

also repeal a portion of section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902, so that future projects would come under the new legislation. We have asked for views of the Justice Department and the other executive agencies on these bills, and have not yet received them. As I said before, this does not represent my idea of a final solution to the problems, but it has been introduced as a starting point for further congressional consideration. However, with the pressure of other work on our committee, I do not see how we are going to be able to do anything further in this session of Congress.

Just to complete the story, let me mention also the bills under consideration by the Senate during the 87th Congress. Only two bills have been introduced. The first, S. 211, was introduced by the Senators from Nebraska, Colorado, and South Dakota, and has the purpose of affirming and recognizing State water laws in the Western States. It follows generally the form of the former Barrett bill. More recently, S. 2636 was introduced by the senior Senator from California. The latter bill, introduced after the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had held hearings on Federal-State water rights problems, would repeal the reservation doctrine, would extend the provisions of section 1(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 to all works constructed in the future by or under the authority of the United States in the Western States, and would provide that any right to the use of water claimed by the United States, under the laws of any State, should be initiated and perfected in accordance with the procedures established by the laws of that State. Also, the bill would provide that no vested rights to the beneficial consumptive use of any waters, as recognized by the laws of the States in which such use is made, could be taken by the United States without just compensation. No action has been taken by the Senate on either of these bills.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

As advocates, many of us have taken a position on one side or the other of this great issue. This is the traditional role of the lawyer. As chairman of one of the subcommittees having jurisdiction in the matter, I can tell you that the position of the western water lawyer has been strongly and most persuasively presented to the Congress. I personally happen to agree with that position. But on the other side, attorneys for the Department of Justice have made a good case. As a Member of Congress I have respect for that position. And let us not forget for a moment that it is backed up by the veto power of the President.

In recent years, eastern lawyers are becoming more concerned with the problem. I am sure that with the background they have, and the interests they represent, they could propose a solution that they felt would solve emerging problems of dual sovereignty over water in the humid States. But would it be a solution that could be agreed to by either lawyers representing western interests or the Justice Department? I doubt it. It would merely present another facet of the

problem, and add to the magnitude of the impasse at which we now find ourselves.

Therefore, as I said at the beginning, we in Congress who know that a solution to these problems must be reached are asking for help. The plea which I make today is for the legal profession to abandon the traditional role of advocate of a position on this great issue, to study it objectively, and to join with the Congress in finding a solution to the Federal-State conflict over water.

Make no mistake about it, a solution must be found, and must be found promptly, if the dual sovereignty of our Federal and State Governments is to be preserved in this and other fields.

### Attorney General Speaks of Efforts To Combat Communist Activity in the United States

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an interview broadcast on the NBC "Monitor" program, Sunday, September 2, 1962, in which the Attorney General spoke of the efforts of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to combat Communist activity in the United States.

A portion of the transcript of that interview follows:

WARD. "Monitor" over the past several weeks has been examining the work of the FBI and its efforts in, among other things, the fight against subversives. Recently, J. Edgar Hoover was described as an ineffective "spy swatter" in this work. How would you characterize the work of Mr. Hoover?

KENNEDY. Well, I think that he has contributed one of the outstanding jobs of public service over the period of the last 30 years, and I think that if it hadn't been for his efforts, his direction, his organizational ability, that the Communist Party and subversion in the United States would be far stronger, far more dangerous, and would have received—the Soviet Union, Communist countries abroad—would have received far more security information than they have. I think that the ineffectiveness of the Communist Party in the United States at the present time is due more to Mr. Hoover and the FBI than to any other individual or group.

WARD. Mr. Kennedy, what is the status of the Communist Party in this country? Is

the Nation's security actually threatened from within or have we been given a scare campaign blown up out of proportion?

KENNEDY. The Communist Party, I don't believe, has any political following in the United States. I think it's been overwhelmingly rejected by the American people. I think that there is a problem, even though the Communist Party is few in numbers, now down to probably less than 10,000 with some others on the fringes who follow its concepts, but it still poses some danger in that as the Supreme Court held 8 to 1 that the Communist Party in the United States is dominated and directed, controlled by the Soviet Union which is, whose aim is, the destruction of the United States, so when they have even a relatively few number of people here in this country which are working for them against the interests of the United States, I think it always poses a security problem for the country.

WARD. Mr. Kennedy, there seems to be a division of political opinion regarding the threat of communism. Some conservative groups on the one hand warning that we must keep our guard up; some liberals on the other hand discounting the threat. Does this division indicate a weakness in our ability to cope with the problems affecting national security?

KENNEDY. I think it is a disservice to discount it, the Communist Party, Communist Party activity, to say it means nothing, because that is untrue. It's also, I think, a disservice to say that there is a Communist under every bush or behind every tree. Or when the State Department or the Government does something with which you disagree to indicate it must be run by a bunch of Communists. The John Birch Society, for instance, said that there are all these Communists. I have written, contacted them to ask them for the names of any that they said existed in Government and never received a reply. The only one that they have identified at all, Mr. Welch has identified, is Dwight Eisenhower, and I think that that is an indication of the disservice of this kind of an operation can bring to the country.

WARD. Since you have occupied the post of Attorney General have you noted a change in Communist activity in this country? Has there been any change in goals or method of operation?

KENNEDY. No. I think that they have, the Communist Party U.S.A. has continued. There has been more effort over the period of the last 12 months to—more effort in the field of universities and colleges, but in my judgment, with not much success.

They also attempted to penetrate into some of these internal disorders that we have, as far as racial questions are concerned, but I think that this is a continuation of their goals that have existed over a period of some years. Communist operations of the representatives of Communist countries abroad who were stationed here in the United States, their activities are steadily increasing, and this is focused mostly on espionage and in attempting to learn security secrets of the United States.

WARD. Thank you, sir.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1962

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. PAT McNAMARA, a Senator from the State of Michigan.

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

Our Father, God, in whose love and wisdom lie all our hopes, we thank Thee

for life's loveliness that cannot be shattered or blighted by all the venomous hate and envy which so sorely set Thy human family into contending camps.

Even as today's discords bombard our ears, we are grateful for friendships which withstand all tests, for music which gives wings to our drooping spirits, for truth which breaks the shackles of error, and for human beacons of righteousness where Thou dost show sufficient of Thy light for us in the dark to rise by.

