a rigid bill. It virtually directed the President to purchase $100 million worth of U.N. bonds at a 2 percent interest rate. That was not at all satisfactory to me, and I do not believe it was satisfactory to many other Members of the Senate.

However, as time went on, it appeared that if we continued to press this amendment, we would suffer defeat and the result would be rigid legislation which would only authorize or virtually direct the purchase of United Nations bonds. Therefore, when the White House indicated its willingness to modify its position and accept a modification of the language of the bill, I welcomed the opportunity to agree upon a substitute or compromise with its representatives.

The substitute is not written as I should like to have it; but it is the best we can do. That is why I have committed myself to support the substitute compromise offered by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Montana. For the same reason, I cannot vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, which I originally submitted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it costs not merely money, but also life, to wage war. The people of the United States are prepared to pay the cost of endeavoring to wage the peace. In the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the people of the country and of the Members of the Senate, the United Nations, with all its faults, has accomplished good for the cause of a just peace in the world.

I agree with the statement of the Senator from Vermont. A useful purpose has been served by the amendment which he and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] originally sponsored as a substitute for the recommendations of the President.

I also pay my respects to the great Republican leader of the Senate, EVERETT DIRKSEN, and his counterpart on the other side of the aisle, the Democratic leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, for joining in offering an amendment in the nature

of a substitute which will unquestionably be adopted overwhelmingly by the Senate tonight.

I wish to make the point that Senators who vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will, with their affirmative votes, approve a loan of $100 million to the United Nations. Those who on the passage of the bill support the position taken by the Republican leader and the Democratic leader will likewise approve the recommendation to lend the United Nations up to $100 million.

The difference is that the amendment now before the Senate would require the money to be paid in 3 years; whereas under the language of the substitute measure the Congress would authorize for the President of the United States a flexibility and a leeway to represent the U.S. Government in making the loan, provided, however, that in no instance shall more than $25 million be lent unless other countries match our purchase dollar for dollar.

I shall not, with my vote, tell the United Nations that in 3 years the United States wants its $100 million back. I shall vote for the amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been so excellently prepared by the leaders on both sides of the aisle; the proposal which would authorize the President of the United States, in time of United Nations fiscal travail, to come to the assistance of the United Nations and to demonstrate that, along with the small countries which have already purchased the United Nations bonds, the United States will play its honorable part.

Those are the reasons which prompt me to oppose the amendment which is now before the Senate and to look forward to voting, with the great majority of the Members of the Senate, for the Dirksen-Mansfield substitute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I do not wish to delay the Senate; but I wish to join with the Senator from California in his remarks about that aspect of the proposal. I associate myself with the remarks about the part which the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana, the majority leader, and the distinguished Senator from Vermont have played in reaching a bipartisan agreement on this very difficult problem. I wish to add one further element to the statement made by the Senator from California, which makes the point very concisely.

The one further element is that the program which is presented in the so-called compromise retains the plan to create a situation in which those who have heretofore refused to pay their part of the special assessment will have pressure brought upon them to pay. This, I think, will be very persuasive upon them.

There are those who say we should not do this; that those nations will get out of the United Nations. I do not believe they will do so at all. I do not think they wish to do it, any more than we wish to get out of the United Nations. They merely disapprove of this particular activity and refuse to pay the special assessment.

The compromise retains the very element of enabling the United Nations to bring pressure to bear. This would bring our part back to one-third in the regular budget. So in addition to what the Senator from California has said, this is a very important element.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay the Senate longer. I think every Senator understands the issue. So far as I am concerned, there is no disputing the question that the United Nations probably needs $100 million. But to me, the question is as to the way the program will be administered and the question of safeguarding the obligation, so that it will not be used as a means of using the United States, from year to year, as would be done with the 25-year bond issue, to bail out the United Nations when various countries fail to meet their obligations. This amendment provides a better approach than does the substitute. That is the issue. We have discussed it.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time; although I assume the Senator from Alabama may have a statement to make.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I was highly impressed with the brilliant presentation made by my old friend of the 80th Congress, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. No one has presented his side of the debate more clearly than he.

However, the irrefutable logic of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] provided a complete answer. Similarly, the able minority whip, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], made another clear, lucid presentation. If I had heard none other than those three speeches, the whole atmosphere would be clarified for me.

This is one of the finest hours of the U.S. Senate. Senators of both parties, on both sides of the aisle, are now about to come together in an historic agreement for the good of our Nation and the good of the United Nations.

I intend to vote against the Hickenlooper amendment. I commend the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for the constructive work he has done in the past few weeks. I am confident that I express the views of Senators on both sides of the aisle who have been studying this problem carefully, and also the views of our majority leader and the views of our minority leader, who have arrived at this solution. The Mansfield-Dirksen amendment should receive overwhelmingly approval.

I believe the solution is a good one for the United States. I believe it is a good one for the United Nations; and I know it is important that we provide this financial flexibility to the President of the United States as he seeks to encourage other members of the United Nations to fully meet their duties and obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. I also take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation for the patient, dedicated, intelligent leadership of the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD. The floor management of this important bill was superb. As always the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama, JOHN SPARKMAN, directed, with great skill, patience and logic, this important bill to what I believe to be a most successful conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the debate has been conducted on a very high plane. I believe it should be stated for the RECORD that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the author of the pending amendment, did not agree to the compromise when it was called to his attention. Neither did he disagree; he kept an open mind.

However, I point out to my colleagues that insofar as the leadership on both sides is concerned, when Members are elected to those offices, Senators place a certain amount of trust, confidence, and faith in them.

There was nothing devious, underhanded, or under the table in the negotiations in seeking to bring about an honorable compromise; and there is nothing devious or underhanded in connection with the Hickenlooper amendment, either on the part of those who oppose it or on the part of those who favor it. The difference of opinion is an entirely honest one.

I express the hope that the compromise which has been arrived at with the knowledge and the consent of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]—and he is a distinguished leader—will be accepted tonight by the Senate, and that in the meantime the amendment now pending will be defeated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am ready to do likewise.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield time to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished minority leader such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, thus far I have taken no part in the debate on the question that is occupying the attention of the Senate.

I have been reflecting a little on its historical aspects, as well as on the issue immediately before us.

I hold in my hand the yea-and-nay vote taken in the Senate at the time when the United Nations Charter was confirmed by the Senate on July 28, 1945. It is a rather impressive vote. Eighty-nine Members of the Senate voted in favor of ratification of that charter in its treaty form. Two Senators voted in opposition to ratification. Five Senators did not vote. I presume that when the United Nations Charter was ratified and when the imprimatur of the Senate was placed upon it, with it went the high hopes of the Members of the Senate and the high hopes of all the other people of the country.

Mr. President, that was nearly 17 years ago. Since then the United Nations has had some rather rocky ups and downs and has pursued a tortuous course. As I look back, I admit that I did my full share of rock throwing when things of which I did not approve happened. That is in the nature of things. But as I grow older, I develop more tolerance; and I believe that a confraternity of nations, starting from scratch, is not unlike an infant that has to toddle its way until its legs become strong and it can fight its way in the world.

So there have been 17 years of history with respect to the United Nations.

I can wax as eloquent as any other Senator in taking exception to the things that have happened in the Congo; and I can take exception to the attitude of India—a little sanctimonious, perhaps—when, without consultation, she moved into a Portuguese territory, the proprietorship of which had not been contested for 4½ centuries; and to this good hour the United Nations, through its officialdom, has seemingly not protested; or, Mr. President, if they have protested, it has been done in a weak and an enervated voice. So I could add my share of criticism.

But, with the world constituted as it is today, with all the fever and flames of controversy upon every firmament at this good hour, I doubt whether the United Nations could possibly be constituted again at this time, and perhaps it could not be done in another 50 years. I do not want to see that effort, which began 17 years ago, falter.

There are people at home who do not like my attitude, believe me.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Illinois is not the only one in that situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I have a definite feeling about the United Nations.

When Lincoln delivered his second inaugural address from the portico on the east front of the Capitol, he said that some would make war in order to see the Nation survive, and others would accept war rather than see it perish.

Today, we are in the same moral situation. There are those who would like to see the United Nations perish. There are those who wish to see it survive. I am one of the latter group.

So I have lent my best talents and what feeble endowment and patience I have to this effort, along with the very distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in the hope that we could send forth to all the world a message and an assurance that at long last the Senate of the United States had acted justly, in order to effect a rescue operation—if that is what it is to be—and at the same time utter some kind of warning to those with whom we are associated in this confraternity that we are not quite satisfied with what they have done in the fiscal field.

We forget that the Charter of the United Nations is not now before us. Here on the floor of the Senate, we cannot amend the Charter of the United Nations. I have grave doubts that we shall ever amend the charter. If one has any doubt about that, let him look at the amendatory provision of the charter, which calls for two-thirds in order to initiate and another two-thirds in order to approve, and consider the complex of the 104 nations under the charter. It seems clear that there would never be approval.

So we had better walk on eggs a little before this institution founders. A rocky road is ahead; we shall find ourselves on it a little later. The Secretary General of the United Nations is only acting until 1963. At that time that problem must be dealt with. Will the Soviet Union then renew its troika proposal? I do not know. But certainly that problem must be resolved.

The funds now proposed to be made available will help for a period of 15 months, and then there will be another problem.

I am glad that Adlai Stevenson said, when he spoke this year before the General Assembly, "Let us go home and do a little praying about it and let us search our souls."

Mr. President, perhaps we had better search our souls before we get through.

I will not charge my conscience with any act or deed which would contribute to the foundering of the United Nations, because I do not know how I would then be able to expiate that sin of commission to my grandchildren.

Mr. President, I have not been flattered by some of the speeches which have been made on this floor during the past few days. It was said in a formal speech that this substitute was a specious proposition. That statement is an affront to me. I know what the word "specious" means, and I do not take such a statement lying down.

Incidentally, that was said from my side of the aisle.

Mr. President, what is specious about this proposal? Is the timing specious? I recast the substitute, and we had it out with those from the other end of the avenue. I said I did not want a roaming authorization which would go on forever and forever; I wish to see it nailed down.

What did the President say in his letter? He said:

> The funds made available under this measure will be promptly used, as necessary:

We asked him to put the words "as necessary" in that letter. I leave it to the Senator from Alabama. He said further, "in this or the next calendar year," and the President has put a shortened limit on it over and above what I was willing to agree to.

The President's word in a written letter is his bond, and I am willing to accept it as such.

It is said that no time factor is involved. It is nailed down better than anything that came out of the committee.

Is it the $100 million that is involved? More is spent for lipstick in 1 year in the United States than that amount. Yet here is an agency dedicated to the business of finding and isolating the causes for war, in the hope that peace may be preserved.

I speak as a soldier who once served on the Western Front, under fire, in World War I. I know what a scourge war is. I do not want to see it come to my grandchildren.

Is it time that causes concern? The time has been specified more than once in the President's assurance.

Is it the money? I believe the Senate voted for development aid, in August of last year, an amount of $7,200 million. By a majority of 66 votes, we approved that measure. We are going to provide $7,200 million to the individual nations who are in this great confraternity that we call the United Nations, and here we are asking for $100 million to keep it afloat. So it cannot be a question of money.

Is it the terms, as my distinguished friend from South Dakota pointed out? I try to remember what we do. I want to treat the President of the United States as fairly as the Senate treated my President when he was in office, when in 1955 he asked for the Formosa resolution. I remember the diligence of the distinguished Senator from Oregon as he discussed this question.

What did we put in that measure? We said in the resolution, "the President of the United States be, and he is hereby authorized, to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary." Did we put manacles on him? Of course, we mentioned the Pescadores and Formosa and related areas, but what else did we say? We said the resolution shall expire when the President shall determine. We did not say in 90 days or 6 months. We had some faith in Dwight Eisenhower; and I have not forfeited my faith in John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I am willing always to trust the President, because I think he has a sense of responsibility.

We hear talk about the terms. There is an acknowledgment in the letter to the effect that repayment of both principal and interest in annual installments shall be taken into account. It says nothing as to interest, or how much. In the Mutual Assistance Act of 1961 the language that the Senate approved was that the President is authorized to make loans payable as to principal and interest in U.S. dollars on such terms and conditions as he may determine. No interest rate is provided. There is no requirement as to payment. There is no indication of the maturity of the loans to be made. We gave the President the power and said, "Here is $7,200 million to be loaned over a period of 5 years."

We got more than that in connection with this proposal, I think, and so I do not quarrel.

It is said that there must not be a precedent. Does any Senator wish to confess on the Senate floor that he does not control his own vote and his own independent judgment, no matter what comes along, when he talks about precedents? I am not throwing any precedent out the window. I suppose I have flaunted many out of a high-storied window when they did not suit my purpose. I felt I was voting and operating as an independent Member of the Senate, trying to serve my constituency and my country; and I think I am trying to do so now.

I do not expect too much. The United Nations will have a tortuous road. Senators should not deceive themselves on that score. There are many problems ahead of us. Who knows what may come out of this effort.

When Dean Acheson managed to get the uniting-for-peace resolution some years ago, it became the springboard and helped the General Assembly, by a two-thirds vote, to overcome and override the Security Council veto. The United Nations took an entirely different form, and we must live with it. But I do not want to see the organization foundering. I want to see us make a little effort. Consider the complexion of the General Assembly. There are 104 votes in the General Assembly.

Perhaps it was facetious—I do not know—but allusion was made, in the course of debate, to the Supreme Court decision that resulted from a complaint from Tennessee with respect to apportionment in the legislature. That argument was followed up by the argument, "Suppose we apportioned the United Nations in that way; we would have many more votes." Today it is one voice, one vote. The smallest nation has a vote. We have a vote. But we have a permanent place on the Security Council. Have those who said that thought about it? Suppose some time Russia should assert that right also? If the votes were based on population, consider the population of other countries. What do we suppose would happen if, God forbid, China came into the organization? We would really be down. We must think "down the road" a little. Those are some of the problems which will confront the United Nations.

I want to see the United Nations survive. I want it to be an effective instrumentality and do all the things recited in the preamble of the charter. There are no nobler objectives to which a nation could direct itself.

When we consider a great fraternity of nations which increased from about 50 in 1945 to 104 in 1962, with all the specialized agencies and commissions, all the work that is being done, and the new functions being performed, perhaps it is not strange or so terrible, after all, that the U.N. stumbles a little. Our job is to extend a helping hand, and that is to be done through the President of the United States.

It has been said, "Buy bonds." I point out that the word "loan" or "lend" appears in the substitute. It does not say anything about bonds. We do not have to buy them if there is another way. But we give the conductor of our foreign policy the flexibility that is so indispensable when we are dealing with such an unpredictable problem. So if it does not work in this direction, it will work in another. The President has assured us in his letter what he will do, and that assurance satisfies me. I point out that I "cooked up" an amendment at 2 o'clock in the morning as I was puzzling over this problem. I got up and sat down at the typewriter in my apartment. What did I want?

I thought we ought to have a better report on the fiscal affairs of the United Nations. I thought it should be considered. I favored a quarterly report. So I wrote that down.

This is what the President said:

> In addition, as a supplement to the present annual report to the Congress on United Nations affairs, I shall ask the Department of State to make a semiannual report setting forth all the fiscal operations of the United Nations, including but not limited to assessments, arrearages, and payments on the principal and interest of all U.N. loans, together with such other information as will indicate, among other things, the status and prospects of United Nations financing.

What more could one ask? What more could he say? I was quite satisfied.

I do not know who is the fiscal officer, but I had hoped there would be some improvement, remembering some of the days when I was on the Appropriations Committee and Cabot Lodge was our representative. I was not always too happy when Cabot Lodge came before us to justify the United Nations budgets. We asked him many questions. There was a good deal of scolding and fussing in that committee. I thought "Is the United Nations in this difficulty because it has no good fiscal officers?"

I made a suggestion. This is what is in the President's letter:

> Steps to be taken in pursuance of this goal would include efforts to improve the administration of fiscal affairs in the Secretariat and constituent agencies.

What more could I ask? There it is.

I shall not detain Senators longer. With me, Mr. President, this is not merely a financial question. This is a moral question. We must stand up and be counted in our own generation. It does not make any difference what the mail from back home says to us. We are expected to be students and to pursue the study of this subject with all the documents and books and records at our command. The average citizen cannot do it. He picks something off the front page, or the views of some columnists, but that does not tell the whole story. It is up to us to stand up and be counted.

When Edmund Burke, one of the greatest parliamentarians and legislators of all time, was asked about his relations with his people, he said:

> You must pay attention to them and give heed to and counsel with them, but at long last, when it comes time to best serve your constituency, then you must render your independent judgment, based upon your conviction, for if that fails, you do indeed betray your people.

I shall not do it. I have a couple of grandchildren in Tennessee. Senators have heard me say this before. I have often said to audiences that they carry a terrible handicap because, I say, "That's where 'Estes the Bestes' lives." [Laughter.]

That statement is born of sheer affection. They are in Tennessee. They are growing up. They will be the custodians and trustees of this country when they grow up. I want them to have a country free, solvent, and secure like the one their granddad had. Along with it, I want to vouchsafe to them as a legacy the last best hope of peace. What greater contribution can we make to those who will come after us than to enable them to summon up out of their souls all the talent the Lord gave them in an atmosphere of peace to achieve whatever a free country has to offer.

So in the interest of peace and in the interest of the continuing effort which must go on I earnestly hope the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] will not prevail, after the work we have done, and I hope that the substitute which bears my humble name and the name of the distinguished majority leader will prevail, and that in good spirit we can send this measure to the House of Representatives for further consideration, so that the nations of the United Nations will no longer be in doubt as to where the United States stands in respect to its interest in the United Nations and in respect to its determination that this effort shall not fail if human ingenuity and some money can make it succeed.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I have been a Member of the Senate for 11 years. This evening I have heard one of the finest speeches ever delivered in the Senate. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as a substitute for the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 72, as follows:

[No. 38 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Butler	Goldwater	Scott
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Morton	Talmadge
Cotton	Mundt	Tower
Curtis	Murphy	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Pearson	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Prouty	

NAYS—72

Aiken	Gore	McGee
Allott	Gruening	McNamara
Bartlett	Hart	Metcalf
Beall	Hartke	Miller
Bible	Hayden	Monroney
Boggs	Hickey	Morse
Burdick	Hill	Moss
Bush	Holland	Muskie
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pell
Cannon	Javits	Proxmire
Carroll	Johnston	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Jordan	Robertson
Church	Keating	Saltonstall
Clark	Kefauver	Smathers
Cooper	Kerr	Smith, Mass.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dodd	Lausche	Stennis
Douglas	Long, Mo.	Symington
Eastland	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Ellender	Magnuson	Wiley
Engle	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McCarthy	Yarborough
Fulbright	McClellan	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson	Chavez	Neuberger
Bennett	Hruska	Russell
Capehart	Long, La.	

So Mr. HICKENLOOPER's substitute amendment for the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On what question are the yeas and nays called for?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the substitute amendment is agreed to by voice vote, will there be a yea and nay vote on the substitute, even though the vote will be on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be an opportunity for a yea and nay vote after third reading.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. May I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may request the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on the bill I yield to the Senator from Arkansas such time as he may desire to take.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is no disagreement on the proposition that the United Nations is in serious financial difficulties. Neither is there disagreement with the observation that a good many Americans are troubled not only with respect to how the financial difficulties of the United Nations may be met, but about the role of the U.N. in the foreign policy of the United States.

Should our discussions of the bond proposal develop into an appraisal of the role of the United Nations in U.S. foreign policy, I suspect our debate will tend to ignore some of our national frustrations which may tend to color and distort our view of the United Nations.