As we bow now at this shrine of Thy grace, we know in very truth that we cannot live by bread alone, and that our spirits must have an escape into the higher realm measured not by clocks or calendars. Make real to us the kingdom whose radiant verities are its faith, its ideals, its visions which shine on the far horizons, and its aspirations which lay hold of God and goodness without alloy.

We lift our prayer in the name of the Perfect One who is our light. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1962.  
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. PAT McNAMARA, a Senator from the State of Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. McNAMARA 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, September 12, 1962, was dispensed with.

### 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 a bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

### 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. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

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

The Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works.

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.

### REPORT ON REVIEW OF DETERMINATION OF QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF COPPER NEEDED IN THE STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the review of determination of quantity and quality of copper needed in the strategic and critical materials stockpile, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (succeeded by Office of Emergency Planning), Executive Office of the President, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 382. Resolution to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Housing for the Elderly" (Rept. No. 2032).

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. CARROLL), from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 9280. An act to amend section 2 of the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2035);

H.R. 9593. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain phosphate rights to the Dr. P. Phillips Foundation, of Orlando, Fla. (Rept. No. 2036); and

H.R. 10540. An act to exclude deposits of petrified wood from appropriation under the U.S. mining laws (Rept. No. 2037).

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. CARROLL), from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2702. A bill for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc. (Rept. No. 2033).

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. CARROLL), from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to determine the susceptibility of minerals to electrometallurgical processes, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2034).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 7796. An act to amend certain lending limitations on real estate and construction loans applicable to national banks (Rept. No. 2038);

H.R. 12577. An act to place authority over the trust powers of national banks in the Comptroller of the Currency (Rept. No. 2039); and

H.R. 12899. An act to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes relating to bank branches which may be retained upon conversion or consolidation or merger (Rept. No. 2040).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 12628. An act to provide additional funds under section 202(a)(4) of the Housing Act of 1959, and to amend title V of the

Housing Act of 1949, in order to provide low- and moderate-cost housing, both urban and rural, for the elderly (Rept. No. 2049).

### INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN & HELPERS OF AMERICA PENSION FUND—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2044)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 8205) to provide tax relief to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America Local 863 pension fund and the contributors thereto, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views and those of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

### MODIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY TAX IN THE CASE OF CONSUMER FINANCE COMPANIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2047)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 8824) to modify the application of the personal holding company tax in the case of consumer finance companies, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views and those of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

### BRICKLAYERS LOCAL 45 PENSION FUND—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2046)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 11059) relating to the effective date of the qualification of Bricklayers Local 45, Buffalo, N.Y., pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views, and the supplemental views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested



by the Senator from Virginia, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

**TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CORKBOARD INSULATION AND ON CORK STOPPERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2043)**

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 12213) to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views, and the supplemental views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

**AMENDMENT OF SECTION 172 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO PROVIDE A 7-YEAR NET OPERATING LOSS CARRYOVER FOR CERTAIN REGULATED TRANSPORTATION CORPORATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2041)**

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 12526) to amend section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 7-year net operating loss carryover for certain regulated transportation corporations, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views and those of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

**FREE ENTRY OF SPECTROMETERS FOR USE OF UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2045)**

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 12529) to provide for the free entry of one nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometer and one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Illinois, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views and those of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

**VALIDATION OF COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES IN ARKANSAS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2048)**

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 12820) to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views, and the supplemental views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

**AMENDMENT OF TITLE 38, U.S. CODE, TO REVISE THE EFFECTIVE DATE PROVISIONS RELATING TO AWARDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2042)**

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H.R. 7600) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the effective date provisions relating to awards, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views and those of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

**BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED**

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

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 3719. A bill to amend the act providing books for the adult blind so as to make books also available to armless readers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3720. A bill for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOTTUM:

S. 3721. A bill to establish a program for the Government purchase and resale of domestically produced, newly mined processed mica and mica ore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3722. A bill for the relief of Ja Han Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOTTUM:

S. 3723. A bill to provide for the emergency transportation of certain products by rail or motor vehicle common carriers for

periods during which the ordinary operations of such carriers are interrupted because of a labor dispute; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3724. A bill for the relief of Margaret M. Romain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S.J. Res. 226. Joint resolution reaffirming the principles of the Monroe Doctrine and authorizing and directing the President of the United States to take such action as is necessary to prevent any violation thereof; to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S.J. Res. 227. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to employ the Armed Forces of the United States in order to protect the peace and security of the United States and the free world; to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

**RESOLUTIONS**

**SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT IN CUBAN SITUATION**

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 388) to support the President in the Cuban situation, which was referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

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

**EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CUBA**

Mr. JAVITS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 389) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding Cuba, which was referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

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

**EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CUBA**

Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 390); which was referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly, as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Senate that the domination and control of the Republic of Cuba by the international Communist movement jeopardizes the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere and violates the basic right of the Cuban people to independence and self-determination.

(b) It is further declared to be the sense of the Senate that the United States, under the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, has the right and obligation to take all necessary actions, in cooperation with other Western Hemisphere nations if possible, and unilaterally if necessary, to end such domination and control and to restore the Republic of Cuba to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

# THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. INDEPENDENCE AND A WORLD'S FAIR IN CHICAGO

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 391), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas in 1976 the United States will commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of its independence; and

Whereas it would be appropriate to commemorate this great event by holding a World's Fair where by proper ceremony the history of the Nation from 1776 to 1976 might be suitably depicted; and

Whereas there has been constituted in the State of Illinois a "Committee of 76" consisting of public-spirited citizens who are presently engaged in planning such a World's Fair; and

Whereas the aforesaid "Committee of 76" has selected the city of Chicago, located near the geographic heart of the United States as the proper place to observe this epochal and historic event; and

Whereas the city of Chicago, the county of Cook and the State of Illinois have all gone on record as encouraging this "Committee of 76" to make bold and imaginative plans for such a World's Fair in the city of Chicago: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the United States Senate that it looks with favor on this proposal and hereby gives encouragement to the "Committee of 76" in its efforts to plan and bring about this two hundredth anniversary commemorative ceremony in the city of Chicago.

## EMERGENCY RELIEF TO FARMERS OF MIDWEST

Mr. BOTTUM. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which I have prepared and which I hope may in some manner grant some emergency relief to the farmers and other citizens of the State of South Dakota and of all the great middle section States of the United States which are affected by the strike on the North Western Railway.

I invite the attention of Members of this body to the fact that this strike, which has prevailed for so long, is now affecting the entire economy of the area.

The entire sugarbeet industry of South Dakota and of Nebraska is now confronted with a situation in which beets are piling up, ready to move to the factories, with no available transportation. Unless the beets are moved within a short time, we stand to lose the entire sugarbeet crop of the States of South Dakota and Nebraska.

In addition to this very serious situation in our beet industry, there are many products of agriculture in the State of South Dakota ready for market, unable to move.

In the Rapid City area there is a great missile program going on at the moment, as a part of our national defense, to which we are unable to move sand, gravel, steel, and all other necessary things which go to make up the component parts of that great defense project.

Construction has ceased on our Interstate Highway System. Unless something is done to provide relief from the strike to those who are faced with the emergency, it will be a sorry day, not only for the farmers and those people

in South Dakota about whom I have spoken, but for the members of the railroad union who will see the destruction and bankruptcy of industry and farming in our State.

Therefore, with that problem in mind, I introduce a bill which would take care of the emergency hauling need during the strike. I ask Senators not to misunderstand me. I am in no way trying to take away from a union its right to strike, but merely to provide a means by which an emergency in connection with hauling can be taken care of in the case of a long and prolonged strike.

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

The bill (S. 2723) to provide for the emergency transportation of certain products by rail or motor vehicle common carriers for period during which the ordinary operations of such carriers are interrupted because of a labor dispute, introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BOTTUM], was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Dakota for the action he has taken in connection with an emergency which not only exists in the northern tier of counties in Nebraska which has a large sugarbeet industry served by the Chicago & North Western Railway, but is developing in Iowa and surrounding areas where many sugarbeets are grown and shipped to the sugar refinery in Belle Fourche, S. Dak. The Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. has the facility there for the refining of sugar from sugarbeets grown in the neighboring area. Incidentally, sugarbeets are grown in the State of the Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Ever since the strike began, the Senator from Nebraska has been receiving letters, telegrams, and telephone calls from businessmen, grain dealers and grain farmers, as well as sugarbeet growers, which report the drastic impact on the economy of the region which the strike has had. In addition, only this morning I had a phone call from a representative of the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co., in which he said that last Sunday night a frost hit that general area, virtually destroying the corn crop for any use except that of silage. Of course, such use would reduce the value of that crop. The bean crop has been virtually destroyed by reason of the frost. Fortunately, the sugarbeet crop has not been affected. But the sugarbeet crop is about the last resource that the farmers have to avoid a great financial disaster, and in many instances outright bankruptcy. So this is an emergency situation. In view of the gravity of the situation, more progress than witnessed so far has to be made. This morning, Mr. President, I sent a letter to the President of the United States urging him to use the full prestige and authority of his office in an effort to achieve resumption of rail service. I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

SEPTEMBER 13, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The plight of agriculture and business in Nebraska adversely affected by the strike involving the Chicago & North Western Railway has reached an alarming critical point.

You are again urgently requested to exercise the full prestige and authority of your office in efforts to allow resumption of service. Unless the strike ends soon, grievous financial loss, and in some cases outright bankruptcy will result.

It is manifestly unfair to the farmers, businessmen, and citizens of the affected communities to be subjected to such losses through no fault of their own. It would seem that in view of the gravity of the situation more progress can be made.

Attached are telegrams and letters received in the past few days indicating the extent of the damage being done by continuance of the strike.

Respectfully yours,

ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
U.S. Senator From Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Dakota for the step that he has taken today to induce some action that will afford relief in a very urgent situation.

Mr. BOTTUM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I also commend the junior Senator from South Dakota on his diligence and forethought in coming forth with a legislative proposal which would deal with an emergency situation involving national defense and the shipping of perishable farm products, and which would provide for a continuation of transportation service during such an emergency, and then permit the normal processes of collective bargaining and negotiation to continue.

Only yesterday I received a call from a group of Nebraska farmers. They discussed the problems mentioned by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. They told me that public indignation meetings in that area are being held and farmers are signing up for a trip to Washington. They intend to camp on the White House lawn, and to remain there until the President takes some action. I sought to deter such action. I said, "Give us another 24 hours. Perhaps some settlement can be reached." We can sense the desperate economic situation they confront when they want to come to the White House, camp on the lawn, and remain there picketing the White House until some action is taken.

The measure suggested by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BOTTUM] would move in the direction of getting relief. We have all been in contact with the Department of Labor and the White House trying to impress upon them the urgency and the significance of the situation. At noon today, while visiting and having lunch with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I listened to his description of the same kind of serious conditions that are affecting his State, which is also served in part by the Chicago & North Western Rail-



way. I hope that the appropriate committee of the Senate will give immediate attention to the proposed emergency legislation introduced by my colleague in the event that neither the White House nor the Department of Labor acts within the next 24 hours to bring the strike to a halt.

Mr. BOTTUM. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I, too, commend the junior Senator from South Dakota for his remarks. I think all of us in this body agree that the laboring man's right to strike is his only strong legitimate weapon. I do not think there is a Member of this body who would vote to take that right away.

But, Mr. President, there will come a time—and I think it will come soon—when the continued abuse of the right to strike by irresponsible labor leaders will react strongly against the labor movement. I should not like to see that day come. But we in the Senate and in the House of Representatives cannot continue to let go by an abuse by irresponsible labor leaders that is depriving whole sections of our country of their livelihood, and is denying to this country the defense that we are trying to build.

I suggest that if any Senators went to one of our missile sites and did damage that took 6 months to repair, we could be tried under the Espionage Act and possibly punished by death.

I think there is just as much irresponsibility on the part of irresponsible labor leaders who deny the necessary materials for the construction of our missile sites as one who publicly engages in sabotage.

I think also that the irresponsibility involved in not permitting farmers to sell their products in the market is inexcusable. I am glad that the Senator has introduced the proposed legislation and I hope that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which we are both members, will give it an early hearing.

Mr. BOTTUM. I thank the Senator.

#### CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF HOUSE BILL 7283

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed order, which I ask to have read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed order will be read. The order was read, as follows:

*Ordered*, That in the engrossment of the amendments of the Senate to H.R. 7283, providing for payments of certain World War II losses to American nationals, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized and directed to make certain transpositions in the order of arrangement of the Senate amendments, and to correct accordingly the paragraph and section numbers and titles thereof.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And, Mr. President, with the addition that the bill as corrected be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed order? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CHANGE OF CONFeree

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] may be excused as a conferee on the bill (H.R. 4670) to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia, and that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] may be appointed in his stead.