Hindsight now suggests that most Americans were unduly optimistic of the role of the United Nations in world politics. In the Senate only two negative votes were cast against ratification of the United Nations Charter. Today, however, a good many Americans are inspecting the U.N. with eyes that are out of focus or colored by prejudice. The United Nations is neither as potent as some believe, nor as impotent as others believe.

While some Americans are frustrated because the United Nations has not become a world government, others are frustrated because it shows too many attributes of power. To put it another way, the U.N. has come farther in 16 years than some have wanted, and not as far as others have desired.

I suggest that Members of the Senate in deciding how to vote on the issues posed by the bond proposal and the various substitutes that may be offered should be clear in their own minds as to precisely what the United Nations is, and what it is not.

We should be clear in the first place that the United Nations is not a perfect instrument in an imperfect world. It is not a device which can be used always to implement the foreign policy of the United States; but neither is it a device to implement the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, or any other state. And by the same token, the United Nations is not an instrument that can be used to force the United States to move in directions which we do not conceive to be in our national interest.

For some reason, Americans who worry about the United Nations seem to fall into one of two categories; they are either so intensely pro-U.N. that they do not see its faults, or they are so vigorously anti-U.N. that they fail to see its virtues. I suggest the truth is somewhere between these extremes. The U.N. has both virtues and faults. It is our job in this debate to determine whether this organization, with its virtues and its faults, is to be kept in business. More specifically, we must decide whether we are to help the United Nations meet the costs of intervening in two special type situations—the United Nations action in the Middle East, and the United Nations action in the Congo.

If we approve the proposal to assist the United Nations, we will continue U.N. intervention in those specific situations. Furthermore, by implication, we will indicate that it would not be improper for the U.N. to intervene in similar situations in the future. If we reject this proposal, we will be saying, in effect, that U.N. forces should be withdrawn forthwith from the Middle East and from the Congo and that the United States would be willing to live with the consequences of those withdrawals.

I am aware that there are strong differences of opinion in this country over the wisdom of the United Nations action in the Congo, and somewhat lesser differences of opinion over the wisdom of the United Nations action in the Middle East. I would point out, however, that U.N. intervention in the Middle East was consummated during the incumbency of President Eisenhower, with the support of the Democratic Congress; and that the U.N. action in the Congo was inaugurated during the incumbency of President Eisenhower, and is strongly supported by President Kennedy.

The fact that both American political parties have supported these actions of their elected representatives does not make those U.N. interventions right. However, that fact should at least shift the burden of proving them wrong to those who would deny that those interventions served the interests of the United States.

I do not propose at this time to examine in detail the nature of United

Nations intervention in either the Middle East or in the Congo. It should be noted, however, that both situations involved serious danger of irrevocable confrontations between the great powers and the very real possibility of uncontrolled escalation into nuclear warfare. Had the U.N. not been available to stand between the great powers or, to put it more bluntly, had the U.N. not proved a stumbling block to Soviet aspirations in the Congo and the Middle East, we might now be confronted with serious Communist penetration of those two areas. We should note further that the troops stationed in the Middle East and in the Congo are not American troops; neither are they Soviet troops. It is the smaller members of the United Nations which have supplied military forces for the Middle East—about 5,000—and for the Congo—15,000 to 20,000. It is these troops that are bearing the brunt of what is at best an onerous duty, and at worst involves the supreme sacrifice.

Now there may be some who take the position that a few American marines could do the job better, quicker, and cheaper. But I am sure of one thing, that direct American intervention in either of these trouble spots would have invited intervention by other great powers and would have stirred nationalist, anti-American sentiment to fever pitch in these areas.

In short, Mr. President, it does seem to me that U.N. forces in each of these areas has contributed to the maintenance of peace and to the independence of these states. We have not sought to establish U.S. hegemony in these areas; but neither have they been captured by the Communists.

If the United States were now to withdraw its logistic and financial support from the U.N. actions in the Middle East and the Congo, United Nations forces would be compelled to withdraw. The vacuum that would thereby be created would invite three types of consequences. One consequence would be the bloody renewal of fighting between the opponents, each seeking arms and support from whoever would help. Another possibility would be the immediate stationing of substantial numbers of American troops in these areas. The third possibility would be outright Soviet intervention.

I prefer the continued presence of United Nations forces in these areas to any of the alternatives. And if United Nations forces are to stay in these areas, they must receive support, including support from the United States.

There remain two questions. First, whether it is in our national interest to keep in being in the United Nations an instrumentality which may be used in similar situations in the future. Second, if so, then is the proposal before us one which provides a reasonable means of meeting the costs of these peace-keeping functions.

Few would deny that there may be situations in the future when United Nations intervention of the type now going on in the Middle East and in the Congo will be in the national interests of the United States. For example, the time may come when U.N. intervention in some way in the Berlin situation may be required; similarly there may be situations developing in southeast Asia which might suggest the rationality of United Nations action there. I am not prepared to support measures which would scuttle forever the possibilities of U.N. action, as distinguished from U.N. talk.

In this connection, it is well to keep in mind that the magnitude of U.S. contributions to the United Nations have been such that it would be most difficult, if not impossible, for the United Nations to mount an intervention over the protests of the United States, and without our assistance.

On the second point—whether the proposal now before us is a reasonable means of financing the Middle East and Congo operations for the next 18 months—I can only say that I have not been able to figure out a better method. While it is seldom in the affairs of man that everything works out as planned, a purchase of United Nations bonds at this time, or a loan to the United Nations, will provide a breathing spell during which the organization can seek more certain methods of financing not only the Middle East and Congo operations, but of financing similar operations which may need to be undertaken in the future. Furthermore, the action of the General Assembly in seeking an opinion from the World Court, which over a period of time may compel members to pay their past assessments on pain of losing their vote in the General Assembly, should assist the United Nations in paying bills past due.

And finally on this point, the retirement of U.N. bonds or the repayment of loans by including repayments as a part of the regular United Nations budget should reinforce the principle that power must be related to responsibility. If every member of the U.N. is to have one vote and if rollcalls are to determine United Nations policies, then members who insist on the right to vote must accept the responsibility of backing up their votes with resources insofar as those resources may be called upon on the basis of their capacity to contribute. Some of the poorer states may be able to give only token support to United Nations operations of the type we have been discussing. But if it is an attribute of sovereignty and independence to vote, it is likewise a responsibility of independence to accept responsibility for the consequences of such votes.

In conclusion, the broad decision before us is whether or not we are to abandon the United Nations. It does seem to me that the United Nations, even though confronted by a most difficult situation brought on partly by its increase in membership, nevertheless is still able to play an important part in preventing war. It also seems to me that the proposal before us is not an unreasonable way to finance the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

CONSTRUCTIVE COMPROMISE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as the Senate nears final action on a measure to meet the financial crisis of the United Nations, there is no evidence that the controversy over this issue is dead. There is no evidence of unanimous Senate support for any position. But, as has been often said in discussions of the United Nations itself, we live in a real world. Honorable men differ. Unanimity is rare indeed and often somewhat suspect.

What we all have every reason to welcome, however, is the manner in which Senators of both parties have studied the issue thoroughly and come up with a number of new and valuable proposals to make our financial help to the U.N. more effective. Basically, all Americans are concerned over the fact that many—in fact most—U.N. members have not been paying their full share. All Americans are concerned over the fact that the Soviet veto has virtually paralyzed the Security Council. All Americans are concerned over the role being played by the General Assembly—not because we do not like new nations which are not as strong as we—but because the General Assembly has not been living up to the standards of a responsible deliberative body, because it has too often been a forum for the exchange of propaganda rather than facts, for the trading of votes rather than the honest resolution of differences. All Americans are concerned with the threat of a U.N. double standard—whether it differentiates between Communist or non-Communist, Afro-Asians or Europeans, new countries or old ones, black areas or whites ones—whether it judges issues on prejudice and propaganda, or on facts. All Americans are concerned when the U.N. votes along any standard other than truth and justice.

And finally, Mr. President, the vast majority of Americans are concerned to insure that the United Nations does not merely go on as it has in the past, but rather that it tries to repair its flaws and to face the challenges of international affairs with new strength.

The Senate debate and consideration of the issue and the final compromise which has been reached have provided the American people and in fact the whole world with a new opportunity to appraise the U.N. The compromise bond proposal is not perfect, for despite the President's letter to Senator SPARKMAN, we do not know how he will finally act, whether he will permit long- or short-term loans and at what interest.

But it has the real merit of giving the President sufficient authority to contribute to the bond issue and at the same time to negotiate on other terms as warranted. If other nations are ready to buy their share of bonds, there may be no need for any short-term U.S. loan. If other nations hold back—still expecting us to foot the bill—they may be surprised and they may discover—I sincerely hope they will—that we expect a full and fair return on any additional short-term loan.

The United Nations can serve the free world well in a number of areas, but

it should never be regarded as an American charity, to be supported by the largesse of U.S. taxpayers. If that happens, it will be doomed. The Mansfield-Dirksen proposal is one possible way to avoid that fate; it was conceived and developed as a bipartisan, nonpolitical measure in the national interest of the United States and in the international interest of the whole free world and of the U.N. itself.

In that spirit, I give it my full and vigorous support.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall support the legislation on which we shall now vote.

We have frustrated the Communist efforts to obstruct and neutralize the United Nations. In this connection, permit this personal observation: We must, if we are to avert the unparalleled disaster of nuclear war, maintain the vision of what the United Nations must become, an effective agency for bringing the rule of law into international affairs.

In addressing a meeting of a unit of the American Association for the United Nations at Charleston, W. Va., on December 8, 1961, I made a statement appropriate to reemphasize. It is this:

As armaments continue to spiral upward we live in ever increasing danger of war by accident or miscalculation. In this atmosphere of uncertainty and increasing tension the ultimate testing time of freedom is just now beginning.

The unity which we must create among the free nations will not remain viable if predicated solely upon a shared antagonism to communism. It must be built on the firmer foundation of a community of aims and aspirations among our allies. And this will require a greater degree of intellectual honesty and hard self-scrutiny than we have heretofore given to the task.

In saying this, I declared last December that I specifically refer to the practice in recent years of the United States depending too heavily on the United Nations as an arena in which to conduct our foreign policy. Too often our willingness to take problems to the United Nations has been a cloak for our own lack of policy. In so doing, we have not strengthened the United Nations, and we have not served the cause of freedom by posing problems which could not be solved in that forum.

I am not suggesting that we go it alone. I am recommending, however, that we be scrupulously honest in our appraisal of our own ideals and in the capacity of the United Nations to serve them. We do no disservice to the United Nations when we acknowledge that, as presently constituted, there are some problems it cannot solve. Indeed, we may help preserve the United Nations and allow it to grow strong if we do not prematurely overburden it.

I believe there is a cognizance by the present administration of the need for such a reappraisal of our country's role in relationship to that of the United Nations. This is reflected in the realistic measure which we shall approve in this forum tonight.

Mr. PELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I believe that the compromise formula worked out by the Democratic and Republican leadership with regard to U.S. participation in the purchase of U.N. bonds is an excellent one in every way.

From the viewpoint of our military interests, it provides the wherewithal to continue operations such as the United Nations emergency fund in the Middle East and the United Nations operations in the Congo. These are operations that must be carried out not only for preservation of peace in the areas concerned, but for the preservation of peace in the world as a whole. Yet these are operations that can be more economically and better politically performed by the United Nations than by the United States. And, because of our own prosperity and from a material viewpoint, we have perhaps the most to lose and hence, the largest stake in this keeping of worldwide peace.

Moreover, from a material viewpoint, if this compromise proposal is accepted, we will be paying approximately 33 percent of the total cost for such operations, instead of the almost 50 percent that we pay now.

Naturally, it is always unpleasant to pay money for anything. But, if ever there was a type of service that was worth its weight in more than gold, it is these keep-the-peace operations that have been performed underneath the U.N. umbrella. Accordingly, I intend to vote for this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators in control of the time yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it proper for Senators to record their votes in any way except from their seats in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a matter of custom for them to answer from their seats.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I insist that the custom be followed.

Mr. LAUSCHE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], are absent on official business.

I also anounce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 22, as follows:

[No. 39 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Aiken	Gore	Monroney
Allott	Gruening	Morse
Bartlett	Hart	Morton
Beall	Hartke	Moss
Bible	Hayden	Muskie
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Burdick	Hickey	Pearson
Bush	Hill	Pell
Butler	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Proxmire
Cannon	Jackson	Randolph
Carlson	Javits	Saltonstall
Carroll	Jordan	Scott
Case, N.J.	Keating	Smathers
Church	Kefauver	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Kerr	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Symington
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Wiley
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Engle	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ervin	McGee	Young, Ohio
Fong	McNamara	
Fulbright	Metcalf	

NAYS—22

Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Magnuson	Stennis
Cotton	McClellan	Talmadge
Curtis	Miller	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mundt	Tower
Eastland	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Robertson	
Goldwater	Russell	

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson	Chavez	Long, La.
Bennett	Hruska	Neuberger
Capehart	Lausche	

So the bill (S. 2768) was passed, as follows:

S. 2768

An act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, without fiscal-year limitation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $100,000,000 for a loan to the United Nations. It is the intent of the Congress that the proceeds of the present loan shall not be used to relieve states members of the United Nations of their obilgation to pay arrearages on payments of any United Nations assessments.

SEC. 2. The amount of money to be lent to the United Nations pursuant to authorization contained in the first section of this Act shall not exceed by more than $25,000,000 the aggregate amount of loans made or agreed to be made by other nations.

SEC. 3. There shall be deducted from the annual payment of the assessed share of the United States of the budget of the United Nations an amount equal to the corresponding annual installment of principal and interest due to the United States on account of the loan made pursuant to section 1.

SEC. 4. Nothing herein shall be regarded as authorizing the United States to participate in any future United Nations borrowing. It is the sense of the Congress that the United States shall use its best efforts to promote a pattern of United Nations financing (including a vigorous program for collection of delinquencies on annual assessments of nations and maintenance of such annual assessments on a current basis) that makes unnecessary any future large-scale borrowing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I announced the schedule of proposed legislation, I wish to congratulate and commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who managed with such great skill and understanding the bill which has just passed the Senate; the distinguished minority leader, who was a tower of strength in the consideration of this measure all the way through; and the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who showed his understanding and his tolerance of the difficulties involved in the consideration of this particular measure. To those three Senators should go most of the credit for what was accomplished tonight.

I also compliment Members of the Senate, who voted either for or against the bill, because they acted from the basis of their honest judgment; they did what they thought was best in the light of their own consciences.

I am delighted that the bill has now passed the Senate and will leave us shortly.

Again, I extend my deepest thanks to the three Senators who so ably managed the work in behalf of the bill, and to all other Senators, regardless of how they voted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no greater or more effective weapon than the brilliant tolerance and understanding of the majority leader. He is never in a hurry; he takes everything in his stride. He is patient with every viewpoint. I know of no instrumentality so contrived to get good results as the quality which he has in such rich measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I join with the majority leader in his high commendation of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for the magnificent work they have done in connection with the bill.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to add two more names to the list of those who deserve high honors, namely, the majority leader himself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I know that if it had not been for the leadership of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Arkansas in the committee, when they assisted the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] at all times, as I feel certain the Senator from Alabama would be the first to testify the bill would have had difficulty in committee. Also wish to thank another Senator for the help the committee received from him. I refer to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. His statesmanship once again was a great service to the Senate.

I think a very effective blow was struck in the passage of the bill tonight in support of peace through the one organization in the world which, in my judgment, offers mankind its best hope for substituting the law of reason for the jungle law of force—that is, the United Nations and its procedures. But if the United Nations is to work, it must have resources and finances with which to perform its services of trying to maintain, peace in the world. So the Senate tonight, in my judgment, has in effect repledged its faith in obtaining international peace through the procedures of the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I agree completely with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon concerning the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I join in the statement of the majority leader. The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], with whom I have had a long association, both on the Committee on Foreign Relations and on the Committee on Banking and Currency, deserves all the credit for the management of the bill. I was in my own State on political business during the hearings. The Senator from Alabama deserves credit not only for the action of the committee in considering the bill, but also for his management of the bill on the floor of the Senate.

I commend the Senator from Alabama and all other Senators who participated in the debate for having moved this excellent piece of legislation through the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate all the good things which have been said about me by my colleagues in the Senate. However, for just a moment I wish to point up something else. It is something to which I really intended to call attention in the course of the debate on the bill, but events moved so well and so fast that I did not have time to do so. I refer to the nonpartisanship with which the bill was considered in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and which is so characteristic of that committee. I have served under five or six chairmen of that committee, and during all that time the same thing has been true. The business of the committee is always approached on a nonpartisan basis.

When the committee was holding its executive session, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] made the statement that he did not wish to see reported to the Senate a bill which might be passed by a very narrow margin and might be fought out largely on partisan lines. He said that whatever bill was reported to the Senate, or whatever bill the committee agreed upon, ought to be a bill which would leave the committee with practically the unanimous support of the committee. The committee approved the bill with only one opposing vote; there was not even a rollcall. We have witnessed the same type of nonpartisanship on the floor of the Senate. That augurs well for the foreign policy of the United States.

I hope and believe the Senate will continue to show that type of nonpartisanship in the handling of foreign affairs, and I trust that that will be true throughout the entire Government.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 384)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to urban mass transportation. The message has been read in the House of Representatives, and, without objection, the message will be referred to the Committee on Commerce, without reading, and printed in the RECORD.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

An efficient and dynamic transportation system is vital to our domestic economic growth, productivity and progress. Affecting the cost of every commodity we consume or export, it is equally vital to our ability to compete abroad. It influences both the cost and the flexibility of our defense preparedness, and both the business and recreational opportunities of our citizens.

This Nation has long enjoyed one of the most highly developed and diversified transportation systems in the world, and this system has helped us to achieve a highly efficient utilization of our manpower and resources.

Transportation is thus an industry which serves, and is affected with, the national interest. Federal laws and policies have expressed the national interest in transportation particularly in the last 80 years: through the promotion and development of transportation facilities, such as highways, airways, and waterways; through the regulation of rates and services; and through general governmental policies relating to taxation, procurement, labor, and competition. A comprehensive program for transportation must consider all of these elements of public policy.

During the last session of Congress, action was taken to place our Federal-aid highway program on a sounder fiscal basis. Initial steps were taken to improve the operations of our regulatory agencies through reorganization. A beginning was also made toward meeting the needs of our cities for mass transportation. By Executive order, I recently assigned to the Department of Commerce authority for emergency transportation planning.

But pressing problems are burdening our national transportation system, jeopardizing the progress and security on which we depend. A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times. This patchwork does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half-century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition.

The regulatory commissions are required to make thousands of detailed decisions based on out-of-date standards. The management of the various modes of transportation is subjected to excessive, cumbersome, and time-consuming regulatory supervision that shackles and distorts managerial initiative. Some parts of the transportation industry are restrained unnecessarily; others are promoted or taxed unevenly and inconsistently.

Some carriers are required to provide, at a loss, services for which there is little demand. Some carriers are required to charge rates which are high in relation to cost in order to shelter competing carriers. Some carriers are prevented from making full use of their capacity by restrictions on freedom to solicit business or adjust rates. Restraints on cost-reducing rivalry in ratemaking often cause competition to take the form of cost-increasing rivalry—such as excessive promotion and traffic solicitation, or excessive frequency of service. Some carriers are subject to rate regulation on the transportation of particular commodities while other carriers, competing for the same traffic, are exempt. Some carriers benefit from public facilities provided for their use, while others do not; and of those enjoying the use of public facilities, some bear a large part of the cost, while others bear little or none.

No simple Federal solution can end the problems of any particular company or mode of transportation. On the contrary, I am convinced that less Federal regulation and subsidization is in the long run a prime prerequisite of a healthy intercity transportation network. The constructive efforts of State and local governments as well as the transportation industry will also be needed to revitalize our transportation services.

This administration's study of long-range transportation needs and policies convinces me that current Federal policies must be reshaped in the most fundamental and far-reaching fashion. While recognizing that a revision of the magnitude required is a task to which the Congress will wish to devote considerable time and effort, I believe the recommendations below are of sufficient urgency and importance that the Congress should begin consideration of them at the earliest practicable date. If direct and decisive action is not taken in the near future, the undesirable developments, inefficiencies, inequities, and other undesirable conditions that confront us now will cause permanent loss of essential services or require even more difficult and costly solutions in the not too distant future.

A BASIC NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

The basic objective of our Nation's transportation system must be to assure the availability of the fast, safe, and economical transportation services needed in a growing and changing economy to move people and goods, without waste or discrimination, in response to private and public demands at the lowest cost consistent with health, convenience, national security, and other broad public objectives. Investment or capacity should be neither substantially above nor substantially below these requirements—for chronic excess capacity involves misuse of resources, and lack of adequate capacity jeopardizes progress. The resources devoted to provision of transportation service should be used in the most effective and efficient manner possible; and this, in turn, means that users of transport facilities should be provided with incentives to use whatever form of transportation which provides them with the service they desire at the lowest total cost, both public and private.

This basic objective can and must be achieved primarily by continued reliance on unsubsidized privately owned facilities, operating under the incentives of private profit and the checks of competition to the maximum extent practicable. The role of public policy should be to provide a consistent and comprehensive framework of equal competitive opportunity that will achieve this objective at the lowest economic and social cost to the Nation.

This means a more coordinated Federal policy and a less segmented approach. It means equality of opportunity for all forms of transportation and their users and undue preference to none. It means greater reliance on the forces of competition and less reliance on the restraints of regulation. And it means that, to the extent possible, the users of transportation services should bear the full costs of the services they use, whether those services are provided privately or publicly.

For some 75 years, common carriage was developed by the intention of Congress and the requirements of the public as the core of our transport system. This pattern of commerce is changing—the common carrier is declining in status and stature with the consequent growth of the private and exempt carrier. To a large extent this change is attributable to the failure of Federal policies and regulation to adjust to the needs of the shipping and consuming public; to a large extent it is attributable to the fact that the burdens of regulation are handicapping the certificated common carrier in his efforts to meet his unregulated competition. Whatever the cause, the common carrier with his obligation to serve all shippers—large or small—on certain routes at known tariffs and without any discrimination performs an essential function that should not be extinguished.

Considerable research and analysis, going far beyond our present findings, will be required before we know enough about the costs and other characteristics of various forms of transportation to guarantee the achievement of these objectives in full. In the meantime, it is clear that the following fundamental reforms in our transportation policy are needed now.

PART I. INTERCITY TRANSPORTATION

Our system of intercity public transportation—including railroads, trucks, buses, ships and barges, airplanes and pipelines—is seriously weakened today by artificial distortions and inefficiencies inherent in existing Federal policies. Built up over the years, they can be removed only gradually if we are to mitigate the hardships that are bound to arise in any program of far-reaching adjustment.

As an initial step, I am requesting the Chairmen of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Maritime Commission to meet at frequent intervals to discuss regulatory problems affecting the various modes of transportation and to seek coordinated solutions in the form of legislation or administrative action that will improve the regulatory process.

(A) EQUAL COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITY UNDER DIMINISHED REGULATION

(1) Bulk commodities: At present, the transportation of bulk commodities by water carriers is exempt from all rate regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act, including the approval of minimum rates; but this exemption is denied to all other modes of transportation. This is clearly inequitable both to the latter and to shippers—and it is an inequity which should be removed. Extending to all other carriers the exemption from the approval or prescription of minimum rates would permit the

forces of competition and equal opportunity to replace cumbersome regulation for these commodities, while protecting the public interest by leaving intact the ICC's control over maximum railroad rates and other safeguards (such as the prohibition against discrimination, and requirements on car service and common carrier responsibility). While this would be the preferable way to eliminate the existing inequality, Congress could elect to place all carriers on an equal footing by repealing the existing exemption—although this would result in more, instead of less, regulation and very likely in higher though more stable rates. Whichever alternative is adopted, these commodities are too important a part of carrier traffic to continue to be governed so unequally by Federal rate regulation.

(2) Agricultural and fishery products: An exemption similar to that described above, and now available only to motor carriers and freight forwarders, relates to agricultural and fishery products. This exemption from minimum rates should also be extended to all carriers. Here, too, the ICC should retain control of maximum railroad rates and certain other controls to protect the public interest in those areas where there is no effective truck or water carrier competition to keep rates down.

The combined effect of extending these bulk and agricultural exemptions will be to reduce drastically and equalize fairly the regulation of freight rates in this country. Freed to exercise normal managerial initiative, carriers will be able to rationalize their operations and reduce costs; and shippers should consequently enjoy a wider choice, improved service and lower rates.

(3) Intercity passenger rates: The traveling public, like the commercial shipper, is also uninterested in paying higher rates to subsidize weak segments of the transportation industry. Chronic overcapacity and deficits can be ended in the long run only in an industry made fit, lean and progressive by vigorous competition and innovation. But this is not possible as long as Federal agencies fix uniform minimum rates for passenger travel. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation which would eventually limit the control of intercity passenger rates to the establishment of maximum rates only. In the case of the airlines, it may be preferable to initiate this program on a gradual or temporary basis under existing authority.

To prevent the absence of minimum rate regulation under the above three proposals from resulting in predatory, discriminatory trade practices or rate wars reflecting monopolistic ambitious rather than true efficiency, the Congress should make certain that such practices by carriers freed from minimum rate regulations would be covered by existing laws against monopoly and predatory trade practices.

While the above three recommendations relate to the most critical—and controversial—problems of unnecessary or unequal regulatory curbs on transportation, other changes in the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act are needed consistent with these same principles. I recommend that legislation be enacted to:

(4) Assure all carriers the right to ship vehicles or containers on the carriers of other branches of the transportation industry at the same rates available to noncarrier shippers. This change will put the various carriers in a position of equality with freight forwarders and other shippers in the use of the promising and fast-growing piggyback and related techniques.

(5) Repeal the provision of the Interstate Commerce Act which now prevents a railroad from hauling cargo it owns. The need for this provision, which goes back to the days of oppressive railroad monopoly, has largely passed; and its current effect is to handicap the railroads in competing with other modes of transportation. The antitrust laws can insure protection against the possible abuse by a railroad of its dual status as shipper and carrier.

(6) Direct the regulatory agencies to sanction experimental freight rates, modifications and variations in existing systems of classification and documentation, and new kinds or combinations of service.

(B) CONSISTENT POLICIES OF TAXATION AND USER CHARGES

The same accidents of circumstance that have molded our transportation regulatory policies and programs have largely determined specific transportation taxes. As a result, inequities have developed and in some instances have persisted for many years.

(1) Transportation excise tax: I have already recommended repeal of the 10-percent passenger transportation tax. This tax, a vestige of World War II and the Korean war, has undoubtedly discriminated against public transportation in favor of the automobile. I again recommend repeal of this tax to improve the competitive position of intercity railroad and bus passenger transportation systems, which generally are not publicly supported, and to clear the way for an equitable system of user charges for aviation.

(2) Aviation: For commercial airlines, I have suggested (a) continuation of the 2-cents-per-gallon net tax on gasoline and extension of that tax rate to all jet fuels; and (b) a 5-percent tax on airline tickets and on air freight waybills. By delaying until January 1, 1963 the effective date of all proposed changes as they affect aviation—including the repeal of the passenger tax for the airlines—ample time will be allowed for review by the Civil Aeronautics Board of any tariff adjustments that may be required by the carriers to recover the cost of user charges on fuel. The ticket and waybill taxes will be passed on directly to ultimate users.

For general aviation, such as recreational flying and company planes to which ticket and waybill taxes would not be applicable, a fuel tax of 3 cents per gallon is recommended as a minimal step toward recouping the heavy Federal investment in the airways.

All of the above taxes—in effect user charges—will recover only about half of the annual cost of the Federal airways system which is properly allocable to civil aviation. Total airways costs, which are approximately $500 million annually, have risen steadily in the past decade and will continue to grow as airways facilities and services are improved to accommodate future air traffic. Repeal of the 10-percent passenger tax as it now applies to aviation should not become effective, therefore, until the recommended user charges are in force for all segments of civil aviation.

(3) Inland waterways: Also in the interest of equality of treatment and opportunity, the principle of user charges should be extended to the inland waterways. A tax of 2 cents per gallon should be applied to all fuels used in transportation on the waterways. The recommended effective date, January 1, 1963, will allow time for review by the Interstate Commerce Commission of any adjustments that may be necessary in common carrier rates. This deferral is recommended even though the bulk of inland waterways traffic is carried by unregulated rather than regulated carriers.

The new tax should include an exemption similar to the current exemption from taxation accorded to gasoline and ships' supplies for vessels employed in the fisheries, foreign trade, or trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States or between the United States and any of its possessions. Vessels in domestic trade using facilities and routes similar to those engaged in foreign trade, and vessels in coastal trade which are too large to use the intracoastal waterways, should also be exempted.

This administration recognizes the responsibility of the Government to maintain and improve our system of inland waterways. Over $2 billion of Federal funds has already been invested in capital improvements. Expenditures for operating and maintaining the waterways are about $70 million annually, even though only a small fraction of the traffic consists of common carriers which serve all shippers and the general public. The users of the waterways include some of the largest and financially strongest corporations in the United States today, and it is surely feasible and appropriate for them to pay a small share of the Federal Government's costs in providing and maintaining waterway improvements.

(4) Income taxes: Another effort to improve equity in taxation is being taken by the Treasury Department, which is reviewing the administrative guidelines now governing depreciation rates in the transportation industry. The objective of this administration will be to give full recognition to current economic forces, including obsolescence, which in their impact upon the lives of depreciable assets may affect quite differently the different modes of transportation and, therefore, their competitive relationships. In addition, I recommend that the Internal Revenue Code be amended to increase from 5 to 7 years the period during which regulated public utilities, including those in transportation, can apply prior year losses to reduce current income for tax purposes.

(C) EVENHANDED GOVERNMENT PROMOTION OF INTERCITY TRANSPORTATION

To achieve a better balance of Federal promotional programs:

(1) I urge favorable consideration of legislation proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board last year to make the domestic trunk air carriers ineligible for operating subsidies in the future. These carriers provide more passenger-miles of transportation service than any of the other common carriers; and, while they are experiencing temporary overcapacity and have recently sustained financial losses, they have bright prospects for longrun growth and prosperity which should make them permanently independent of Government support.

(2) With respect to other aviation subsidies, the Congress has limited to $6 million the funds available in fiscal 1962 for the payment of operating subsidies to the three certificated helicopter services; and the Appropriations Committees have requested the Civil Aeronautics Board to prepare a schedule for the termination of these subsidies. I endorse this position and seek the extension of this principle. I am asking the Board to develop by June 30, 1963, a step-by-step program, with specific annual targets, to assure sharp reduction of operating subsidies to all other domestic airlines as well, within periods to be established by the Board for each type of service or carrier. Rigorous enforcement of the Board's use-it-or-lose-it policy and further development of the class rate subsidy plan which the Board initiated in January 1961, with the cooperation of the local service carriers would clearly facilitate this objective. The development of single airports to serve adjacent cities, or regional airports, is also clearly necessary if these subsidies are to be eliminated and if the Federal Government and local communities are to meet the Nation's needs for adequate airports and air navigation facilities without excessive and unjustifiable costs.

(3) The Federal Government is a major user of transportation services. To assure the greatest practical use of the transportation industry by Government, I am directing all agencies of the Government, in meeting their own transport needs, to use authorized commercial facilities in all modes of transportation within the limits of economical and efficient operations and the requirements of military readiness.

(4) I also recommend that the Post Office Department be given greater flexibility in arranging for the transportation of mail by motor vehicle common carrier.

(5) Last year the Congress extended until June 30, 1963, the authority by which the Interstate Commerce Commission has been guaranteeing interest and principal payments on emergency loans to the railroads for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements for which the carriers cannot otherwise obtain funds on reasonable terms. A similar law by which the Government guarantees loans for aircraft and parts being purchased by certain certificated air carriers will expire this year. Since the Department of Commerce is already a focal point for Government transportation activities and since, in the interest of program coordination and consistency of policy these activities should be further consolidated, I recommend that the railroad loan guarantee authority, and the aviation loan guarantee authority if it is extended, be transferred to the Department of Commerce. These problems are not regulatory in nature and are clearly separable from the chief functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, and can be acted upon more expeditiously by an executive agency.

(D) PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(1) Mergers: A great resurgence of merger talk has occurred in the railroad and airline industries in the last several years, and major mergers have been proposed in recent months in both industries. The soundness of such mergers should be determined, not in the abstract, but by applying appropriate criteria to the circumstances and conditions of each particular case. This administration has a responsibility to recommend more specific guidelines than are now available and more specific procedures for applying them.

Accordingly, I have directed the formation of an interagency group to undertake two tasks: first, after proper consultation with interested parties, to formulate general administration policies on mergers in each segment of the transportation industry; and second, to assist the Department of Justice in developing a Government position on each merger application for presentation before the regulatory agencies. This group will consist of agency representatives designated by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the heads of other agencies involved in a particular case. Under the chairmanship of Commerce, this group will examine each pending merger in transportation on the basis of the following criteria and others which they may develop:

(1) Effective competition should be maintained among alternative forms of transportation, and, where traffic volume permits, between competing firms in the same mode of transportation.

(2) The goals of economical, efficient, and adequate service to the public—and reduction in any public subsidies—should be secured by the realization of genuine economies.

(3) Affected workers should be given the assistance to make any necessary adjustments caused by the merger.

(2) Through routes and joint rates: For many years some regulatory agencies have been authorized to appoint joint boards to act on proposals for intercarrier services; but they have taken virtually no initiative to foster these arrangements which could greatly increase service and convenience to the general public and open up new opportunities for all carriers. I recommend, therefore, that Congress declare as a matter of public policy that through routes and joint rates should be vigorously encouraged, and authorize all transportation agencies to participate in j int boards.

(3) I have requested the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of General Services to make the fullest possible use of their statutory powers, and I urge the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary, to encourage experimental rates and services—to explore every promising simplification of rate structures—and to encourage the development of systems that will make rate ascertainment and publication less costly and more convenient. These experiments will be pilot studies for a more general simplification of rates and for the application of new kinds of service to transportation in general.

(4) I am requesting the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, in cooperation with the Interstate Commerce Commission, to develop and urge adoption of uniform State registration laws for motor carriers operating within States but handling interstate commerce. The Congress should, consistent with this effort, give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to enter into cooperative enforcement agreements with the various States, covering both the economic and the safety aspects of highway transportation.

(5) I recommend that all common carriers, including freight forwarders and motor carriers, be required to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates.

(6) Finally, I recommend that the civil penalty now imposed on motor carriers for failure to file required reports be substantially increased; that the same civil penalty be imposed for violations of safety regulations and for operating without authority; and that the safety regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission should be made fully applicable to private, as well as to common and contract carriers, so as to clarify the ambiguous situation prevailing at present.

PART II. URBAN TRANSPORTATION

I have previously emphasized to the Congress the need for action on the transportation problems resulting from burgeoning urban growth and the changing urban scene.

Higher incomes coupled with the increasing availability of the automobile have enabled more and more American families, particularly younger ones with children, to seek their own homes in suburban areas. Simultaneously, changes and improvements in freight transportation, made possible by the development of modern highways and the trucking industry, have reduced the dependence of manufacturers on central locations near port facilities or railroad terminals. The development of improved production techniques that require spacious, one-story plant layouts have impelled many industries to move to the periphery of urban areas. At the same time the importance of the central city is increasing for trade, financial, governmental and cultural activities.

One result of these changes in location patterns has been a change in the

patterns of urban travel. Formerly people traveled mainly along high density corridors radiating to and from downtown. Today traffic patterns are increasingly diverse. Added to traditional suburb-to-city movements are large crosstown flows which existing mass transportation systems are often not geared to handle. Also, the increasing use of automobiles to meet urban transportation needs has resulted in increasing highway congestion, and this has greatly impeded mass transportation service using those highways.

This drastic revision of travel patterns in many urban areas has seriously impaired the effectiveness and economic viability of public mass transportation, which is geared to the older patterns. A steady decline in patronage and a concomitant rise of unprofitability and financial problems have occurred. This has been particularly true of rail commuter and streetcar services limited to particular routes by fixed roadbeds.

To conserve and enhance values in existing urban areas is essential. But at least as important are steps to promote economic efficiency and livability in areas of future development. In less than 20 years we can expect well over half of our expanded population to be living in 40 great urban complexes. Many smaller places will also experience phenomenal growth. The ways that people and goods can be moved in these areas will have a major influence on their structure, on the efficiency of their economy, and on the availability for social and cultural opportunities they can offer their citizens. Our national welfare therefore requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth.

At my request, the problems of urban transportation have been studied in detail by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce. Their field investigations have included some 40 metropolitan and other communities, large and small. Their findings support the need for substantial expansion and important changes in the urban mass transportation program authorized in the Housing Act of 1961 as well as revisions in Federal highway legislation. They give dramatic emphasis, moreover, to the need for greater local initiative and to the responsibility of the States and municipalities to provide financial support and effective governmental auspices for strengthening and improving urban transportation.

On the basis of this report, I recommend that long-range Federal financial aid and technical assistance be provided to help plan and develop the comprehensive and balanced urban transportation that is so vitally needed, not only to benefit local communities, but to assure more effective use of Federal funds available for other urban development and renewal programs. I recommend that such Federal assistance for mass transportation be limited to those applications (1) where an organization or officially coordinated organizations are carrying on a continuing program of comprehensive planning on an areawide basis, and (2) where the assisted project will be administered through a public agency as part of a unified or officially coordinated area-wide transportation system.

(A) Long-range program: Specifically, I recommend that the Congress authorize the first installment of a long-range program of Federal aid to our urban regions for the revitalization and needed expansion of public mass transportation, to be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I recommend a capital grant authorization of $500 million to be made available over a 3-year period, with $100 million to be made available in fiscal 1963. Only a program that offers substantial support and continuity of Federal participation can induce our urban regions to organize appropriate administrative arrangements and to meet their share of the costs of fully balanced transportation systems.

This Federal assistance should be made available to qualified public agencies in the form of direct grants to be matched by local, non-Federal contributions. For rights-of-way, fixed facilities, including maintenance and terminal facilities, and rolling stock required for urban mass transportation systems, grants should be provided for up to two-thirds of the project cost which cannot reasonably be financed from expected revenue. The remaining one-third of the net project cost would be paid by the locality or State from other sources, without Federal aid. The extension and rehabilitation of existing systems as well as the creation of new systems should be eligible. In no event should Federal funds be used to pay operating expenses. Nor should parking facilities, except those directly supporting public mass transportation, be eligible for Federal grants.

While it is expected that the new grant program will be the major Federal support for urban mass transportation, it is important to have Federal loans available where private financing cannot be obtained on reasonable terms. I therefore recommend removal of the time limit on the $50 million loan authorization provided in the Housing Act of 1961. Federal loans would not be available to finance the State or local one-third contribution to net project cost.