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

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON PROBLEMS IN THE FIELD OF FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations will hold an executive meeting on subcommittee business on Tuesday, September 18, at 10 o'clock a.m. At 10:30 o'clock a.m. an open hearing on problems in the field of Federal-State-local relations will be held in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 13, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1130) to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for family clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers, and for other purposes.

#### THE COMMON MARKET ISSUE AND THE TRADE BILL

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Macmillan government's dilemma in seeking to resolve the Common Market issue portends our own future in this regard.

Recent radio dispatches from the British Commonwealth conference currently underway in London have indicated that Prime Minister Macmillan is dismayed by the fierce opposition to Britain's accession to the Common Market expressed by other Commonwealth nations. And these dispatches appear to be putting the best possible face on the situation. What has, in fact, happened is that Mr. Macmillan has encountered a veritable buzz saw of opposition—a buzz saw that threatens the continuance of his conservative government. For example, the Associated Press reported on September 12:

A major crisis loomed today for Prime Minister Macmillan's conservative government after a concerted Commonwealth revolt against Macmillan's plan to join the European Common Market.

Statesmen of at least five countries lined up to back the massive assault loosed yesterday by eight of their fellow leaders against the prospective terms of Britain's linkup with the six-nation continental bloc.

In the face of the demonstrations of overwhelming anxiety Macmillan ran the risk of imperiling his government if he presses on with his plan.

The climate of disaster clearly indicated by this report was made even more

palpable by a Reuters dispatch, of the same day, reporting:

The general secretaries of 32 British trade unions, with a total membership of over 2 million, issued a surprise demand today for a British general election on the Common Market issue.

With the latest poll of the London Daily Mail on this particular issue reporting that British public opposition to Macmillan's plan stands at 52.2 percent, the prospect of a general election must be somewhat disquieting, at the very least, to the Prime Minister.

While Mr. Macmillan's plight is perhaps the most dramatic political development of the contretemps, other conference participants have their own political problems which, at least in part, account for the severity of the rift sundering the Commonwealth leaders. Robert Menzies, Australia's Prime Minister, is under understandable pressure to depart the bargaining table with a deal favorable to his country, inasmuch as in the last election his government was returned to office by a majority of only one seat.

And Canada's John G. Diefenbaker is in even shakier shape. His Government has no majority at all, because since the last election the balance of power has reposed in the hands of the maverick Social Credit Party.

While adverse reaction from the Commonwealth nations was, of course, expected, nobody, apparently not even Mr. Macmillan, was prepared for the violent storm of protest which now has broken over the conference table. For example, Keith Holyoake, of New Zealand, accused Macmillan's plan of "vagueness and generalization," and added the somewhat personal comment:

The promise of long-term benefit is unlikely to be given its proper value by a man faced with the certainty of short-term disaster.

Pakistan's Ayub Khan, perhaps the most vigorous and outspoken leader of all those representing the Commonwealth's new nations, and who made such a strong impression on the Congress when he addressed us in joint session, characterized the present proposals as "inadequate." He further asserted:

The Western World must decide whether it will make a viable place for developing countries or whether it intends to turn itself into a powerful international cartel, denying access to our manufacturers to their markets and forcing us to remain primary producers to feed their factories, dictating terms of trade and compelling us to pay several times more for their finished goods. If this were to happen it would amount to reestablishing imperialism of the worst kind, the consequences of which would be nothing short of disastrous.

Equally hard-hitting comments were made by others. Only Ceylon, Malaya, and little Jamaica did not join the all-out attack.

What, we may ask, do these storm signals mean to the United States? Why should we concern ourselves with an essentially intramural squabble among the participants in the British Commonwealth? In my opinion, Mr. President,

these developments convey a very important message to this country, and especially to us here in the Senate.

What is in the wind from Whitehall, obviously, is an eventual shift in the traditional trading patterns of the world. In what direction the shift will be made, and to what degree, no one can yet say; but that it will occur is manifest.

Yet we in Congress—facing a world in flux, knowing full well that major and unpredictable realignments in world trade are in the offing—have been asked to legislate in haste an unprecedentedly drastic program for the conduct of America's foreign trade. In all probability we shall be asked to approve a bill, H.R. 11970, which may sacrifice domestic industry on the altar of international amity—which indeed details the ritual for that sacrifice—when we have not the slightest notion what trading patterns the United States will face during the 5-year period of the legislation.

I suggest, Mr. President, that to acquiesce in these demands for the most sweeping, far-ranging foreign trade bill in history under these circumstances would be nothing short of irresponsible. It would be sheer folly for us to proceed at full speed through the murk now engulfing world trade. When the fog lifts and the icebergs are in clear view—then, Mr. President, and only then, can we move ahead confident that we are not courting disaster.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

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

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Paul J. Maguire, of New York, to be assayer of the U.S. assay office at New York, N.Y.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nomination of Vice Adm. Harold T. Deutermann, U.S. Navy, for appointment as a U.S. representative of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations as a senior member, the appointment of three rear admirals to the grade of vice admiral while serving in special assignments, and three vice admirals to be placed on the retired list of the Navy. I ask that these names be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed

on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The nominations are as follows:

Vice Adm. Harold T. Deutermann, U.S. Navy, for appointment as a U.S. representative of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, as a senior member;

Rear Adm. Paul D. Stroop, Rear Adm. Horacio Rivero, Jr., and Rear Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, U.S. Navy, for commands and duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admirals while so serving; and

Vice Adm. Charles Wellborn, Jr., Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie, and Vice Adm. Clarence E. Ekstrom, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also report favorably 136 officers for promotions and appointments in the Regular Army in the grades of major and below, and 533 officers for appointments and promotions in the Navy and Marine Corps in grades of captain and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The nominations are as follows:

Irma L. Jaakkola, Robert G. Ferrari, and Barrett S. Haight, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

John D. Proe (Infantry), and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army;

Charles M. Katsuyoshi, and sundry other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Larry R. Croll, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the U.S. Navy; and

Carl P. Ackerman, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Marine Corps.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

#### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Corwin S. Snyder, of North Dakota, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 34.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12711) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions,

corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. THOMAS, Mr. YATES, Mr. CANNON, Mr. OSTERTAG, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### 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:

H.R. 2125. An act for the relief of Soon Tai Lim;

H.R. 3125. An act for the relief of Joao de Freitas Ferreira de Vasconcelos;

H.R. 3619. An act for the relief of Gennaro Prudente;

H.R. 3719. An act for the relief of Pagona Pascopoulos;

H.R. 6653. An act for the relief of Maurizio Placidi;

H.R. 7582. An act for the relief of Dario Taquichel; and

H.R. 11914. An act for the relief of Charles Gambino.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

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 may be rescinded.

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

#### AUTHORITY TO CALL RESERVISTS TO ACTIVE SERVICE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I note with great regret and with some resentment that it is alleged that the action on the part of myself, and perhaps other Senators, in submitting resolutions of amendment to the Reserve callup joint resolution, which the Senate will consider today, indicates that in taking a position in favor of recognition of the Monroe Doctrine we are doing so on a political basis. I am particularly struck by the language in the Washington Post & Times Herald this morning:

The idea is to sidetrack what the Democrats contend are politically inspired Republican efforts to put Mr. Kennedy on the spot over Cuba.

I emphatically disavow that the amendment which I submitted yesterday was submitted for that purpose. In support of my disavowal I remind the Senate, as I have repeatedly over a period of 2 years, that on January 7, 1960, I submitted a similar resolution designed to accomplish almost exactly the same purpose. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution I then submitted



be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submitted that resolution at that time on behalf of myself and Mr. SPARKMAN. Who is Mr. SPARKMAN? He is the next to the senior member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, a member of the Democratic Party. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was sympathetic with that resolution at that time, or he would not have put his name on it. I have reason to believe that he is still sympathetic with the purpose of that resolution, and I have good reason to believe he would not accuse me of offering the amendment on the basis of partisan political considerations.

I said in my remarks yesterday that I thought the passing of the resolution by the two Houses of Congress would fortify the position of the President of the United States. I still believe that is the case. I wish to express my resentment to members of the Democratic Party who have accused me surreptitiously of being partisanly political in connection with this issue.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BUSH. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 more minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator's time is extended 2 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. I do not believe this is an issue in which partisan politics has any play at all. I also believe that an expression of the will of the Congress of the United States, an expression of its determination in the interests of the safety of this country, would fortify the President in the coming months when we shall not be in this city, when Congress will not be in session, until the Congress reassembles in January.

That was my sole purpose in preparing the amendment which I shall offer when the callup joint resolution is before the Senate today.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to an article published in today's New York Times, written by Arthur Krock, in which he makes this point:

The phrase in constant public use by officials here against critics of these policies is, "Do you want a full-scale, nuclear world war?"—the import being that this single alternative is not a matter of judgment but a fact established beyond any shred of doubt. But the Cuban situation has spawned another, and very privately uttered phrase aimed at those who contend that Soviet Russia has clearly challenged the Monroe Doctrine there. This expression is, "The Monroe Doctrine is dead." To make this statement in public would raise a tornado of public protest, would echo a similar appraisal by Premier Khrushchev and controvert President Kennedy's recent reaffirmation of the doctrine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Krock may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. (See exhibit 2.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the position which I take, and which I think most Senators take, is that the Monroe Doctrine is not dead, that the time has come when we should reaffirm it in modern dress. We should relate it to our obligations under the United Nations and to our obligations under the Organization of American States.

I am glad to have an opportunity today to express my indignation against those who assert that because a Senator is in favor of fortifying the President in this critical hour in any decision he may make in respect to our problems in Cuba, he is engaging in partisan politics.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. BUSH. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 more minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator may be granted 2 minutes.

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I earnestly hope that if the callup joint resolution is passed, and if my amendment to it is approved, that neither will have any effect but that effect intended by the President himself; namely, to warn the world and to warn Soviet Russia in particular that we mean business, that the Monroe Doctrine is not dead, that we intend to defend our rights in this hemisphere, and that we intend to take whatever steps may seem appropriate at any time to turn back an invasion of international communism into the Western Hemisphere.

I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

S. CON. RES. 79

(In the Senate of the United States, 86th Congress, 2d session, January 7, 1960, Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations)

Whereas intervention by the world Communist movement directly or indirectly in the affairs of any of the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere would threaten the sovereignty and political independence of that nation and other such nations; and

Whereas the free and independent nations of the Western Hemisphere have long since ceased to be objects for domination, control or colonization by other powers; and

Whereas the direct or indirect intervention by the world Communist movement, by whatever means such intervention might be disguised, in any American nation, would constitute in effect such domination, control or colonization by a non-American power, and would violate the sovereignty and political independence of an American nation; and

Whereas any such intervention by the world Communist movement in the affairs of any nation situated in the Western Hemisphere would constitute a threat to the peace and safety of the United States and the other nations of that hemisphere;

Whereas in the rapidly evolving atomic age the threat presented by any such inter-

vention might develop with such rapidity that there would not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide for joint action to repel the danger: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) if one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance should be threatened in any manner with domination, control or colonization through the intervention of the world Communist movement, any other such party would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking appropriate steps to forestall such intervention and any domination, control or colonization of any nation of the Western Hemisphere by the world Communist movement.*

(b) If any such defensive measures are taken by any defending nation of the Western Hemisphere, such nation should report promptly the action so taken to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, established in the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, may be organized to provide for the provisional administration of the nation so defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

#### EXHIBIT 2

CARACAS RESOLUTION OF 1954 AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—For some time now, beginning with the indispensable U.S. support of the U.N. military offensive against Katanga as required to preserve international peace, a certain phrase has been reiterated by officials of the Kennedy administration with an air of confidence that the words justify every foreign policy which has been under strong critical fire. In addition to the U.S.-U.N. Congo policy of waging peace with the implements of war, these critical targets include two others in particular. They are the failure of the administration to lay before the U.N. Assembly India's violation of the charter by seizure of Goa; and the administration's role in Indonesia's blackmailing operation in Netherlands West New Guinea.