Although grants and loans would be available only to public agencies, those agencies could lease facilities and equipment or make other arrangements for private operation of assisted mass transportation systems. The program is not intended to foster public as distinguished from private mass transit operations. Each community should develop the method or methods of operation best suited to its particular requirements.

A community should be eligible for a mass transportation grant or loan only after the Housing Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are necessary for carrying out a program for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area.

The program I have proposed is aimed at the widely varying transit problems of our Nation's cities, ranging from the clogged arteries of our most populous metropolitan areas to those smaller cities which have only recently known the frustrations of congested streets. There may, however, be some highly specialized situations in which alternative programs, for example, loan guarantees under stringent conditions, would be better suited to particular needs and the Congress may, therefore, wish to consider such alternatives.

(B) Emergency aid: Time will be required by most metropolitan areas to organize effectively for the major planning efforts required. Even more time may be needed to create public agencies with adequate powers to develop, finance and administer new or improved public transportation systems. Meanwhile, the crisis conditions that have already emerged in some areas threaten to become widespread. Mass transportation continues to deteriorate and even to disappear. Important segments of our population are thus deprived of transportation; highway congestion and attendant air pollution become worse; and the destructive effects upon central business districts and older residential areas are accelerated.

In recognition of this serious situation, I also recommend that the Congress, for a period of 3 years only, authorize the Housing Administrator to make emergency grants, (a) where there is an urgent need for immediate aid to an existing mass transportation facility or service that might otherwise cease to be available for transportation purposes, (b) where an official long-range program for a coordinated system is being actively prepared, and (c) where the facilities or equipment acquired under the emergency grant can reasonably be expected to be required for the new long-range system. This emergency aid should not exceed one-half of the net project cost. Upon completion of an acceptable areawide transportation program within 3 years, these emergency projects, if a part of the ultimate system, should qualify for the balance of the regular Federal assistance available under the long-range program.

(C) Role of highways: Highways are an instrumental part of any coordinated urban transportation program, and must be an integral part of any comprehensive community development plan. Accordingly, I have requested the Secretary of Commerce to make his approval of the use of highway planning funds in metropolitan planning studies contingent upon the establishment of a continuing and comprehensive planning process. This process should, to the maximum extent feasible, include all of the interdependent parts of the metropolitan or other urban area, all agencies and jurisdictions involved, and all forms of transportation, and should be closely coordinated with policymaking and program administration.

Progress has already been made in coordinated transportation planning for metropolitan areas through the use of funds made available under both Federal

highway and housing legislation. To increase the effectiveness of this effort, I recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to increase the percentage of Federal funds available to the States for research and planning. Legislation will be submitted to effectuate this change and to provide that (a) these funds should be available for planning and research purposes only; (b) the funds be matched by the States in accordance with statutory matching requirements; and (c) any funds not used for planning and research lapse.

In addition I recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to provide that, effective not later than July 1, 1965, the Secretary of Commerce shall, before approving a program for highway projects in any metropolitan area, make a finding that such projects are consistent with comprehensive development plans for the metropolitan area and that the Federal-aid system so developed will be an integral part of a soundly based, balanced transportation system for the area involved.

Highway planning should be broadened to include adequate traffic control systems, parking facilities, and circulation systems on city streets commensurate with the traffic forecasts used to justify freeways and major arterial roadways. Provisions for transit and highway facilities in the same roadway, permissible under present law and already tested in several cases, should be encouraged whenever more effective transportation will result. Moreover, I have requested the Secretary of Commerce to consider favorably the reservation of special highway lanes for buses during peak traffic hours whenever comprehensive transportation plans indicate that this is desirable.

To permit the State highway departments greater flexibility in the use of Federal-aid highway funds to meet urban transportation needs, I further recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to permit more extensive use of Federal-aid secondary funds for extensions of the secondary system in urban areas.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to consult regularly regarding administration of the highway and urban mass transportation programs, and to report to me annually on the progress of their respective programs, on the needs for further coordination, and on possibilities for improvement.

(D) Relocation assistance: Last year in a message to the Congress on the Federal-aid highway program, I called attention to the problems of families displaced by new highway construction and proposed that the Federal highway law be amended to require assistance to such families in finding decent housing at reasonable cost. The need for such assistance to alleviate unnecessary hardship is still urgent. The Secretary of Commerce has estimated that, under the interstate highway program alone, 15,000 families and 1,500 businesses are being displaced each year, and the proposed urban mass transportation program will further increase the number of persons affected.

To move toward equity among the various federally assisted programs causing displacement, I recommend that assistance and requirements similar to those now applicable to the urban renewal program be authorized for the Federal-aid highway program and the urban mass transportation program. Legislation is being submitted to authorize payments of not to exceed $200 in the case of individuals and families and $3,000 (or if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of business concerns or nonprofit organizations displaced as a result of land acquisitions under these programs.

(E) Mass transit research and demonstrations: Further, I believe that progress will be most rapid and long lasting if the Federal Government contributes to economic and technological research in the field of urban mass transportation. These research activities should be an integral part of the research program described later in this message. Important parts of this program should be carried out by the Housing Administrator directly, through contract with other Federal agencies, private research organizations, universities and other competent bodies, or through the allocation of funds to local public agencies for approved programs.

To facilitate this approach, I recommend that the $25 million authorized last year for demonstration grants be made available for broad research and development undertakings, as well as demonstration projects, which have general applicability throughout the Nation. That amount, plus an additional $10 million from the proposed capital grant funds for each of the years 1963, 1964, and 1965 should suffice for these purposes. These funds, together with research funds available under the Federal-aid highway program, can contribute to substantial advances in urban transportation.

(F) Interstate compacts: Finally, since transportation in many urban areas is an interstate problem, I recommend that legislation be enacted to give congressional approval in advance for interstate compacts for the establishment of agencies to carry out transportation and other regional functions in urban areas extending across State lines.

PART III. INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORTATION

We should endeavor, to the maximum extent feasible, to (a) gear international transportation investment to the requirements of our peacetime international trade and travel, and (b) provide incentives to users that will channel traffic to those forms of transportation that provide desirable service at the lowest total cost. The most critical problems associated with these policies are in the national defense area. Determination must be made as to whether the number and types of ships and aircraft adequate to meet long-range peacetime needs are also adequate to meet probable military emergencies, and if they are not, how best to meet these additional requirements.

(A) Merchant marine: In the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the U.S. Government made a new start on the vexing problems of the American merchant marine in the face of repeated failure to improve its condition both before and after World War I. Subsequently, other aids in the form of cargo preference legislation, various trade-out, trade-in, and tax incentives devised to stimulate new construction, and a mortgage insurance program with up to 87½ percent Federal guarantees were added to the arsenal of protection against the industry's exposure to low-cost foreign competition.

In spite of these aids, subsidies required for both construction and operations under the 1936 act have steadily increased. Operating subsidies will rise from $49 million in 1950 to over $225 million in 1963. Ship construction costs in U.S. yards are now approximately double those in Japanese and German yards. For this reason and because of an acceleration of the program beginning in 1956 to replace war-built cargo ships, Federal expenditures for new ship construction will rise to a postwar high of $112 million in 1963.

At my request, the Secretary of Commerce has undertaken a study of the current problems of the American merchant marine. This review will involve such specific issues as the state of coastal and intercoastal shipping and the costs of service to our noncontiguous territories. It will also consider more fundamental questions of long-term adjustment: Are the criteria adopted in 1936 as guides to the establishment of essential trade routes and services relevant for the future? Are there alternatives to the existing techniques for providing financial assistance which would benefit (a) the public in terms of better service and lower rates and (b) the operators in terms of higher profits, more freedom for management initiative, and more incentive for privately financed research and technological advance? What research and development efforts are most likely to increase the competitiveness of our merchant marine? Can defense readiness requirements be met adequately by greater reliance on the reserve fleet and the ships of our allies under NATO agreements? Would a smaller reserve fleet be adequate? Are the international arrangements pursuant to which world shipping operations are carried on conducive to the stability of the industry, fair but effective competition and adequate service?

I have also asked the Secretary of Defense to provide the Secretary of Commerce with estimates, under a range of assumptions as to military emergencies, of what active and reserve tonnages of merchant shipping should be maintained in the interest of national security. In addition, I have established a Cabinet level committee, chaired by the Secretary of Labor, whose study will include the flags of convenience and cargo preference issues. When the findings and conclusions of these studies become available, I shall send to the Congress appropriate specific recommendations concerning our maritime program.

In the meantime, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to implement fully section 212(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, for securing preference to vessels of United States registry in the movement of commodities in our waterborne foreign commerce; and I have directed all executive branch agencies to comply fully with the purpose of our cargo preference laws.

I have also recommended a stepped-up research program for developing ways and means of increasing the competitive efficiency of our merchant marine and related industries. Of particular significance in this effort will be the application of the principles of mass production, and the standardization of ship types and ship components, for reduction in the cost of new vessel construction. Also, I am urging that sound development in technology and automation be applied to merchant shipping as rapidly as possible, fully recognizing and providing for the job equities involved, as a major program for enhancing the competitive capability of our merchant marine.

(B) International aviation: An interdepartmental committee, headed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and including representatives from the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Bureau of the Budget, was established at my direction last July to undertake a study of U.S. international air transportation policies and problems.

This study is presently underway, and will be completed by late summer. Concurrent with this policy study, the Bureau of the Budget is conducting a study of the organizational structure within which Government agencies carry out activities concerned with international aviation. Once these studies have been completed and evaluated, an administration policy on international civil aviation will be enunciated, with responsibilities assigned to the agencies involved according to statutory requirements.

PART IV. LABOR RELATIONS AND RESEARCH

(A) Labor relations: Technological advance in transportation must be explored and developed if we are to meet growing requirements for the movement of people and goods. New equipment often requires new skills, sometimes displaces labor, and often requires retraining or relocation of manpower. An overall reduction in manpower requirements in transportation is not inevitable, however; and the new Manpower Development and Training Act will help those transportation workers in need of new jobs or new skills.

For the long-range benefit of labor, management, and the public, collective bargaining in the transportation industry must promote efficiency as well as solve problems of labor-management relations. Problems of job assignments, work rules, and other employment policies must be dealt with in a manner that will both encourage increased productivity and recognize the job equities which are affected by technological change. The Government also has an obligation to develop policies and provide assistance to labor and management consistent with the above objectives.

(B) Research: To understand the increasingly complex transportation problems of the future, to identify the relationships of social, economic, administrative and technical factors involved, to translate scientific knowledge into transportation engineering practice, to weigh the merits of alternative systems, and to formulate new, improved and consistent policies—we need information that can evolve only from a vigorous, continuous and coordinated program of research. Yet, in the field of transportation where we have many unfulfilled opportunities, research has been fragmented, unsteady, inadequate in scope and balance.

Scientific and engineering research will bring to all forms of transportation the benefits of new high strength, low cost and durable materials, compact and economical powerplants, new devices to increase safety and convenience—improvements which have characterized the development of jet-propelled aircraft. Experiments in the maritime field have resulted in the development of a nuclear powered merchant ship, the N.S. *Savannah*, which has already begun test cruises, and a hydrofoil ship, the *Dennison*, which is nearing trial runs. Transportation on land, as well as in the air and on the seas, can benefit from accelerated scientific research.

Economic and policy research will improve knowledge about the functioning of our transportation system as a whole and about the interrelation of the major branches of the industry. It should consider the new demands for transportation, the changing markets and products being handled, and the need for speed and safety. For instance, such research can consider the handling of freight as a system beginning in the shipper's plant and ending with the delivery of goods to the very doors of his customers—using new packaging, containerization and cargo handling methods that will take full advantage of new economies and convenience.

Taking advantage of new techniques that would provide convenience and efficiency, we must consider the impact of different forms of transportation investment on economic development; we must combine and integrate systems to take advantage of the maximum benefits of each mode of travel; we must now consider the Nation's transportation network as an articulated and closely linked system rather than an uncoordinated set of independent entities.

Just as a transport system must be built and operated as a whole, the different areas of transportation research must be coordinated within an overall concept. With the advice and assistance of the heads of the principal Federal agencies concerned with transportation and members of my own staff, the Secretary of Commerce is undertaking a broad evaluation of research needs in transportation and of the appropriate methods to meet these needs. I look to the Secretary of Commerce to develop a comprehensive transportation research program for the Government for later consideration by the Congress. Once such a coordinated and policy-oriented research program is underway, it will produce a flow of information of the kind that we must have to implement a comprehensive public policy on transportation.

Improved statistics for private and Government use are also urgently needed. The 1963 budget repeats a request made by the previous administration for funds to prepare for a census of transportation. This census will make an important beginning to supplying these much-needed data. I urge early favorable action on this request.

CONCLUSION

The troubles in our transportation system are deep; and no just and comprehensive set of goals—which meets all the needs of each mode of transportation as well as shippers, consumers, taxpayers, and the general public—can be quickly or easily reached. But few areas of public concern are more basic to our progress as a nation. The Congress and all citizens, as well as all Federal agencies, have an increasing interest in and an increasing responsibility to be aware of the shortcomings of existing transportation policies; and the proposals contained in this message are intended to be a constructive basis for the exercise of that responsibility.

The difficultly and the complexity of these basic troubles will not correct themselves with the mere passage of time. On the contrary, we cannot afford to delay further. Facing up to the realities of the situation, we must begin to make the painful decisions necessary to providing the transportation system required by the United States of today and tomorrow.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1962.*

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED FORCES, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1279, H.R. 9751.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an

amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1963 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft: For the Army, $218,500,000; for the Navy and Marine Corps, $2,134,600,000; for the Air Force, $3,626,000,000, of which amount $491,000,000 is authorized only for the production planning and long lead-time procurement of an RS-70 weapon system: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1962, restrictions on the fund authorization contained in Public Law 87-53, approved June 21, 1961, for the procurement of aircraft, will no longer apply.

MISSILES

For missiles: For the Army, $558,300,000; for the Navy, $930,400,000; for the Marine Corps, $22,300,000; for the Air Force, $2,500,000,000.

NAVAL VESSELS

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,979,200,000.

SEC. 2. Section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, or after December 31, 1962, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the research, development, test, or evaluation of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such dates."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is no intention of proceeding with the consideration of the bill tonight; it will be the pending business of the Senate on Monday. There will be no yea-and-nay votes on Monday. If there is a possibility that the bill may be passed on that day, it will be passed. If the bill is not passed on Monday, I hope it may be passed on the following day, Tuesday.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may file a report on the Peace Corps bill while the Senate is in adjournment.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, following the consideration of H.R. 9751, it is the intention of the leadership to call up Calendar No. 1227, H.R. 3008, for the relief of Hom Hong Hing, also known as Tommy Joe; and tentatively Calendar No. 1195, S. 4, to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore.

USE OF CIVIL SERVANTS AS LOBBYISTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, yesterday Mr. Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, very properly expressed strong objection to the recent action by the Kennedy administration in spending $75,000 of the taxpayers' money for the purpose of bringing members of the State ASC committees to Washington for the purpose of lobbying for the Kennedy farm program.

I commend Mr. Shuman for denouncing this arrogant attempt of the administration to use civil servants as lobbyists for his legislative program. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Shuman's press release condemning this action printed in the RECORD, as well as an editorial published in today's Washington Daily News entitled "Unlawful Farm Lobby," and an editorial published in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Career Men as Advocates?"

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

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 4.—American Farm Bureau President Charles B. Shuman today protested to President Kennedy the use of taxpayers' money to propagandize taxpayers' representatives in Congress.

Mr. Shuman noted that members of State agricultural stabilization and conservation (ASC) committees had been summoned to Washington—at taxpayers expense—for a 2-day meeting on April 3 and 4 to instruct them on administration farm legislation. He estimated the total travel and per diem cost at about $75,000, and charged that some of the ASC men have been looking up their Congressmen.

In a telegram to President Kennedy, Mr. Shuman stated: "We protest as improper, the use of public funds for paying travel and per diem expenses of State ASC committeemen at a secret meeting called in Washington by the Secretary of Agriculture." He added: "One apparent purpose of the meeting was to develop a propaganda campaign and to lobby Members of Congress in support of the administration farm bill. Even if they had paid their own expenses, organized lobbying by Government employees is a dangerous and deplorable practice."

Mr. Shuman called the meeting "the latest exercise of the administration's rather frightening technique of using Federal funds and Federal employees to promote Federal programs and even proposed legislation for Federal programs.

"Alongside such a massive and expensive propaganda campaign to bury all opposition," Mr. Shuman said, "the nickels and dimes of voluntary organizations are small change."

ASC committees are U.S. Department of Agriculture representatives in the States and counties who administer Federal farm programs. The State committees are appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and serve at his pleasure.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 5 1962]

UNLAWFUL FARM LOBBY

By law, members of State committees set up to supervise farm acreage allotments are prohibited from lobbying for specific farm legislation. But apparently this law doesn't mean much to President Kennedy or to Orville Freeman, his Secretary of Agriculture.

To begin with, it was unusual enough for the administration to invite the committeemen—who really are political appointees to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee—to Washington at taxpayer expense. The American Farm Bureau thinks the 2-day shindig yesterday and the day before will cost you and me $75,000. Some of the guests even flew first class, a practice now discontinued by many American corporations because a tourist-class airplane seat is about as comfortable and is cheaper.

Then after they arrived, the President suggested to the committeemen ("delicately," one wire service commented) they use their stay to lobby for his farm bill. "We hope you will see Members of Congress and acquaint them and the Senators. We don't want them to be * * * lonesome."

Coming from the boss himself, this sounds like a direct order to flout the law.

It also sounds as if the Kennedy-Freeman farm bill is in trouble. This is good. It should be defeated, because it is too costly and (probably more important) because it won't solve our farm problems.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 5, 1962]

CAREER MEN AS ADVOCATES?

Senator WILLIAMS has good reason to complain about the ruling of Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., of the Civil Service Commission, to the effect that career officials may explain the position of the administration on proposed legislation before interested public groups. The ruling clearly suggests that professionals in the career service may be used by the administration to support its legislative program before Congress. If civil servants are drawn into such controversies, they will obviously lose their standing as neutral public servants and thus become vulnerable to political attack when there is a change of administrations.

The impropriety of drawing career men into controversies over pending legislation becomes obvious from the ruling of Attorney General Robert Kennedy on this subject. The Attorney General says that, although it is legally permissible for a Government employee to explain the administration's view, it would be a "serious impropriety and a distinct breach of his duty as a career official to use his official position publicly to oppose the policy of the administration he serves." Of this latter statement there can be no doubt. Only chaos could result from career employees running around to address public groups in opposition to what the administration is asking Congress to do.

How can it reasonably be argued, then, that such employees should speak up in favor of the President's program? If they are to address public groups at all on pending legislation, surely they should be free to express their candid views. The only reasonable course is for them to remain aloof from political controversies if they wish to retain their standing as career men in the Government service. Explanation of the President's program is the business of policy-making employees who do not work under the inhibitions of the career service.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to the District of Columbia home rule bill which I have introduced. The RECORD should contain this brief explanation, because the bill probably will be acted upon within the next week or 10 days.

My amendment seeks to modify one section of the home rule bill in its original form and in the form in which it had been introduced by me and the late Senator Matthew Neely, of West Virginia. My amendment seeks to modify one section of my home rule bill.

Mr. President, my bill in its original form, and also in the form in which it was introduced by the late Senator Matt Neely, of West Virginia, provides for

nine councilmen for the District of Columbia, to be selected from three wards, but with the vote to be citywide.