The phrase in constant public use by officials here against critics of these policies is, "Do you want a full-scale, nuclear world war?"—the import being that this single alternative is not a matter of judgment but a fact established beyond any shred of doubt. But the Cuban situation has spawned another, and very privately uttered, phrase aimed at those who contend that Soviet Russia has clearly challenged the Monroe Doctrine there. This expression is, "The Monroe Doctrine is dead." To make this statement in public would raise a tornado of public protest, would echo a similar appraisal by Premier Khrushchev and controvert President Kennedy's recent reaffirmation of the doctrine. So it is not surprising that the few who say that, and support it with the following arguments, specify they are talking strictly off the record:

1. When the 10th Inter-American Conference of 21 nations met in March 1954, at Caracas, it adopted a resolution urged by Secretary of State Dulles. The principal declaration was that control of the political institutions of any American state by international communism, or any extension of that system to this hemisphere, would constitute a threat to the Pan American continents, and would be met by immediate consultation and action under existing treaties.

#### DELEGATING POWER TO OAS

2. The actual and practical effect of this resolution—approved 17 to 1 (Guatemala

alone voting "No," Mexico and Argentina abstaining) was to turn over enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine to the Organization of American States as a multilateral proposition. Thereby the United States delegated to the OAS its historic position that it could and would enforce the doctrine unilaterally as before, when in its judgment the extension of a foreign power system to this hemisphere became a matter of fact.

3. Hence, unless and until such an extension was evaluated by the United States as a solid threat to its security, this Nation would abdicate enforcement of the doctrine, and the details of enforcement, to the judgment of the OAS.

4. Consequently, the historic Monroe Doctrine "died" at Caracas in 1954, and the only basis for forceful U.S. measures toward Cuba is an evaluation by the President that the threat posed there endangers national security.

A supplemental argument advanced for this thesis is that unilateral invocation of the doctrine by the United States would be repudiated by world opinion because of the ring of our military bases and armed forces around the U.S.S.R.

In the very private sessions in which these views have been asserted, they have thus been rebutted:

1. The right of the United States to enforce the Monroe Doctrine unilaterally, if necessary, was not abandoned at Caracas either by implication or by anything said or encouraged as an inference by our representatives there. Secretary Dulles' comment was merely that the resolution adopted "relates to the extension to this hemisphere of the political system of despotic European powers" and made "as international policy" of the Americas "a portion of the Monroe Doctrine which has largely been forgotten." This gives no foundation to the analysis that, when the OAS declines to implement this policy, the United States has committed itself to do the same.

2. Unlike the infiltration and subversion of Soviet Russia in Cuba, the purpose of this Nation's bases and troops around the periphery of Russia is to prevent the spread of these activities of international communism, not to expand the American governing system.

Any high officials or Members of Congress who may dispute this rebuttal are not likely to do so publicly.

#### PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCGEE

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I regret to say that a previously made commitment out in the West will make it impossible for me to be present later today for the vote on President Kennedy's request for standby authority to call up 150,000 reservists. However, I should like to add my support to the bipartisan effort to give the President the power to act if an emergency should arise when the Congress is not in session. "Forewarned is forearmed" is an old proverb that has real application to the current tense situation. Certainly the action of the Soviets in providing military assistance to Fidel Castro's tottering Communist government represents a threat to hemispheric stability and increases the chances of an incident that could lead to open hostilities. Although I hope that such an occurrence does not take place, I think it would be folly not to be prepared for it.

But I think this action is more important for what it says to those who would expand the rule of tyranny in the world.

It says to them that the United States of America will not stand by and see the spread of totalitarianism. It says that we will come to the defense of freedom, and that any would-be aggressor had better watch his step. But the fact that the President has asked only for the authority to call up these troops tells our friends in this hemisphere that, while we will defend democracy in this half of the world, we will not launch out on any face-saving aggression that could plunge the world into war and could end for many, many years any hope for the advancement of mankind. This request says that, while we will not let the irritation of this galling action goad us into hasty and unwise action, neither will we—by inaction or unreadiness—deliver the birthright of freedom of the peoples of this hemisphere into the hands of despotic Communist rule.

#### MARITIME GAP BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND U.S.S.R. POINTS TO SOVIET DRIVE FOR SUPERIORITY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, every Member of the Congress received a reprint of an astounding article entitled "Will Russia Bury Us at Sea?" from *Marine Engineering/Log*, a leading maritime trade journal. In truth, Russia's steadily increasing numbers of naval and merchant vessels constitute a real threat to our ability to control the seaways of trade and commerce. I suspect this situation prompted Maritime Administrator Donald W. Alexander to say in California the other day:

If [present maritime] trends continue \* \* \* sometime between 1965 and 1970, the Soviet Union will surpass us.

While several of my colleagues have already referred to this threatening situation, I believe the letter which accompanied the *Marine Engineering/Log* article also carries an important message. Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that this letter, together with my reply, be included in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA,  
August 6, 1962.

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: Knowing your keen interest in matters affecting national security as well as the Nation's trade and commerce I am taking the liberty of sending you the attached reprint of an article entitled "Will Russia Bury Us at Sea?" from the June 15, 1962, issue of *Marine Engineering/Log*, an authoritative technical journal serving the maritime industry.

We particularly call your attention to the dramatic charts on pages 7 and 8. You will note that the 1960 Russian merchant fleet will double in size by 1965, triple by 1970, and is expected to attain a 5 to 6 times increase by 1980. All of this, of course, involves increasing budgetary commitments on the part of the Kremlin, and of course these goals are being accomplished with a 100-percent subsidy.

This accelerated fleet expansion program of the U.S.S.R. is in startling contrast with the steady contraction of the U.S. merchant fleet. The chart on page 8 substantiates the high

priority Russia has assigned to merchant fleet shipbuilding. At the start of 1962, Russia had 226 ships building or on order while the United States had only 65. This is surely a maritime gap of alarming proportions.

Equally alarming is the author's view, based on many months of exhaustive research and documentation, that the Russian fleet expansion is a prelude to either an economic or military showdown—a showdown we could lose by default, a showdown we could ill afford to lose. Yet, while our avowed enemy is engaged in a massive maritime buildup, we are truly engaged in a massive maritime breakdown.

Sincerely,

EDWIN M. HOOD,  
President.

U.S. SENATE,  
August 14, 1962.

Mr. EDWIN M. HOOD,  
President, Shipbuilders Council of America,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOOD: I want to thank you for calling my attention to the article in *Marine Engineering/Log* magazine which vividly compares Russia's increasing maritime strength with our own maritime atrophy. This is indeed a serious situation, and I am appalled to note that this analysis is largely based on statistics and information which is in the hands of the very people in our Government who have primary responsibility for the adequacy of our maritime capability.