I have made a rather comprehensive study of the practices in municipalities across the country, as regards the election of councilmen. I find that in an overwhelming majority of the cities the councilmen are elected on a ward basis by the residents of the wards from which they come.

I have also checked into a good many things in connection with this subject matter in the field of municipal government; and I find that it seems to be the overwhelming consensus on the part of the authorities that the election of councilmen on the basis of participation by the citizens of the wards gives the best participation by the people in their government, in connection with the problems which arise in connection with the government of the cities, ward by ward.

Therefore, I have offered this amendment, for appropriate reference to the Committee on the District of Columbia; and I modify my bill accordingly.

I think the amendment is a sound one; and I hope the amendment will be incorporated in the bill which finally is reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN THE SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL OR THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I assured the Senate that today I would submit a resolution dealing with a very delicate problem which I discussed 2 days ago, and again yesterday—namely, the problem of permitting the serving of hard liquor in the Senate wing of the Capitol or in the Senate Office Buildings, at official or semiofficial affairs or at affairs which really are conducted under the permission of the Senate.

I have prepared such a resolution. It reads as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to Regulation of the Senate Wing of the Capitol) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"3. The serving of alcoholic beverages shall not be permitted within any portion of the Senate Wing of the Capitol, or any portion of any office building set aside for the use of the Senate, other than a room or suite which is assigned for occupancy by a Member or officer of the Senate for the transaction of the business of his office. As used in this paragraph, the term 'alcoholic beverage' means any alcoholic beverage containing more than 24 per centum of alcohol by volume."

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be held at the desk until the close of the business of the Senate next Tuesday, if the Senate meets on that day; or until the close of the business of the Senate next Wednesday, in case the Senate does not meet next Tuesday, or until the close of the business of the Senate next Thursday, in case the Senate does not meet on either Tuesday or Wednesday of next week; and I ask that the resolution remain at the desk that long, available for cosponsorship by other Members of the Senate who may wish to join in sponsoring it.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in my comments about the resolution; but, because I think it will have some bearing on the matter of cosponsorship, I wish to make this statement tonight about the resolution:

To my great pleasure, although my surprise, a very large number of Senators—and, Mr. President, in my judgment, when one uses the word "large" in connection with the Senate, it means at least a dozen or more Senators—at least a dozen or more Senators have come to me, today, and have said to me—and now I paraphrase their statements, but do so accurately: "WAYNE, if you ever get a vote on your resolution, I will vote for it, because you are dead right."

Several Senators spoke to me about a most unfortunate incident which apparently occurred last night in the Capitol, after permission was obtained to use some facilities of the building for a reception in connection with the Cherry Blossom Festival; and the facilities could not have been obtained except by the intervention of a Senator. There were taken into that reception three cases of hard liquor; and apparently the resulting drinking was of such a nature that it has caused a considerable amount of adverse comment and has caused embarrassment to the Senator involved.

I warn the Senate that this practice, which has developed in the last 2 or 3 years, is going to rise to plague and embarrass this body if we do not put a stop to it right now; and it is going to result in a public reaction in this country—once the American people come to understand the situation—that will, and should, do great damage to the prestige of the Senate because the American people have every right to resent a policy of the Senate which, in effect, turns the Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings into a saloon on those occasions when these drinking parties—and I understand that the affair last night could better be described as a drinking bout or brawl—occur in buildings paid for and maintained by the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, in my judgment this is wrong. If Senators want to give drinking parties, there are places where they can give them; they can rent reception rooms at hotels. But I, for one—and I am satisfied that millions of Americans will agree with me—do not think the Capitol of the United States, or the part of it over which the Senate has jurisdiction, or the Senate Office Buildings, insofar as these public rooms are concerned, should be desecrated by the serving of hard liquor at so-called official or semiofficial Senate affairs.

Let me warn the Senate about another problem that will come up. Some prohibition is going to have to be placed upon this matter. Some system will have to be set up for the giving of consent or the denying of consent for the use of these facilities. The legislative representative of one of the very large industries of this country came to me, today, and said to me what these Senators have said. He said, "Senator, you are completely right about the position you are taking in regard to the use of the public rooms of the Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings for affairs at which hard liquor is served." He said, "Let me tell you what you will be confronted with if you don't get this stopped." He pointed out to me that this could not be done 2 or 3 years ago; but he said, "You are going to have one industrial or commercial group after another start putting pressure upon a Senator or both Senators from their States, in order to get the Vandenberg Room or the new reception room or the Caucus Room or some other room made available for the holding of what will be called a reception, using that Senator or group of Senators as the official sponsors of the affair, but the money that will supply the liquor will come from the lobbyists, and they will use these social affairs in their attempts to proselyte the affairs of their industries within the Senate of the United States. How are you going to stop that? Where are you going to draw the line?"

Another Senator came to me today and said, "You know what this is going to lead to? Yesterday a constituent of mine came to me and asked me if I could not get the use of the new reception room in the Capitol for a reception for the wedding of his daughter." He said, "You know what that reception would involve." He said, "I feel I can turn that one down, but you are going to get into many areas where it is going to be difficult to draw the line."

Let me say to the Rules Committee that it will have a job, if it does not stop this, in preparing rules and regulations that we Senators can follow when requests are made for the use of these rooms for one purpose or another.

My solution is a direct and simple one, impartial and uniform in its applicability. The answer is going to be a flat, "No, you cannot use any of these rooms for any affair, if part of the purpose of the affair is to serve hard liquor for the function."

You will be surprised, Mr. President, how that would reduce the requests for the use of the rooms. Tell them to go to the hotels. Let me say, somewhat facetiously and goodnaturedly, that I should obtain a great deal of support for my resolution from private enterprises in the District of Columbia, hotel associations and everybody else that might rent rooms for receptions and affairs of the nature of which we are coming to give here in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings.

Mr. President, I shall put the resolution on the desk, under the request that I have made, and I hope other Senators will cosponsor it.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has already indicated that he will. I think the other Senator from South Carolina may.

I have a word of plea for the Rules Committee. I was a little surprised to

hear so many of my colleagues say, "You will never get it out of the Rules Committee."

That raises another issue, Mr. President. It raises another parliamentary issue as to whether or not, when a Senator, or a group of Senators, offers a resolution or a bill to be considered by any committee of the Senate, he or they may be confronted with an attitude in this body that it will be bottled up in that committee. I think the Rules Committee will give, by a very early date, a clear answer to that charge, because that charge is a reflection on every member of the Rules Committee, and I think it is an unwarranted reflection.

When that argument was made to me, and I named members of the Rules Committee, I said, "Don't tell me that these colleagues would resort to that sort of parliamentary tactic to prevent this resolution from getting to the floor of the Senate for a vote."

I say to the Rules Committee that that is a common charge, and I think it ought to be answered very quickly by getting this resolution back to the floor of the Senate, once it is referred to committee, for early debate and vote.

This is the type of resolution on which there does not have to be a very long hearing. We know pretty well, as individual Senators, whether we are for or against this proposition, whether or not, as Senators, we think the public policy ought to be or ought not to be making available the public rooms of the Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings for drinking parties, to put it bluntly.

If I should ever find myself in a position where any resolution or bill of mine were being bottled up by any committee, I think every member of such a committee knows that the senior Senator from Oregon has not been a student of the rules of the Senate for 18 years to take that kind of strategy or tactic against him lightly. I have sufficient confidence that the rules of the Senate can be so applied, if I run into that kind of opposition, that we shall probably be able to get the matter before the Senate for a vote by use of other rules of the Senate, if necessary. But I am not going to assume that that is ever going to be necessary, for I have complete faith in the fairness of the members of the Rules Committee; and I am satisfied that when the resolution goes to the committee, it will come back to the floor of the Senate either with a favorable or adverse report, and the Rules Committee will say in effect, "We are willing to let this matter of policy be determined by the Senate."

It is in that spirit that I send the resolution to the desk, under the terms that I have offered it, and I hope, when the period for the signing of cosponsors has run out, we shall find there are several names on the resolution as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 325) submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON, and Mr. THURMOND), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PRAISE FOR MRS. KENNEDY'S GOOD-WILL TOUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite my colleagues' attention to a recent broadcast by the noted commentator, Alex Dreier, in regard to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's good-will tour.

Mr. Dreier voices the opinion, shared by the overwhelming majority of the American people, that Mrs. Kennedy performed a valuable service to her country by making the trip.

Those few individuals who have attempted to discredit our First Lady's trip are finding out to their dismay that such attacks are being considered for what they are, mean and petty sniping at a great lady who represented our country so well.

I only wish that we could have more such ambassadors of good will to help erase the false image of America which, most unfortunately, too many people of other lands have.

I join in saluting the First Lady for the service she rendered to our country by this arduous trip.

I ask unanimous consent that Alex Dreier's radio broadcast appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMMENTARY BY ALEX DRIER

The hue and cry against Jacqueline Kennedy's good will trips—and admittedly, it is more sniping than hueing and crying—is reminiscent of some of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's earlier junkets here, there, and everywhere.

Every anti-F.D.R. columnist in the country made jokes about Mrs. Roosevelt's trips. But everywhere she went that curious, idealistic, and dedicated lady made friends for her country.

I believe that Jacqueline Kennedy is doing the very same thing, making friends for the United States. And her assets are obvious: She is charming, she is beautiful, she is perfectly groomed, she is obviously cultured and conducts herself with grace and dignity.

What could be more frustrating to the political opponents of President Kennedy. Many of these, of course, were certain that wife Jacqueline was going to be anything but an asset to her husband. They had complained that Kennedy himself was too young when he was campaigning. But grudgingly they conceded that he had suddenly grown older after those now famous TV debates. But they still had Mrs. Kennedy's youth to hang their prejudiced hats on. As one slightly reckless observer of the modern scene put it, "Who needs a young woman in the latest fashions visiting these underdeveloped countries where there are so many poor people?" It's a good question, and I think the answer is "We do." The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Mrs. Kennedy was a tremendous success everywhere she went. And don't kid yourself about the poor people. They don't expect to see President's wives in rags any more than they expect to see their own rulers and public officials in rags.

One of the more ridiculous charges leveled at Mrs. Kennedy has been that she hasn't got out and mixed with the people. This is one of the most inane assertions we've ever heard of. What ruler of any country ever gets out and actually mixes with the people? Local security never allows it. A Khrushchev or a Kennedy—or their wives and public officials—are guarded by legions of sharp-eyed security men.

Once any public official—or his wife or family—has reached a certain status, his freedom to mix with John and Mary Doe in any country, is gone forever.

I think Mrs. Kennedy is doing a fine job of representing her country. She is no average American, and nobody ever thought she was. She is the President's wife, and she looks and dresses and acts the part. Nobody expects more, and few could expect less of her than that.

If Jacqueline Kennedy were Mrs. Nixon—or Mrs. Anybody Else—we would be happy to see her making the trips she has made. In far too many places we have the undeserved reputation of being a warlike nation. Sending a pretty, youthful young lady abroad is one of the best ways in the world to dispel that fiction.

What very well may be griping some columnists and commentators is that when 1964 rolls around they not only are going to have to beat John Kennedy, they are also going to have to beat Jacqueline Kennedy. And it's going to be a tough daily double to beat, trips or no trips.

TRIAL OF PRISONERS OF WAR BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Fidel Castro's Cuban state prosecutor, according to press dispatches, has told us what the recent courtyard trial in Havana is really all about.

Every fairminded person and every Member of the Senate will reject these and other such crass attempts to brand the United States as the real defendant in Havana. Nevertheless, we are deeply concerned over the plight of the nearly 1,200 men now awaiting the verdict of Cuban justice. Our heart goes out to them. We gave them supplies and we helped make possible their training. They sought to free their country from the grip of dictatorship. It was an act of heroism and patriotism.

These facts are well known to all of us. I will not rub salt into old wounds by discussing whether we should or should not have taken this or that course of action. Such speculation belongs to history.

My purpose in speaking today is threefold: First, to remind us that we cannot and will not disavow the brave men captured at Playa Girón last year; second, to commend these men for their honorable and dignified comportment at the mass trial in Havana. They have behaved like brave men. There was no repetition of the Moscow show trials of the 1930's, when the defendants outdid themselves to confess their alleged guilt and to make up crimes of which they were not even accused. No; the brave Cuban exiles have conducted themselves as courageous and dedicated patriots of their beloved Cuba and the cause of freedom.

Finally, I want to add my voice to the chorus of appeals from statesmen and leaders throughout our hemisphere for humane and lenient treatment of the prisoners. In particular, I wish to commend the Council of the Organization of American States for the resolution it passed last Thursday, on the initiative of the Foreign Minister of the Dominican Republic, appealing for a just and impartial trial.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my statement, this resolution together with the note of March 27 of the Dominican Secretary of State for Foreign Relations, Mr. Bonilla Atiles.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is particularly fitting that the Dominican Republic should have taken this humane initiative. It is a country which only recently has freed itself from a dictatorship of the right different only in form, and not in substance, from the totalitarian dictatorship of the left now governing its sister Republic of Cuba. No one should know better than the Dominicians themselves the truth of the saying that "men forgive what they have lost on the field of battle, but never what they have lost on the scaffold."

For the sake of the prisoners and their relatives, for the sake of justice and respect for international law, Premier Castro should take these words to heart while he ponders the sentences to be imposed on his 1,179 prisoners.

EXHIBIT 1

TRIAL OF PRISONERS OF WAR BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

(Resolution adopted by the Council at the special meeting held on March 29, 1962)

The Council of the Organization of American States,

Considering:

The grave concern in all sectors of the American community over the trials that the Government of Cuba has begun of the prisoners of war captured at the time of the expedition at Playa Girón; and

The note that the Secretary of State for Foreign Relations of the Dominican Republic addressed to the Chairman of the Council March 27, in which he requests the making of an "appeal to public opinion and to the conscience of the peoples of America to aid in insuring to those prisoners, taken in an act of war, all of the measures that might assist in their defense, and very particularly those that refer to the impartiality with which they would be tried in regularly constituted courts and surrounded with the legal guarantees that are recognized as indispensable by civilized people,"

Resolves:

1. To express, on behalf of the governments and peoples of America, its strong hope that these trials may be conducted with the strictest respect for human rights, and hence that the accused may be given the guarantees and resources established in the laws of this hemisphere.

2. To acknowledge the contribution that the governments have made or may make, individually, toward achieving the humanitarian aims sought through this resolution.

3. To express its gratitude to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights for the keen interest it has taken and is taking in the fate of the prisoners whose trial has begun.

MARCH 29, 1962.

NOTE ADDRESSED TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF THE OAS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

DELEGATION OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES,
Washington, March 27, 1962.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have the honor to address you for the purpose of requesting that a special meeting of the Council of the Organization of American States be convened in conformity with article 9 of the regulations of that body, in order to submit to its consideration, in compliance with instructions that have been given to me by the President of the Republic and of the Council of State, a matter of the greatest importance and urgency.

The matter to which I refer relates to the fate of the prisoners captured by the Government of Cuba on the occasion of the expedition at Playa Girón in April of last year. In view of the imminence of the initiation of the trial by the Government of Cuba, the Government of the Dominican Republic wishes to make a motion to the Council of the Organization that, in harmony with the lofty principles that gives form to the inter-American system and taking into account the standards of modern international law, it address an anxious appeal to public opinion and to the conscience of the peoples of America to aid in insuring to those prisoners, taken in an act of war, all of the measures that might assist in their defense, and very particularly those that refer to the impartiality with which they would be tried in regularly constituted courts and surrounded with the legal guarantees that are recognized and indispensable by civilized people.

Thus it is not a question of any action by the Council of the Organization of American States that might in any way affect the respective positions taken by the governments with respect to the case of Cuba, but simply and plainly that, in view of the high status of that body and with all of its moral authority, to call attention to the grave concern of the peoples of America for the destiny of those prisoners.

As our people eagerly desire social justice it is necessary for them to react whenever they look upon the uncertainty of the life and freedom that are its basis. It is impossible for the Dominican people, who suffered in their own bodies the brutalities of the Trujillo tyranny, which had no respect for the life of the invaders of Puperón, Constanza, Estero Hondo and Maimón, to remain impassive before what could happen in Cuba, and they therefore make this fraternal appeal to the peoples of America through their representatives at the Organization of American States.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

J. A. BONILLA ATILES,
Secretary of State for Foreign Relations of the Dominican Republic.

VISIT BY PRESIDENT GOULART OF BRAZIL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the visit to this country by President Joáo Goulart of Brazil has strengthened the ties of friendship which have long bound our nations and peoples together. We extend our sincere thanks and good wishes to President Goulart and the people of Brazil.

President John F. Kennedy's return visit to Brazil this fall will, in turn, underline our appreciation of those ties, and recognize the great Brazilian Republic's role of leadership in this hemisphere with her example of adherence to the most civilized principles of democracy.

President Goulart, before a joint session of the Congress, demonstrated his administration's understanding of the purposes and prospects of the alliance for progress. His remarks show Brazil's determination to move forward in our hemispheric efforts for freedom and social justice.

President Goulart emphasized Brazil's adherence to Western democracy and her right to chart her own course in world affairs in accord with those principles, a right we recognize as sovereign and basic. He restated Brazil's desire for disarmament and peace, and indicated support for the disarmament controls necessary to assure progress toward these ends.

I was pleased by the joint communique issued by the two Presidents and their declaration of support for a program of fair compensation for public utilities transferred to Brazilian ownership; and we note the program to assure opportunity for reinvestment in other segments of the Brazilian economy and the encouragement of investment and industrial developments.

The Presidential communique underscored their support for a Latin American Free Trade Area, and a world price stability for coffee, both achievements which would do much to strengthen and quicken the economic development toward which the alliance for progress is directed.

The visit of President Goulart has provided the opportunity for frank and useful exchanges of views between other officials of the two Governments. I mention in particular the opportunity for discussion of mutual foreign policy interests with Foreign Minister San Tiago Dantas and for talks with Finance Minister Walther Moreira Salles on Brazil's economic and financial problems.

Close cooperation between the United States and Brazil on all international matters is of vital interest to both countries and the Western Hemisphere. The official visit of this friend from Brazil has served the cause of mutual understanding and hemispheric unity. President Goulart, by his humble and friendly manner, has gained the respect and admiration of the American people.

We appreciate the candid, direct words of President Goulart, knowing this to be the manner of the closest of friends. We are able to take from his frankness a greater understanding of Brazil's problems, and our own.

The Brazilian leader's visit here has been characterized by openness of expression, mutual understanding, rededication of basic principles, and obvious devotion to the kind of progress both our citizenry wish and demand. I submit that no better indication of the great similarity between our peoples and countries is possible, and that we of the United States of America are grateful for this dramatization of an enduring friendship upon which we rely, and which we value greatly. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the communique of President Kennedy and President Goulart be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF KENNEDY-GOULART COMMUNIQUE

The meetings of the President of the United States of Brazil and the President of the United States of America during the past 2 days have been marked by a spirit of frankness, cordiality, and mutual understanding. During their talks the two Presi-

dents examined relations between their two countries with respect to topics of worldwide and hemispheric, as well as bilateral, concern. On the conclusion of these extremely fruitful talks, they agreed to publish the following joint communique:

They reaffirm that the traditional friendship between Brazil and the United States has grown through the years as a consequence of the faithfulness of the Brazilian and the American peoples to common ideals of representative democracy and social progress, to mutual respect between the two nations, and to their determination that both Governments work together in the cause of peace and freedom.

The two Presidents declared that political democracy, national independence and self-determination, and the liberty of the individual are the political principles which shape the national policies of Brazil and the United States. Both countries are joined in a worldwide effort to bring about the economic progress and social justice which are the only secure foundations for human freedom.

DISARMAMENT DISCUSSED

The Presidents discussed the participation of their countries in the Geneva disarmament talks and agreed to continue to work to reduce world tensions through negotiations insuring progressive disarmament under effective international control. Resources freed as a result of such disarmament should be used for peaceful purposes which will benefit peoples everywhere.

The two Presidents reaffirmed the dedication of their countries to the inter-American system and to the values of human dignity, liberty, and progress on which that system is based. They expressed their intention to strengthen the inter-American machinery for regional cooperation, and to work together to protect this hemisphere against all forms of aggression. They also expressed their concern that political crises in American nations be resolved through peaceful adherence to constitutional government, the rule of law, and consent of people expressed through the democratic processes.

The Presidents reaffirmed their adherence to the principles of the charter of Punta del Este and their intention to carry forward the commitments which they assumed under that charter.

They agreed on the need for rapid execution of the steps necessary to make the Alliance for Progress effective—national programing to concentrate resources on high priority objectives of economic and social progress; institutional reforms, including reform of the agrarian structure, tax reform, and other changes required to assure a broad distribution of the fruits of development among all sectors of the community; and international financial and technical assistance to accelerate the accomplishment of the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

The President stressed the important role which trade unions operating under democratic principles should play in advancing the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

EACH STATES PURPOSES

President Goulart stated the intention of the Government of Brazil to strengthen the machinery for national programing, selection of priorities, and preparation of projects. President Kennedy indicated the readiness of the U.S. Government to assign representatives to work closely with such Brazilian agencies to minimize delays in project selection and the provision of external support.

The Presidents noted with satisfaction the effective cooperation of the two Governments in working out an agreement for large-scale U.S. support of the Brazilian Government's program for development of the northeast of Brazil. They expressed the hope that this program would provide a fruitful response at an early date to the aspirations of the hard-pressed people of that area for a better life.

The President of Brazil stated the intention of his government to maintain conditions of security which will permit private capital to perform its vital role in Brazilian economic development. The President of Brazil stated that in arrangements with the companies for the transfer of public utility enterprises to Brazilian ownership the principle of fair compensation with reinvestment in other sectors important to Brazilian economic development would be maintained. President Kennedy expressed great interest in this approach.

The two Presidents discussed the efforts which the Government of Brazil has undertaken for a program of financial recovery, aiming at holding down the cost of living and assuring a rapid rate of economic growth and social development in a context of a balanced economy. The Government of Brazil has already taken significant action under this program.

The Presidents agreed that these efforts, effectively carried through, will mark an important forward step under the Alliance for Progress. The Presidents welcomed the understanding recently reached between the Brazilian Finance Minister and the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, under which the United States is providing support for the program which has been presented by the Government of Brazil.

In order to promote the expansion of Latin-American resources, the two Presidents indicated their support for the Latin-American free trade area and their intention to speed its development and strengthening.

The two Presidents discussed the major aspects of the problem of raw materials and primary products. They decided to give full support to the competition of a worldwide agreement on coffee, which is now in process of negotiation. They will jointly support representation to the European Economic Community looking toward the elimination of excessive excise taxes which limit the sales of such products and custom discrimination which reduces the ready access to European markets for the basic products of Latin-American origin.

In conclusion, the two Presidents agreed that their exchange of views had confirmed the close relations between their two Governments and Nations. President Kennedy reaffirmed his country's commitment to assist the Government of Brazil in its efforts to achieve its people's aspirations for economic progress and social justice. The two Presidents restated their conviction that the destiny of the hemisphere lay in the collaboration of nations united in faith in individual liberty, free institutions, and human dignity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an address by President Goulart, of Brazil, on March 23, 1962, prior to his visit to the United States, delivered at the American Chamber of Commerce luncheon, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address may be printed in the RECORD.

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

TRANSLATION PRESIDENT GOULART'S SPEECH ON MARCH 23, 1962, AT AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON

The honor that the American Chamber of Commerce bestows on me, at this time, inviting me to participate in this luncheon in which its members, on the eve of my trip to the United States, are entertaining me with so much cordiality and so much esteem, is a manifestation that greatly moves me and for which I wish immediately to express my gratitude.

I understand the scope and meaning of this gathering. And as if I were already on the threshold of your great country, to which, despite specific differences that separate us, we are bound by ties of the most expressive tradition of good neighborliness, I will invoke your customary objectivity in order to use with you that direct, frank language that should be characteristic of the tone of relations between friends who wish and need to continue being friends.

Opposed by temperament to the language of protocol, I prefer the dialog of charity and sincerity, even though it may seem, on superficial examination, less diplomatic and less courteous.

I assure you that the Brazilian Government neither nourishes the least prejudice, nor cultivates any kind of preconception of ill will toward those who represent or defend the interests of foreign capital.

Personally, I see in you gentlemen intelligent men of business who invest capital in our country and who, naturally, must obtain adequate remuneration for the financial resources so employed in order to cover the risks that you run. This is a matter of business, and it is a right that we fully recognize. But just as we acknowledge and are grateful for the pioneering activity of the great commercial complexes that help us to conquer and expand our internal market, introducing and diffusing new methods and new relations between buyer and seller, in the distant corners of our country as well as in the capitals, we are opposed to those who come and isolate themselves from the fellowship of the Brazilian community and try neither to understand nor to interpret our feelings and aspirations.

With regard to investments, it is also natural that they be protected by guarantees in order that they may be applied on a growing scale. In sum, we wish to give to businessmen the tranquility they need in order to work. In the same way, this tranquility must be maintained in an effective manner for Brazil, for the progress of our country.

What you gentlemen cannot fail to consider also, and I am certain that you do it, is the matter of what is suitable to our country, which should always be in the forefront.

We believe that investments should be selected in the joint interest of Brazil and the investors, rigorously guaranteed, but also directed, with regard to their end result, to the path of what is most in keeping with our development policies. And in this connection it is certain that I would be neither truthful nor sincere with you if I were to tell you that, as a Brazilian and as the man having responsibility for the government, that I place every proposed type of investment on the same plane. A proposal, for example, to establish an industry to produce knickknacks, or some merely intermediary or speculative activity on the one hand; and on the other, some basic or necessary economic enterprise in which your know-how and your resources may fill the empty spaces of production indispensable to progress—these cannot represent the same thing.

I acknowledge that, in classic terms, it is very logical for the investor to insist on his preference for the activity that will render him the most profit and that, to this end, he will try to employ his capital in such a way. We must all understand, however, that Brazil must reserve to herself the right to establish her own rules and that so long as she offers security, tranquillity, and profit potential to foreign investment, she must not forgo her prerogative to direct it in accordance with her development needs.

Gentlemen (Americans or whatever other nationality you may be)—and I wish, in the awareness of the responsibility of my office, to make this declaration in the most unequivocal manner—you may be sure that there does not exist any attitude of suspicion or prejudice toward the entry of foreign

capital that is sincerely disposed to help us in the fight for our economic emancipation.

With regard to the return of capital to the country of origin, or the remittance of profits, all you gentlemen should bear in mind that this had to do with an operation that involves important national interests and that, therefore, it is not possible to proceed in a disorderly fashion. We have the sincerest concern about assuring guarantees to capital, in order that it continue with us, that it become a part of Brazil and remain here in the fight for our national development.

It is for this reason that in relation to this problem I spoke up in the last message that I sent to the Congress with respect to the need for a statute defining and insuring the limits for action of foreign capital, and appealed for the finding of a just solution in the interest of Brazil. And such a solution will be that which seeks to eliminate xenophobia toward outside resources and elements that collaborate honestly in our economic life, and also prevent exploitative action against our economy itself, which wishes to help and to be helped, but will never again be colonized.

My conviction is that this is the best way to find a common denominator that will be a stimulus to foreign capital that will always and truly represent support and incentive to Brazil and its progress. We wish the investor to be comfortable in our country, that he become wealthy, but that his enrichment result in, above all, the enrichment of Brazil and that it never represent our impoverishment. I know that this is your feeling also.

Another point that I feel the obligation to take up at this meeting is that which refers to the sector of public services.

We have had in the past the collaboration of foreign know-how, business capacity and capital, directed particularly to the sector of the carrying out of such services. Water supply and sewage systems in the large cities, railroads, electric power, streetcars, harbors, navigation, telephones, and many other public services in this country were the products of the pioneering spirit of foreign enterprises which came to settle in Brazil and brought here skills and capital for the stimulation of our progress through the process of public service concessions. It is not to be denied that that process, in which private initiative and the public authority contracted to cooperate for the best provision of services indispensable to the public, marked the first great experiment in the joining of public and private efforts toward the realization of great tasks, and that it produced fertile results.

The truth forces us to confess, nevertheless, that the evolution of circumstances contributed to the system's ending by exhausting itself, leaving behind broad, vast areas of misunderstanding and friction among public opinion, concessionary authority, and the concessionaires, and by a very natural phenomenon of transference, poisoned the very relations between our country and the foreign governments, especially the one most represented in this area, that of the United States.

Now is not the time, at this luncheon, to analyze the causes that led to such a situation, among which the most dispassionate analyst would emphasize, principally after the abandonment of the so-called golden clause that was the attitude necessarily taken in defense of legitimate national interests by the great President Getulio Vargas, the disharmony between rate schedules in an expanding inflationary economy and the incontestable disinterest on the part of capital and investors in the amplification of these services, with the loss of their capacity to expand and meet the development needs of the country. From all this resulted the situation that may be corroborated by anyone who examines it. Enterprises that played a significant role in the economic history of our country are today frozen in sectors fundamental to our development without the possibility of attending to the needs of our expanding economy and a growing clientele for public services. Services and enterprises, therefore, begin to deteriorate and become continually more deficient.

No one can deny in good conscience that, save for rare exceptions, public service concessions in general work badly in Brazil, work inadequately and insufficiently.

And although it is admitted that the rates that they collect are not the most favorable, the truth is that the people, ill-served, retain their right to proclaim that they pay dearly, in relation to their purchasing power, for bad service.

You gentlemen know that I and many others responsible for national policy have made such statements from public rostrums. And I did not change when I became President; on the contrary, my conviction of the need for a solution to just popular complaints in this important sector was reinforced.

I am not a man to retreat from my positions when I believe them to be right and when I believe that they reflect the popular interest. But neither do I wish, as one of those responsible for national tranquillity, as Chief of State, to cause you uneasiness or panic, which would only aggravate common difficulties in the present and in the future.

In sum, gentlemen, I wish to be faithful to my past and to my convictions. I wish to meet the interests of the people halfway, without ever betraying my freely assumed commitments to them. I am certain, however, that these popular yearnings can be satisfied without provoking inadvisable reactions here or abroad, especially in the countries, the men and the groups which have invested or will invest in Brazil. I believe that here, too, we can and must find a common denominator that, while keeping in the foreground the interests of Brazil, will not ignore those of concessionaire enterprises.

Without bluster, but facing up to important national interests, we can meet the people halfway, without trampling on those who live in our country and invest their capital here. If those public services, for various reasons, can no longer discharge their task of giving the public good service, if the companies themselves maintain that they are not obtaining satisfactory results, and since we wish that the capital that is now here continue here in untroubled areas where it can make its maximum contribution to national progress, it will not be difficult to agree upon a solution, which satisfying important national and popular interests, will not creat difficulties or injure investors or capital whatever their country of origin. And especially, gentlemen, when such questions involve the interests of two countries, which, because of their identification with the democratic ideal, have in this hour more than in any other an obligation to avoid misunderstandings and clashes in their daily relations, as is the case with the United States and Brazil, the problem that presents itself is a simultaneous summons to the capacity for decision on the part of those governments, to their good sense, and to the capacity to understand on the part of the interested parties.

I am sure that you will understand my language as that of a man of his times who, interested in preserving his ideals of a convinced democrat, knows that he can establish a dialogue of such a kind with the present Government of the United States, submitting himself to the perception and sensitivity of a leader of the new generation who so many times has called for the formation of a world community, where freedom of decision will exist, where men can live in accordince with their own wishes, in conditions which will allow them to amplify their economic opportunities and increase social justice, and where the nations can make their own decisions within the framework of their own cultures and traditions.

In line with this understanding, I am certain that the Brazilian Government and people, whose democratic maturation has been well proved in recent times, will be able concretely to demonstrate that they value and welcome, under conditions of security and incentive, foreign investment that comes to cooperate with us, as well as the investors themselves, who will be considered our friends, and who will be requited.

In accordance with this orientation, convinced that relations between states only flourish in the measure that the respective peoples understand and incorporate them in the roots of their feelings, I can assure you that, as for me, I will spare no efforts to the end that, through eliminating obstacles, frank language, without subterfuge, will lead the people of Brazil and the people of the United States to an identity of aims in the field of their mutual interests, since both, each in its own way, need no more than an effort to demonstrate that they believe in the democratic ideal as the irreplaceable instrument of action among free nations.

Gentlemen, with sincerity in our aims and without hidden motives, let us work together for the future and for the greatness of this country which wishes to see you tranquil, which wishes to see you involved in the fight we are carrying out for the development and emancipation of our country—which wishes to see you tranquil in our Brazil, which wishes to see you ever more a part of our life, of our society, and of the extraordinary effort we are making for the development of this country, which also wishes to see its country and its children with a better life, wishes to see its children independent, within a country ever more sovereign, free and independent.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO FILE REPORT DURING RECESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee may be authorized to file its report on the Peace Corps bill while the Senate is in recess or adjournment.

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

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced for appropriate reference, an administration bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas. I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill lie at the table through April 10 so that other Senators who wish to cosponsor the measure may do so.

Mr. President, this bill represents an important effort to carry on the beginning that was made last year with passage of the Housing Act to help develop, as the President stated:

The comprehensive and balanced urban transportation that is so vitally needed, not only to benefit local communities, but to

assure more effective use of Federal funds available for other urban development and renewal programs.

In his message to Congress President Kennedy said:

To conserve and enhance values in existing urban areas is essential. But at least as important are steps to promote economic efficiency and livability in areas of future development. In less than 20 years we can expect well over half of our expanded population to be living in 40 great urban complexes. Many smaller places will also experience phenomenal growth. The ways that people and goods can be moved in these areas will have a major influence on their structure, on the efficiency of their economy, and on the availability for social and cultural opportunities they can offer their citizens. Our national welfare, therefore, requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth.

It goes without saying that this legislation is the result of intensive and painstaking study by the administration, Members of Congress, independent consultants, and interested organizations and individuals. In addition the Senate and the House have conducted extensive hearings on the subject for the last 2 years. And, finally, the legislation bears the imprint of the knowledge acquired by the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the administration of the $75 million grant and loan programs enacted by Congress last June as part of the Housing Act.

I am sure the Members of the Senate remember, with a strong sense of personal loss, the contributions made by the late distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Styles Bridges. As chairman of the Republican policy committee, Senator Bridges joined last year in sponsoring a forerunner of this legislation, S. 345, and in his statement to the Banking and Currency Committee during hearings on the bill, Senator Bridges said:

I trust that before this session of the Congress is concluded we shall be able to say that in the field of domestic problems one of the most aggravating and serious was that of mass transportation and that this Congress recognized it and passed legislation necessary to alleviate this important and critical problem.

Were the Senator still with us today, I believe he would agree that the problem remains most aggravating and serious. I, too, hope that before the 87th session of Congress comes to a close, we will be able to say that we have passed legislation necessary to alleviate this important and critical problem.

THE URBAN HIGHWAY PROGRAM

To fully understand the critical importance of the urban transportation problem, it is necessary to examine the Federal interstate highway program. It seems to me that one of the most important facts is that about $20 billion of the $41 billion program is scheduled for urban highway construction. For example, a total of $2.7 billion in Federal aid has been authorized since 1953 for interstate highway construction projects in the Washington metropolitan area. A total of $106 million has been authorized for the Cleveland metropolitan area. In Boston the figure is $84 million. Atlanta is getting $78 million. Seattle is getting $61 million. For Los Angeles, $411 million. For Houston, $101 million. For Minneapolis, $124 million. And so on down the list of metropolitan and other urban areas across the country.

Now this program of urban highway construction is vitally essential to meet a whole variety of needs—national defense, interstate commerce, the afternoon shopper, the traveling salesman, the doctor who must use his car; for the movement of truck freight in the metropolitan area, for countless commercial purposes, for visits to the suburban homes of friends, for weekend vacation travel, and for rush hour commutation of people who, because of the location of their homes or their place of work could never be adequately served by mass transportation service of any kind. In addition urban highways will be necessary in many smaller and even large metropolitan areas to provide the right-of-way for express bus service where grade-separated transit is not feasible. The existence of the highways, of course, will not guarantee the provision of adequate express bus service, but they will make it physically possible.

But despite the wide range of needs urban highways can and will serve, it is becoming increasingly clear that there is one mammoth problem that highways and automobiles alone cannot hope to meet, except at prohibitive cost or without profoundly changing the face and function of the metropolitan area, and in particular the central city. That is the morning and evening rush hour travel from home to work.

And it is largely this 20-hour-a-week rush hour need that has forced the allocation of $20 billion of the $41 billion interstate program for urban highway construction.

For example, here in Washington, a 4-mile stretch of Shirley Highway is going to be widened from four to eight lanes at an estimated cost of $20 million. The reason is simply that this highway is a nightmare of traffic congestion 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours at night. The rest of the day, the road operates at just over one-half of its practical capacity, which in turn is substantially less than its maximum possible capacity. And at night you could almost use the highway as an auxiliary landing strip for the National Airport.

As another example, there are now six bridges crossing the Potomac, with two more on the way by 1965. All of these bridges are extremely overcrowded during rush hours, but even the most congested, Key Bridge, operates at about half capacity the rest of the day. Similar examples can be found in practically every other urban area in the country.

The point, of course, is not so much that our urban highways are underused except during rush hours, but the social and economic implications of attempting to meet rush hour traffic demands exclusively by highways and automobiles, especially where modern mass transportation can provide a feasible alternative.

URBAN HIGHWAY COSTS

In the first place, urban highway construction is extremely expensive, averaging between $5 million and $20 million a mile in built-up areas. For example, the 15-mile inner loop proposed for the Nation's Capital will cost $300 million. In Philadelphia, a 22-mile highway along the Delaware River will also cost $300 million. In Boston, a 12-mile turnpike into the downtown area will cost $180 million. And to build the proposed highway, scarcely more than a mile long, across lower Manhattan will cost $100 million. In contrast, this $100 million which will provide just a little more than 1 mile in Manhattan might provide 50 miles or more of highway in the outlying suburbs or around the metropolitan fringe or between cities where in the not distant future these highways will be badly needed and where people will be extremely dependent on their automobiles to get around.

But the per-mile cost of highways in heavily built-up urban areas is not the only problem. After you build the highway, it then becomes necessary to improve and widen the local street system to handle the cars pouring off the limited access artery. This, plus the highways themselves, creates tremendous problems of family dislocation. As the President noted in his message, the interstate highway program is displacing 15,000 families and 1,500 businesses every year. I understand that this is about the same number as are being displaced by the urban renewal program. Then there is the loss of parks and trees along the street and other amenities so essential to a livable urban environment. Air pollution increases, and the city's tax base dwindles as tax ratable property is replaced by nontaxable concrete and asphalt. And when you get all through, you still have the gigantic problem of finding places for all the cars to park—a job which is not only very expensive, but which also carves away the very commercial and cultural attractions that caused the demand for access in the first place.