Against the background of the gyrations and gobbledygook of the administration late last year when a reduction of funds for merchant ship construction was threatened, this maritime gap, as you put it in your letter of August 6, is even more disquieting. The subsequent testimony of official spokesmen before the Committee on Commerce, while I was in the chair, to the effect that the Budget Bureau wanted a slowdown or stretchout in the merchant vessel replacement program, substantiates the continuing fears of many of my colleagues here in the Senate that our merchant marine is indeed being neglected by purposeful design. In all fairness, however, this neglect is non-partisan or, if you will, bipartisan, for the previous administration was no better than the present administration on this score.

While the Russians have 226 ships under construction or on order—some in European shipyards which were reconstructed with the dollars of U.S. taxpayers after World War II—we have only 65. The Russians are not building these ships for sport; they are a part of a purposeful design for world domination, economically as well as politically. But nit-picking policymakers and pennypinching (only from a maritime standpoint) budget makers in this country, with their heads in the clouds and their feet planted firmly in midair, seem unable or unwilling to recognize this fact. Perhaps Russia's massive maritime buildup will stir them to action. I hope so.

With warm personal regards, I am,  
Sincerely,

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,  
U.S. Senator.

#### NEEDED: U.N. NEUTRALIST COMMISSION TO CREATE DISARMAMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these critical times, the world hungers for an easing of tensions, for safeguards against nuclear war, for an opportunity to channel more resources, technological know-how and manpower and brainpower to serve and not threaten to destroy people, many of whom barely exist on the jagged edge of poverty, indignity, hopelessness—and for peace.



Over the years, the United States and its allies have tried relentlessly to: (a) bring about realistic disarmament; (b) establish machinery for peaceful settlement of differences among nations; and (c) create peace in the world.

Deep in the heart of humanity, there is a yearning, a great need, of these safeguards for the future.

Realistically, we must face the fact, however, that unless there is a change of Red policy, of which there is no real evidence, the Communists will not agree to safeguarded disarmament.

Recently recessed, the 17-nation Geneva Disarmament Conference stands as one more futile effort to reach agreements on arms reduction and control with the Communist world. As of now, there have been over 100 meetings ending regrettably in no real progress.

Now what can be done? About a year ago I recommended that there be established a neutralist U.N. group to "hammer out" a disarmament plan.

The goal would be to create universally recognized standards for disarmament, which, by any realistic criteria, must include inspection as a safeguard. The plan, then, would be presented to the United Nations as a whole; and to each nation, individually, for a "yes" or "no" vote.

This would, I believe, present a clearer picture of whom—namely, the Communist nations—continue to roadblock progress toward disarmament.

As of now, the disarmament debate is scheduled to go back to the General Assembly, scheduled to open on September 18. Consideration there, in my judgment, will result in little more positive progress than was made at the 17-nation Conference in Geneva.

The creation of a special neutralist subcommittee to hammer out fundamental criteria for disarmament holds, I believe, one of the few hopes for progress.

Until a realistic system has been developed, we will need to continue, first, to maintain a strong deterrent power against massive attack; second, develop more effective forces to cope with brush-fire wars; third, design techniques for stopping the infiltrative actions of the Reds in southeast Asia, Latin America, Africa, and elsewhere in the world; and fourth, gird ourselves for a long, difficult struggle—for the battle against the great and growing Red threat to freedom will not be easily won.

I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from the New York Times printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### ANOTHER DISARMAMENT FAILURE

Against a background of mounting world crisis, the Geneva Disarmament Conference that was to make a supreme effort to create a disarmed and peaceful world has abandoned the attempt for the present and has recessed for 2 months. It could do nothing else when Soviet Russia is adamant against all workable formulas for banning nuclear tests, and raises tensions in Berlin and Cuba, thus forcing the free world to look to its defenses in such ways as President Kennedy's request for standby authority to call up 150,000 reservists.

The disarmament debate, which in the atomic age involves the question of life or death for all mankind, now goes back to the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York next week. But the prospects for progress will remain dim until the United Nations, representing world opinion, puts its own principles and resolutions above expediency and calls for two things. One is peace settlements in conformity with the U.N. Charter providing freedom and self-determination for all peoples—not only in Western colonies but also in the Soviet colonies. The other is compliance with its own disarmament resolutions demanding progressive and balanced arms reduction under effective international control.

The Soviet Government has flouted both the charter and the disarmament resolutions. While the Western colonial empires are disappearing, the Soviet colonial empire expands. The West has reduced its insistence on international control to the minimum. It even offers to dispense with it entirely for nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. Yet the Russians continue to reject all international control. The issues are thus clear, and the neutrals who apply a false equation to both sides or continue to sit on the fence of equivocal proposals which they refuse to clarify must accept part of the responsibility for continued failure.

#### ORIGINAL JURISDICTION OF U.S. DISTRICT COURTS IN CERTAIN ACTIONS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I would like to express my endorsement of H.R. 1960 which was recently called up and passed by the Senate. Press of official Senate business prevented my commenting on it at the time. I take this opportunity to do so. Although the bill passed with little fanfare, it has far-reaching significance for many of our citizens, particularly those living in the Western States.

We are all aware of the increasing role which the Federal Government plays in the everyday life of the individual. Not so well known is the fact that a person who has been aggrieved by the action of a Government officer or agency and seeks relief from a court will oftentimes find that the courts in his home district are closed to him. If he wishes to file suit, he must come to Washington, D.C., to do so. This, of course, means that litigants must travel hundreds or even thousands of miles to have their cases heard. For many of them the expense and inconvenience is prohibitive, so they are, in effect, being denied their day in court.

H.R. 1960 is intended to relieve this hardship. The bill would make it possible for an individual to secure court review of an agency determination in his local Federal court rather than having to come to Washington. To accomplish this, the bill has two main provisions. One section of the bill grants additional jurisdiction to the Federal district courts. The other broadens the venue statutes.

#### JURISDICTION

Cases often arise in which an individual may wish to appeal an adverse determination by a Government official, but judicial review is not specifically authorized by statute. In this event his only recourse is to bring an action in the

nature of mandamus to compel the officer to perform his duty. However, at the present time, the Federal district courts, with the exception of the U.S. court for the District of Columbia, do not have original jurisdiction over this type of action.

The District of Columbia court has been able to hear these suits because it derives some of its jurisdiction from the body of law which was established by the State of Maryland before the land now known as the District of Columbia was ceded to the Federal Government. Included within this body of law was jurisdiction to hear mandamus actions, so the U.S. court for the District of Columbia has continued to exercise original jurisdiction over this type of action.