To give an indication of downtown parking costs, the Washington Post recently observed:

The $2.46 million civic center garage in Brooklyn, N.Y., provides space for 693 cars at a cost per space of about $3,556. The $4 million Grand Circus Park garage in Detroit holds 1,125 cars at a cost per space of around $3,902. The $4.1 million Auditorium Plaza in Kansas City has room for 1,050 cars at a cost per space of $3,905. The $3.2 million Mellon Square garage in Pittsburgh has places for 890 cars at a cost of about $3,636 per space. The $8.3 million Grant Park garage in Chicago has room for 2,100 cars at an average cost per space of about $3,952.

And, of course, the prize example is the garage proposed right here on Capitol Hill which, as the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has pointed out, will cost $41.9 million for some 1,900 cars. This averages out to a handsome price of $22,089 per parking space.

Lastly, there is the question of traffic control costs. Last fall New York City started a program to alleviate traffic congestion in the area of Manhattan

south of 20th Street. According to a report in the New York Times, the project "involves a central control room that receives reports of developing traffic congestion from policemen in 15 radio cars, 15 men on motorcycles and 1 police helicopter."

It perhaps should be pointed out that there are more policemen working to reduce traffic tie-ups in lower Manhattan than there are people in the entire Federal Establishment working on the problem of improving mass transportation throughout the country.

CARS UP, TRANSIT DOWN

But this is not the end of the story, because in the background are two trends which may well turn what is now a very serious problem into a full-scale crisis. One trend is the rapid rise in automobile ownership. At present there are about 70 million registered vehicles in the United States. In 15 short years, this number is expected to rise to well over 115 million, with most of the increase occurring in the metropolitan areas. In fact in many areas the cars are multiplying faster than the people. In itself this is fine, but it could become a first-class catastrophe if, lacking any mass transportation alternative, it becomes necessary for more and more people to use those automobiles to get to and from work each day.

And this possibility is becoming more and more likely because the other important trend is the equally rapid decline and deterioration of mass transportation service. In fact in the last 10 years, ridership on all forms of mass transportation has declined 38 percent.

However, it is important to point out that most of this decline has occurred during the offpeak hours and on weekends. Rush-hour ridership has held up very well, and is turning upward in many areas. As a matter of fact, grade-separated transit is beginning to show an absolute increase in ridership and bus ridership seems to be leveling off from its previous decline.

PEOPLE WILL RIDE TRANSIT

In the few areas where positive efforts have been made to improve transit service, the results have been very impressive indeed.

The New York subway system, which is undertaking a modernization program, had an increase of 20 million riders last year over the year before.

Several years ago, the Boston & Albany Railroad, down to about 3,000 riders a day on its Highland branch line, was petitioning strenuously to eliminate all its service. The Boston MTA took over the 11-mile line, linked it up with the subway system, turned it into a rapid transit-type operation, provided some fringe area parking, and now the line is pushing the figure of 30,000 riders a day, despite the fact that it does not operate on exclusive right-of-way.

In 1959, Philadelphia, one of the real pioneer cities in the field of mass transportation, entered into a contract with the Pennsylvania Railroad to provide more frequent service at lower fares on a line running out to Chestnut Hill. This Operation Northwest, so-called, proved so successful, increasing ridership 30 percent and reducing by 400 the number of cars coming into the downtown area each day, that similar operations were instituted on other lines, and equally successful increases in ridership occurred. The program has been so successful, in fact, that the suburban counties are becoming interested in joining with the city in extending the new improved service out beyond the city line. All told, the five experimental operations are now carrying 6.2 million riders a year—an increase of 44 percent in ridership over pre-Operation Northwest years.

Chicago can point to two significant developments. The first being the almost unprecedented phenomenon of a railroad making money on its commuter service, although I understand that recently the service has begun slipping back into the red with the opening of a parallel highway. The railroad is the Chicago & Northwestern, under the aggressive and farsighted leadership of its chairman, Ben Heineman, who is providing modern, clean, and courteous service to the commuter and an even more important service to the city of Chicago. The second development was the construction of a rapid transit line in the median strip of the Congress Street expressway. This line, which is operating at only 25 percent of capacity is already carrying more rush-hour traffic than the highway itself, which is operating at full capacity at rush hour.

Thus, there is no question that mass transportation can and does provide an absolutely essential rush-hour service.

WHY TRANSIT IS ESSENTIAL

The reason this service is essential is simply that the alternative costs would be staggering. For example, the American Municipal Association has estimated that if the five cities of New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland were to lose just their rail commuter service it would cost $31 billion with 30-year, 4 percent financing to build the highways necessary to serve a comparable number of people.

And in addition to the direct alternative costs, there would be all the indirect but related social and economic costs that I discussed earlier.

In study after study, the same conclusions have been reached.

Here in Washington, an extensive transportation survey found:

> By 1980, under a dominant transportation system, 12 to 18 lanes would be required to carry traffic from the Capitol to Wheaton. The Inner Loop would require 14 lanes. Several other corridors would require more than eight lanes. Not only would the cost be great but excessive damage would be done to residential communities and to the character of the central area of the Nation's Capital. These findings led to the conclusion that, in the absence of substantially improved public transit, the highway system needed to serve the projected traffic volumes is hardly feasible from the engineering standpoint, and is certainly out of the question from the viewpoint of desirable regional development.

During Senate hearings on mass transportation legislation 2 years ago a representative of the Georgia Department of Commerce testified:

> In Atlanta, the northern portion of the expressway currently has 6 lanes, but has traffic sufficient to warrant 16 lanes. By 1970 this need will have jumped to at least 36 lanes. By no stretch of the imagination is it physically or financially possible to build such a facility.

That is why, as the President put it, "Our national welfare requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport."

That is why we must have transit as well as highways, using each to their greatest natural advantage.

THE PROBLEM

The problem, however, is twofold.

In the first place, private bus, transit and rail carriers are finding it increasingly difficult to break even, much less make a profit, on a 20-hour-a-week basis. And if they cannot break even, they cannot stay in business. The railroads are especially burdened with heavy capital costs for facilities and equipment. But even bus companies are plagued by similar problems, as illustrated by the difficulties of the Fifth Avenue Coach Line in New York City, which is similar to problems faced by bus companies in hundreds of other cities across the country, large and small. Caught in the squeeze of rising capital and operating costs, and declining patronage, the private carriers, bus and rail, must resort to raising fares, trimming service, and deferring maintenance—which simply drives away more riders, and accelerates the downward spiral.

This may be all right from the standpoint of the carrier, but it deprives a large segment of our population, which does not have direct access to an automobile, of an essential service, and of course it puts enormous strains on the community to provide alternative service.

Parenthetically, it is worth noting that in 26 metropolitan centers with populations of 500,000 or more, about 40 percent of the households do not own cars. To all the people who are too young, too old, too poor, or too infirm to have access to a car, mass transportation is quite important.

The only solution to the downward spiral I have mentioned is the injection of public funds to bridge the financial gap standing between the transit carriers and the needs of the community.

THE FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

But at this point a second problem arises. When State or local governments begin searching for an answer to a particular traffic problem, they are faced with the overwhelming powerful economic fact that in most cases they need put up only 10 percent of the cost for a highway solution. Whereas they must contemplate bearing 100 percent of the cost of a transit solution, whether it involves improving a rail line, buying a new fleet of buses, providing fringe area parking, establishing a downtown distributor system or whatever.

Obviously this situation is not conducive to the establishement of a

balanced urban transportation system, utilizing transit where it is logically needed and using a highway where it is logically needed.

There are, of course, a number of other reasons why this problem involves a considerable measure of Federal responsibility.

For one thing, the problem of providing adequate mass transportation service has long ago spilled over local political jurisdictions. In fact it has spilled over a good many State boundaries. Some 53 of our 200-odd metropolitan areas either border on or cross over State lines. The financial difficulties of the State and local governments are even more acute than the jurisdictional difficulties. Most of our cities are faced with rising service costs and declining tax bases. State and local debt has risen 15 times faster than Federal debt since the war.

And finally there is the very great national importance of traffic congestion. It has been estimated that traffic jams cost the Nation about $5 billion a year in time and wages lost, extra fuel consumption, faster vehicle depreciation, lower downtown commercial sales, lower taxes, and so forth. It is also clear that traffic congestion discourages private investment in central cities, and thereby makes the task of urban renewal that much more difficult and costly. The former mayor of Philadelphia, for example, testified last year that Philadelphia businessmen told him that they would be willing to invest $500 million to $600 million over their present plans if they had some assurance that something would be done about traffic congestion. Officials of a nonprofit organization here in Washington called Downtown Progress, who are attempting to revitalize the downtown area, have frequently stated that the key to their efforts is the construction of the proposed rapid transit system.

Traffic congestion also adds to the cost of moving freight in the metropolitan area, because trucks have to compete for clogged street space with the automobile. Who knows how many truck drivers simply park on the outskirts of the metropolitan area and wait until the rush hour is over? Those who do come straight in are faced with incessant stops and starts, which are not only time consuming but extremely expensive. I understand that some trucking firms have set up depots at the fringe of the metropolitan areas, where truck loads are divided into smaller vehicles which can maneuver more quickly and easily in traffic congestion. This, too, adds to the total cost we must all pay for our goods and materials.

Safety is another factor. In fact it was one of the primary factors that led to president of the Standard Oil Co. of California to endorse the ambitious San Francisco rapid transit program, because use of the highways during rush hours exceeded the limits of reasonable safety. And, of course, the more accidents that occur, the steeper the insurance premiums become.

And last but not least there is the intense irritation and frustration I am sure we have all felt when we get caught in a traffic jam. If for no other reason than to provide a little better peace of mind for the automobile commuter, I believe this legislation is warranted.

BENEFITS OF TRANSIT

Looking at the other side of the coin for a minute, I firmly believe that a program of assistance to improve mass transportation service can significantly help alleviate traffic congestion and reduce total urban transportation costs. At the same time, I am confident that any expenditure for mass transportation will more than pay for itself in many different ways. I mention Mayor Dilworth's testimony, and there is even more concrete evidence of the beneficial effect of transit improvements on property values.

Toronto is the only city in North America actively engaged in the construction of a rapid transit system at the present time. In 5 years since the opening of the subway line there, assessed valuations along the route rose 17 percent more than in the city as a whole and this amounted to a difference of $88 million in assessed valuation. With the same tax rate, the tax yield from this increase was $4 million, which was enough to amortize the annual debt service on the project.

But I should emphasize that the ability of transit to improve property and commercial values is not limited by any means to the downtown areas of central cities.

TRANSIT VITAL TO SUBURBS

With proper planning, transit as well as highways can be as great a boon to the suburbs as to the central city. It can be a vital positive tool to help curb suburban sprawl, which profits no one, and help structure better patterns of suburban development. A good illustration of how this might work can be seen in the year 2000 plans for the Washington metropolitan area.

In an effort to curb the present aimless, haphazard and inordinately expensive sprawl that characterizes current development at the fringe of this metropolitan area, the planners and officials have recommended a so-called corridor plan, with future development radiating out from the present fringe in five or six corridors, separated by wedges of open space. More compact and economical development in the corridors would be encouraged by placing high-speed rapid transit and highways down the centers of the corridors, like spokes on a wheel, tying the suburbs to the central city. With this kind of development, suburban officials might have some hope of providing necessary school, utility, police, and other community services at considerably less cost than would be possible under a pattern of widely scattered, low-density development. And with these rapid transit and highway arteries, industry locating out in the corridors could be assured of access to a labor market throughout the metropolitan area.

I think it is important to point out that the bulk of the population increase is occurring and will continue to occur in the outlying portions of the metropolitan area, and it is increasing much too fast for the central cities to cope with anything but a small fraction of it. And with the population increase will come commerce, industry, and public services of all kinds.

This fact, combined with the growing capacity of residential, commercial, and industrial developers to lay out whole new communities in one fell swoop, offer unparalleled opportunities to coordinate transit and highway systems with these land-use developments to create new suburban environments with a vastly higher level of diversity, variety, comfort, efficiency, productivity, and attractiveness than we have ever been able to achieve before.

This is why highways should not be the sole concern of the highway engineer and why transit should not be the sole concern of the transit operator. There is a great challenge here as well to those who are vitally concerned with housing, urban renewal, community facilities and the urban environment generally to achieve the kind of urban society commensurate with 20th century standards.

PROBLEM OF THE SMALL TOWNS

Mr. President, my comments so far have been directed primarily to the medium- and larger-sized urban areas. But it would be a mistake to conclude that mass transportation is a problem of concern only to those larger areas. Part of the problem is that the larger cities usually command more national publicity. But I recently came across an editorial from the Fairmont, W. Va. Times. The editorial, commenting on a fare increase by the local bus company, noted that "more than 100 bus companies have been forced out of business in West Virginia within a little more than 10 years. Only 28 are still in operation, counting both city and suburban lines. Between 1955 and 1959 alone, the number of passengers hauled on West Virginia local lines dropped 35.3 percent."

What has happened in West Virginia has been happening throughout the country.

The American Transit Association, which represents about 80 percent of all the bus and transit service in the United States, compiled statistics showing that exactly 145 transit companies have completely abandoned service since 1954. The figure is much larger for the period going back to the end of World War II. These abandonments have occurred in such cities and towns as Little Rock, Ark.; Alhambra, Calif.; Denver, Colo.; Middletown, Conn.; Pocatello, Idaho; Kankakee, Ill.; Wichita, Kans.; Hannibal, Mo.; Great Falls, Mont.; Tulsa, Okla.; and so on down the list.

In addition, another 150 companies have been sold in the same period, for a total of about 350 companies sold or abandoned since 1954. In some of the cities, the service has been restored, but almost invariably at a greatly reduced level, accompanied by higher fares and reduced wages. In 83 cases no replacement has been made at all.

The American Transit Association estimates that there are about 60 cities of 25,000 population or more which have no public transportation service at all. Many of our smaller cities and towns are experiencing rapid rates of growth, and they are beginning to taste the first bitter fruits of traffic congestion. But growing rapidly or not, these cities and towns all have a sizable portion of their residents who have been seriously inconvenienced by the loss of public transportation service. And, of course, there is always a need for standby or emergency public transportation service.

This legislation is designed to help assist in the solution of mass transportation problems wherever they occur, in large cities or in small, and I believe the legislation will be equally beneficial to both.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Without going over the bill section by section, I would like to comment on a few major provisions of the bill. The legislation places primary reliance on grant assistance, supplemented by the existing loan program. There are several reasons for this. In the first place, any effort to meet the problem exclusively with a direct loan program would involve a much more serious impact on the Federal budget than the proposed matching grant program. In the second place, many highly desirable projects that might be assisted would not be sufficiently self-supporting to make a loan useful and would require a grant to fill the gap. Thirdly, a large direct loan program would tend to preempt rather than encourage private commercial investment, which is absolutely essential to the success of this program.

It is important here to describe how the grant program would work. In general, it would be similar to the urban renewal grants. In other words, the grants would be designed to trigger the desired private investment. They would not apply to the total cost of the project, just as the urban renewal grants are limited to the cost of reducing the price of land to the point where private redevelopment becomes financially possible.

In this case, the Federal grant would share only two-thirds of the net project cost—that is, that part of the project cost which cannot be financed from revenues.

To give an actual, and I believe typical example, the Delaware River Port Authority recently received approval to begin construction of a 12-mile rapid transit line between Philadelphia and the Camden suburbs. This project will cost about $50 million. One-half the cost, or $25 million, will be covered by the issuance of bonds supported by the estimated revenue of the system. The port authority is making a grant of the remaining $25 million out of its surplus funds.

If those surplus funds had not been available, the project might have been financed by a Federal grant of $16.5 million and a State or local grant of $8.5 million and the grants could be further spread over the construction period, which is usually several years.

Thus the Federal grant would not be two-thirds of $50 million, but two-thirds of $25 million. I believe, therefore, that the amounts requested in this bill, while by no means excessive in terms of the magnitude of the job to be done, will be adequate to stimulate an enormous amount of progress throughout the country in a field I believe is in urgent need of help.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the section-by-section analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL OF 1962

SECTION 1

Short title: Section 1 of the bill would provide that it may be cited as the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962."

SECTION 2

Findings and purpose: Section 2(a) of the bill contains a finding by the Congress which describes the increasing concentration of the Nation's population in urban areas, which generally include several local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States. It would declare that the deterioration or inadequate provision of urban transportation facilities, intensified traffic congestion, and the lack of coordinated transportation and other development planning is jeopardizing the welfare and vitality of urban areas, the satisfactory movement of people and goods within such areas, and the effectiveness of housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs.

Subsection (b) of this section would state that the purposes of the act are (1) to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods; (2) to encourage the planning and establishment of areawide urban mass transportation systems needed for economical and desirable urban development; and (3) to provide assistance to State and local governments and instrumentalities thereof in financing such systems, to be operated by public or pr.vate agencies as determined by local needs.

SECTION 3

Federal financial assistance: Section 3 of the bill would authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make grants or loans, subject to limitations in the bill, to assist local public bodies in financing the acquisition and improvement of mass transportation facilities and equipment. These could be used in urban mass transportation service or in coordinating such service with other urban transportation. Terminal facilities, rights-of-way (but not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, and other needed real or personal property would be eligible for assistance. The loan authority in this section would be limited to the unused amount of the present $50 million mass transportation loan authority.

Although an applicant for a loan or a grant under this section would have to be a public body, it would not have to operate the transit facilities and equipment itself. The applicant could, for example, acquire buses and lease them to a private transit company, or it could contract with the private transit company for the company itself to acquire the buses and operate them according to an agreed-upon program. Title to such buses could remain in some cases in the hands of a third party, such as in an equipment trust transaction.

In all cases, however, the applicant public body would have to have satisfactory continuing control over the use of the property acquired or improved and, together with any private transit company or other associated parties, would have to have satisfactory legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out the proposed project.

Also, the Federal assistance could not be used for operating subsidies. An assisted project would have to consist of the provision of new, or the improvement of existing, transit facilities and equipment.

SECTION 4

Long-range program: Section 4 of the bill would set forth the terms and conditions regularly applying to the loans and grants authorized under section 3. Except as provided in the emergency program described below under section 5, no such loan or grant could be provided unless the Housing Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area.

This does not mean that such a program has to set forth a specific schedule for a series of detailed projects, which together would comprise a complete transportation system for the urban area. Urban planning and development, especially in metropolitan areas where many jurisdictions may be involved, is inevitably very complex and must be carried on as a continuing and evolving process. It does mean, however, that a transportation plan must have been prepared which sets forth the basic framework of the highway network and the mass transportation system needed for the urban area, that the proposed project is needed for this mass transportation system, that there is a program for the establishment of the system, and that the system will be administered either by one agency or by officially coordinated agencies. Also, the proposed transportation plan itself must have been prepared by an organization, or officially coordinated organizations, carrying on a continuing areawide program of comprehensive planning, under which comprehensive plans for the urban area have already been prepared in sufficient detail to provide a satisfactory basis for the highway and mass transportation plans.

Section 4(a) of the bill would authorize the immediate appropriation of $100 million for grants under section 3 of the bill for fiscal 1963, $200 million for fiscal 1964, and $200 million for fiscal 1965. Advance or progress payments could be made on account of any such grant.

Where the planning and organizational requirements described above are met, section 4(a) of the bill would authorize the Housing Administrator to provide Federal grants in accord with a formula which is designed to take into consideration the availability of revenues to meet debt service on proposed projects, and is also designed to require the locality itself to provide a matching grant in addition to any revenue financing for the project. These Federal and local grants would be based on the net project cost of the project, defined as that portion of project cost which the Housing Administrator ascertains cannot reasonably be financed from revenues. A Federal grant could be made for up to two-thirds of this net project cost.

The locality would be required to provide the remainder of the net project cost from sources other than Federal funds and—by the definition of "net project cost"—other than anticipated revenues. This would ordinarily be done through the issuance of bonds based on the taxing powers of the local government, transit authority, or other local public body. If this local contribution were later reduced by the use of surplus project revenues then a corresponding refund would have to be made to the Federal Government

in the same proportion as the original Federal and local grant. Surplus project revenues could instead be used to reduce fares or increase service, if the locality so chose.

Section 4(b) of the bill would specify that, where the planning and organizational requirements described above have been met, loans may be made under section 3 of the bill subject to the same restrictions and limitations (set forth in section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955) that apply to the present temporary mass transportation loan program. These provisions establish the interest rate according to a formula which presently produces a rate of up to 3⅝ percent, permit loans to be amortized over 40 years, provide for deferral of up to 50 percent of the interest on a loan for up to 10 years in certain cases, specify that loans shall be made only where financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms, and require that the loans be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment. The unobligated balance of the $50 million authorization for loans under the present temporary mass transportation loan program would be made available, without expiration date, solely for loans under section 3 of this bill.

Section 4(b) would also specify that such loans are to be available only for projects for which no Federal grant is made under section 3. It is expected that, in the case of projects for which there are matching Federal and local grants, those grants would be made sufficiently large to provide the coverage necessary for the revenue-based portion of the financing to be obtained on reasonable terms in the private market. Federal loans would therefore be authorized only for projects which can be entirely financed from revenues, without any Federal and local grants.

SECTION 5

Emergency program: Section 5 of the bill would provide that, until July 1, 1965, loans and grants could be made under section 3 of the bill in emergency situations even though certain of the regular planning requirements in section 4 had not been met. These emergency loans and grants could be made where (1) the program for the development of a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system is under active preparation although not yet completed, as required by section 4; (2) the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought can reasonably be expected to be required for such a system; and (3) there is an urgent need for their preservation or provision. An example of such a situation would be where adequate land-use and other comprehensive development plans have not yet been prepared for an urban area or where a general urban transportation plan for the area, coordinated with such development plans, has not been completed, but the proposed project would assist an existing transportation system which in all probability will continue to be needed and which is in urgent danger of losing needed rights-of-way or in urgent need of modernization. Emergency loans would be made under the same terms and conditions as regular loans, including the prohibition against a loan for a project receiving a grant.

The emergency Federal grants would be for one-half rather than two-thirds of net project cost. In the case of such an emergency grant, the local contribution would therefore have to be one-half of net project cost. However, if a project did meet the full planning requirement within 3 years from the time of such a grant, section 5 provides that the project would then qualify for an additional grant equal to the difference between a two-thirds grant and a one-half grant—i.e., an additional grant of one-sixth of net project cost.

The same proportional refund provisions would apply to these grants as to a regular two-thirds grant.

SECTION 6

Research, development, and demonstration projects: Section 6 of the bill would authorize a research, development, and demonstration program for all phases of urban mass transportation. Demonstration grants could be provided under the new program without the present restrictions against grants for over two-thirds of project cost or for major long-term capital improvement. Research and demonstration projects could also be carried on directly by the Administrator, or through other Federal agencies, public or private institutions, or individuals, as appropriate. The unobligated balance of the present $25 million demonstration grant authority would be made available to finance such projects, plus up to $30 million of the new $500 million grant authority under section 3.

In carrying out these provisions the Administrator would be authorized to request and to receive any appropriate data or information, from public or private sources.

SECTION 7

Relocation requirements and payments: Section 7(a) of the bill would require, for any project assisted with a loan or grant under section 3, that an adequate relocation program is being carried on for families displaced by the project, and that an equal number of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings are being provided in areas of comparable desirability and convenience, at prices which the displaced families can afford.

Section 7(b) of the bill would authorize relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced from projects assisted with a loan or a grant under section 3. No local contribution would be required for these grants. They would be financed from the Federal grant funds authorized to be appropriated in section 4 of the bill. These payments would cover otherwise uncompensated reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit. Payments could be up to $200 in the case of an individual or family and could be for a fixed amount. Payments could be for up to $3,000 (or, if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of a nonprofit organization or business concern.

SECTION 8

Coordination of Federal assistance for highways and for mass transportattion facilities: Section 8 of the bill would provide that the Housing Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information on proposed projects in urban areas.

SECTION 9

Interstate compacts to implement comprehensive urban planning: Section 9 of the bill would amend section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 to broaden the advance congressional consent now provided in that subsection for interstate compacts or other agreements relating to urban development. Section 701(b) now provides only for the establishment of agencies or for other cooperative interstate efforts relating to comprehensive planning. The proposed amendment would provide also for the establishment of agencies or for other cooperative efforts in carrying out mass transportation or other urban development programs.

SECTION 10

General provisions: Section 10(a) of the bill would apply, to activities carried on under this bill, certain administrative provisions found in section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950. These include the prevailing wage and overtime provisions in section 402(b) of that act, under which prevailing wages, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accord with the Davis-Bacon Act, and time-and-a-half for overtime, would be required to be paid to all laborers and mechanics employed on projects assisted under this bill.

Section 10(b) of the bill would—

1. Define "States" to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States;

2. Define "local public bodies" to include municipalities and other political subdivisions of States; public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and public corporations, boards, and commissions established under the laws of any State; and

3. Define "Administrator" to mean the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Section 10(c) of the bill would set forth a general authorization for appropriations of funds necessary to carry out all functions under the act, with the exception of loans under section 3, which are to be financed through the existing Treasury borrowing authority. Funds appropriated for other than administrative expenses would remain available until expended.

COMMERCIAL SPACE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on March 29, 1962, the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly began hearings on the antitrust and monopoly aspects of the various proposals to establish a commercial space satellite communications system.

Our opening witness was the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] who made one of the most brilliant statements that I have heard in a long time. He explained in clear and concise language the many considerations that should be thoroughly studied before any decision is made to give away hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to a private monopoly.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement 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 OF SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH BEFORE THE SENATE ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPACE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to appear before this distinguished subcommittee this morning as it begins another in its great series of inquiries in behalf of the public interest. I think it entirely appropriate that this Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee should begin to gather evidence on the monopoly implications of the great new potential business of communications by earth satellites. We are at the brink of another great forward step in communications technology; now is the time to determine to what extent we wish Government policies to encourage true American business competition in this new enterprise. Let me stress that this is a new venture, a turning point, as were the Panama Canal, or the Atomic Energy Commission in their inception. We have here no established pattern either of Government ownership or private ownership that should be followed; instead we must rationally determine the best course, and follow it.

ONLY ONE SYSTEM

Technical and economic factors indicate that for the foreseeable future there will be only one satellite communications system for commercial use. For this reason it is

inevitable that there will be a national monopoly in the field of satellite communications. It must be borne in mind that we are not confronted with a choice between Government ownership and private competitive free enterprise. The question which Congress must decide is whether we are to have a satellite system owned and operated by the Government for the benefit of *all the* people or whether we are going to turn this vast potential resource over to a private monopoly to be operated primarily for the financial benefit of a relatively small segment of the population—a favored few.

Let me emphasize here that the question is not one of being for or against the participation of the existing communications companies and equipment manufacturers in this great technological venture. We will need their help, their great technical competence and experience, to obtain the maximum benefits from a communications satellite system. We will welcome their partnership as they freely compete for business, but the question is who will have economic control, who will reap the cream of the returns on the major investments already made and to be made.

GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT

A workable satellite communications system is possible only because of vast expenditures of taxpayers dollars. By the end of fiscal 1963 NASA and the Department of Defense will have spent more than $470 million on satellite communications alone. Estimates of the cost to the taxpayers of our space program to date run as high as $25 billion. Without these billions that have been spent on the space program, our communications technology would be of little value.

John H. Rubel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, has said:

"About 90 percent, I would say, of the problem associated with the communications satellite system really doesn't have much to do with communications, Mr. Chairman. It has to do with launch vehicles, it has to do with spacecraft that you put into orbit, it has to do with controlling those spacecraft when they are up there in orbit, it has to do with the life of electronic and mechanical equipment in space. All of these are technologies and techniques that are being developed by the Department of Defense, partly as part of our communications satellite efforts, but not exclusively so * * * I just can't imagine that this kind of effort could successfully be undertaken by any organization other than both the NASA and the Department of Defense."

There has been some confusion as to the role played by private companies in the financing of research in the field of space communications. So that there can be no mistake on this matter, I would like to refer to a recent statement of Dr. E. C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of NASA. He stated:

"The taxpayers have financed in excess of 90 percent of this space communication competence."

Regardless of any decision which may be made relating to ownership the Government will continue to carry out research and development that is essential to a satellite communications system. James E. Webb, NASA Administrator, recently testified as follows:

"It is contemplated that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will continue to do active research and development on the technology involved in using communications satellites and the tie-in with communications satellite systems.

"The (communications) industry is not capable of doing the research that we do. For instance, these boosters are very expensive, and the only way you really find out if equipment works is to send it on a rocket out and put it up and work it."

U.S. expenditures on our space program for the next 10 years are expected to be in the range of $35 billion, including our project to put a man on the moon. And even the space research involved in our moon shot will be directly related to our understanding of space communications problems.

Clearly the American people as a whole have supplied most of the investment for making satellite communications possible. Advocates of private ownership have expressed views that members of the general public, having made the program possible, should now be allowed to invest additional money in a private corporation in order to share in the profits of a satellite system. The logic of this limited view escapes me. It is my belief that all the American taxpayers who have contributed so much already should receive the benefits of their investment automatically and directly.

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT

The Government will be deeply involved in the operations of this satellite system. Under both plans proposing private ownership the Government still would be required to—

1. Furnish launch vehicles.
2. Launch the satellites and provide launch crew and associated services.
3. Consult with the private corporation regarding technical specifications for satellites and ground stations and in determining the number and location of such facilities.
4. Coordinate continuing governmental research and development with the activities of the private corporation.
5. Insure that the satellite system established is technically compatible with existing facilities with which it will interconnect.
6. Insure that present and future access to the system on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis is made available to all authorized communications carriers.
7. Preserve competition in the field of supplying goods and services to the corporation.
8. Supervise any change in the internal structure of the private corporation.
9. Insure that opportunities are provided for foreign participation in the system.
10. Insure that the corporation provides communication services to areas of the world where such services may be uneconomical, if it is determined that providing such services would be in the national interest.
11. Regulate the ratemaking process.

The plan advocating the more widespread ownership also provides for extensive State Department supervision of foreign negotiations.

With so much essential governmental involvement, why should the system be turned over to a private monopoly?

ONE COMPANY DOMINANCE

If a private corporation is created to own the satellite system, it will be dominated by A.T. & T. Senator KEFAUVER has appropriately described the position of A.T. & T. among the communications carriers as that of an elephant dancing among the chickens. But this is no ordinary elephant we are dealing with. This is a very, very large elephant. It has assets of approximately $25 billion; equal to those of General Motors, Standard Oil of New Jersey, and United States Steel combined. Twenty-five billion dollars, an amount equal to one-twentieth the gross national product of the entire United States or one-twelfth of our total national debt.

I make these comments not out of prejudice against this company, or the individuals who run it; I am sure they endeavor to operate in the public interest so far as their nature as an organization operated for profit will permit. But however benign this near monopoly, we cannot rationally expect them to act other than in the historic economic pattern of monopoly.

Under the plan which limits ownership to communications carriers, dominance by this corporate giant is clearly inevitable. Its size alone would be sufficient to insure dominance, but there are additional factors. First, it will be the major commercial user of the system. Second, the other carriers are dependent on this corporation for oversea and other long-distance cables.

An alternative plan relies on the possibility of broader participation in the ownership in the hope of avoiding this dominance. The hope is illusory. As a technical matter there is nothing in the proposal to insure that there will be widespread private ownership. Dr. Welsh, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, has testified that the communications carriers are expected to put up the biggest part of the necessary investment. Mr. Nicholas Katzenbach, of the Department of Justice, pointed out that there is no assurance that money will be forthcoming in substantial amounts from sources other than the carriers. He stated that if this is the case "the carriers will in fact control the corporation with token investments in class A stock and make the bulk of their investment in class B, or in some other securities which are issuable under section 304(c) of the bill. Under these circumstances the administration proposal would result in substantially the organizational form proposed by the Kerr bill, and supported by the telephone companies."

The problem is still deeper. Assuming as we must that the carriers will put up a substantial portion of the investment needed by any private satellite corporation, widespread distribution of the remaining stock-ownership would merely facilitate control of the corporation by a smaller percent of the ownership interest.

It is highly probable that the single largest investing carrier would be capable of dominating a private satellite corporation even without a single director on the board. This would be possible because of (1) its power to supply and withhold necessary investment funds, (2) its extensive use of the system, and (3) the dependence of other carriers on this giant monopoly.

Thus, the alternative plan does not escape the problem of dominance by a single private monopoly. It is impossible to avoid the problem under any plan where the satellite system is owned by a private corporation.

If the satellite system is to be put on a sound economic basis, it must operate at or near capacity. In statements advocating ownership of a private corporation in proportion to use, Mr. Dingman, executive vice president of A.T. & T. commented on the extent of his company's use as follows:

"We would figure that on a usage basis we would have to put up 75 to 80 percent of the investment of the satellite."

If that corporation were to withhold its use of the system, relying instead on its own facilities, a private satellite corporation would necessarily have to charge rates so high that users of the satellite system would not be able to compete with it. This is entirely possible, for the FCC has no power to require any carrier to use the satellites.

A Government corporation, with the public interest as its primary motivation, would be able to set rates to insure immediate utilization and maximum long range efficiency. Under Government ownership, the satellite system can be operated in a way that will stimulate competition in the communications industry. If the Government owns and operates the system, it can lease the facilities to all communications carriers on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis, thus making for vigorous competition among the communications carriers.

This would accord with our historical attachment to competitive principles and our deep-seated hostility toward monopoly. We should avoid any step that would lead to the establishment of a system of monopoly privilege and the eventual eroding away of

national sovereignty. A very considerable amount of competition is possible here and it is my firm belief that we should make all practical use of competition. That is the real way to have free enterprise.

PROCUREMENT

The satellite system will have to buy enormous amounts of equipment. Most of the communications carriers, who are the major prospective investors in the private corporation, are in the business of manufacturing and supplying such equipment.

Under private ownership, the equipment suppliers who own stock in the other corporation will almost inevitably tend to favor their own interests in supplying the satellite corporation. If ownership is limited to the carriers, as proposed under one plan, there will be little opportunity for competition is supplying equipment to the satellite corporation. Chairman Newton Minow of the FCC has stated that "the danger of such abuses is also inherent in unrestricted ownership."

FCC regulation of a private monopoly is inadequate protection in this area since the FCC is not experienced in insuring competitive bidding.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

It is essential that a truly global communications system be developed and made operational at the earliest possible date. Moreover, we must continue to advance the frontiers of scientific knowledge and make maximum use of new discoveries as soon as they are available. Any private monopoly will have an inherent conflict of interest in the rapid development and expansion of the satellite system. Under the domination of a single large corporation there will be a natural tendency for the private satellite corporation to delay the introduction of technology that would render huge investments in existing equipment obsolete. This is normal behavior for a private monopoly, and the problem exists no matter how widespread the ownership may be.

The fact that we have an efficient communications system in the United States today should not be our only standard for judgment. If we could have had a better system through the encouragement of competition in the field of equipment manufacture and supply or among the communications carriers themselves, we, as a nation, are poorer on two counts for not having it: First, the American people have been denied the advantages of an even better system; second, we have needlessly compromised our traditional belief in competition as the most efficient guiding force in a free economy.

ANTITRUST VIOLATIONS AND EXEMPTIONS

Both the plans proposing private ownership will result in a joint venture of companies that are currently supposed to be competing with each other. Through such a joint venture these companies presumably will be able to avoid competition with respect to their communications and manufacturing activities related to the satellite corporation.

As a matter of fact there appears to be good reason for believing that the only reason legislation is necessary to establish a private corporation to operate the satellite system is to grant an exemption from the antitrust laws to the communications carriers. Testimony before the Senate Space Committee brought out the point that there is apparently nothing in existing law which would prevent a single private corporation from launching its own communications satellite. It would, of course, need a license from the FCC if it wanted to send messages in interstate commerce. There would be no need for special legislation to authorize the granting of an appropriate license.

If Congress is being brought into the picture simply for the purpose of conferring upon the communications carriers the privilege of engaging in anticompetitive behavior under governmental protection, the issue should be clearly presented and discussed in those terms.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS

International cooperation is inherent in satellite communications technology. From the beginning President Kennedy has pointed out the necessity of using the system to its fullest potential, including cooperation with other countries and the provision of services to economically less developed areas. The establishment of the system will require extensive negotiations with nations through the world on a multilateral basis. These negotiations will be very complex and can only be conducted at the intergovernmental level.

It would be folly to delegate to a private monopoly the duty of shaping and directing American foreign policy in this or any other area.

CONCLUSION

Two plans have been submitted to Congress which propose the establishment of a private monopoly. Although the two proposals differ somewhat in detail, they are essentially one and the same in terms of the ultimate consequences. Justice Department officials have admitted that the status of the proposed private corporation under the antitrust laws is unclear. This problem requires study and consideration in order to clarify the issues.

There is one issue, however, which is perfectly clear now. If the communications satellite system is turned over to a private monopoly, it will constitute the biggest giveaway in the history of the United States.

The profits from an investment of billions of taxpayer dollars will be channeled into the pockets of a relatively privileged few. This shocking and unconscionable result can be avoided by retaining ownership of the satellite system by the Government and thereby insuring that the benefits will be available to all the people.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 5, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 270. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic; and

S. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the previous order, until Monday, April 9, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

How Far Can We Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the current hearings of the Ways and Means Committee on legislation intended to authorize more liberal trade agreements have brought forth many compelling arguments and illuminating statements on the importance of free trade upon the economy of the United States. A point that we cannot overlook, and one that has also been emphasized in the hearings, is the danger of going too far and too fast at the risk of jeopardizing the economy of some industrial areas which already have suffered considerably through the competition of imports from nations which have the wage factor decidedly in their favor.

One of the most enlightening statements in this latter category has been made before the Ways and Means Committee by our colleague, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN, who represents the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut. He has made the point, and I think it is an important one, that it appears the full brunt of a liberalized trade program is borne by districts like the one he represents, which is in the highly industrialized Naugatuck Valley where rubber footwear, plumbers' brass goods, clocks, common pins, and bicycles have been produced in large quantities over the years by skilled workers who have come to recognize from experience the employment and economic problems created by reduced tariffs and increased imports.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at this point the statement made by Congressman MONAGAN on April 2, 1962, before the Ways and Means Committee.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE CONCERNING H.R. 9900, APRIL 2, 1962

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear in connection with H.R. 9900.

I applaud the objective of the administration in seeking through this legislation to increase our trade with other nations of the world. Certainly, we want to stimulate that trade and to keep our allied nations economically sound and proof against Communist infiltration.

At the same time, however, we should not liquidate our own industries in order to stimulate imports of foreign products.

It is clear, therefore, that free trade cannot be considered in the abstract, but must be considered in relation to the peculiar conditions of cost and production in the industries affected and the social effects of trade regulation.