H.R. 1960 merely extends this jurisdiction to the other Federal district courts. The Senate version of the bill authorizes these courts to entertain "any action to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff or to make a decision in any matter involving the exercise of discretion."

This provision carries out the original objective of the bill as it was passed by the House. However, it has been reworded by the Senate to make clear that an official can be compelled to act in a matter involving the exercise of discretion, but he cannot be told how that discretion will be exercised. In other words there can be no interference with an officer's discretion or any control over the substance of his decision.

In its report, the committee has expressly stated that this grant of additional jurisdiction to the courts is not intended to affect the doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies.

#### VENUE

Aside from the question of jurisdiction, a further problem arises in suits to secure judicial review of an action taken by a Government agency. Because of the doctrine of indispensable parties, it may be necessary to name the agency head as a party defendant in such a suit. Since the top official will usually have his official residence in Washington, D.C., the present venue statutes require that the suit be brought in Washington. The hardship which this inflicts upon litigants is, of course, obvious and should be remedied.

As for the Government, it will usually be just as convenient or even more convenient to have its cases heard in the field. The decisions complained of are usually made at that level, and most of the pertinent files and records are likely to be located in the field office. Since U.S. attorneys are present in each of the judicial districts, the Government should have no difficulty in arranging for counsel.

Under H.R. 1960, the choice of a forum would not be limited to the district where agency officials reside. The bill permits suits against the Government to be brought in any judicial district in which, first, the defendant resides; or, second, the cause of action arose; or, third, any real property is situated; or, fourth, the plaintiff resides if no real property is involved in the action.

The Justice Department has pointed out that there would be no justification for permitting a plaintiff to bring an action in his home district if the subject of the suit is real property which is located in another district. Accordingly, the Senate version of the bill has been amended so that suits could be brought in the district of the plaintiff's residence only in the event no real property is involved in the action.

In short, Mr. President, H.R. 1960 brings the courts closer to the people. It removes the geographical obstacle that has heretofore prevented many litigants from resorting to the courts. I join the many other citizens who have been interested in this legislation in expressing my satisfaction that it has been approved by the Senate.

Report on this bill was submitted to the Senate from the Committee on the Judiciary by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. He has had firsthand experience and observation of some of the situations with which this bill is designed to deal.

In the other body it was the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RICHARD POFF] who introduced this measure and followed it so well through its several stages to congressional approval. He is to be commended for the clear insight into this legal problem which he demonstrated and his logic and ability to express it. All this is in keeping with the splendid legislative ability he has developed in his years in Congress on behalf of the common good.

#### CLOSER COOPERATION NEEDED IN SPACE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in the current issue of Air Force and Space Digest appears a remarkable article on the subject of the need for closer cooperation in space by the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The article argues, as I have argued on the Senate floor, that a clearer role must be given to the military applications in space.

The article, written by William Leavitt, discusses the question of using our fullest energy toward reaching our peaceful and military space objectives. The writer states a compelling argument and identifies the urgency that is needed for a decision committing us to the fullest examination of the threat to our security from space.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by William Leavitt be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### NASA-USAF INTERFACE—WILL IT BE A TWO-WAY STREET?

(By William Leavitt)

"Interface (noun). A surface, especially a plane surface, forming a common boundary of two bodies or spaces"—Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary.

To the mass of jargon that is an unnerving semantic feature of our harried times and includes such governmentese as "finalize," "reorient," "capability," "building block," and "deemphasize" must now be added the space-age watchword "interface."

Interface is another way of saying: trying to work together on difficult enterprises under complicated circumstances. It is what a patient company of Air Force and National Aeronautics and Space Administration specialists are attempting to do in the national space effort. Interface is not an easy way of life; there are differing views in the space community on both technical and policy questions. There is the specific problem that NASA, as an agency created by Congress on the same level as the Department of Defense, can and does deal laterally on basic policy questions with DOD, while the Air Force, which is the prime agency for operational cooperation with NASA, is an element of and subject to well known and firm control by DOD.

Yet, if candor and a true spirit of cooperation and mutual respect prevail, the Air Force-NASA interface can go a long way toward helping the country meet space deadlines ranging from the Apollo moon-landing program to the potentially far more significant requirement for viable military space operational skills and hardware. This latter and less glamorous aspect of the national space effort is where the real test of interface will come. The crucial question is whether USAF-NASA interface will be a "two-way street." There is little doubt USAF is heavily supporting NASA goals. But will NASA support Air Force space defense aims? And will the White House and Department of Defense give their imprimatur?

The process of USAF-NASA interface has been underway for much longer than the word itself has been popular in space-planning circles. Interface has not been devoid of acrimony, especially in early post-sputnik days. Those were times when the zealous advocates of space purely for peaceful purposes went to rather incredible lengths to suppress military contributions to such efforts as the Mercury program after it was renamed and transferred from the Air Force to the embryonic NASA. Those were frustrating and morale-shaking days for blue-suiteders who found themselves, for policy reasons, asking visitors to such installations as the Air Force's animal laboratory at Holloman AFB, N. Mex.—where chimpanzees got their schooling for spaceflight—to please not make too much of the Air Force role in the training of animals for space missions as a prelude to manned orbital flight. Air Force people either on direct loan to the space agency or working at support roles from their regular service billets—in research and development, booster procurement, and launch operations—have from the start beefed up the civilian agency's efforts. What is now ancient history is the tale of today and tomorrow, too. All the way to the moon and back and in earth-orbital operations, military men and machines will make significant contributions.

As Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert put it in a recent issue of the General Electric Forum:

"The Air Force and NASA have already established the broad basis for cooperation and a concerted effort is made to maintain it to the fullest possible extent at all levels of Air Force and NASA management. We are in agreement with NASA officials that our programs must be mutually supporting—rather than competitive. NASA-Air Force management cooperation will keep pace with the expanding NASA program. Ninety-three Air Force research and development officers are now assigned to duty with NASA. NASA and Air Force efforts together form the major part of the national space program."

But in the same article, the Secretary also said:

"Despite the broad common ground between civilian and military needs, the Air Force has a big job in building the technology on which the military applications (of

space) are based. Within such technological areas, there are unique military requirements that will not be attended to by civilian developments."

As examples, the Secretary lists: inspection of uncooperative satellites; survivability in combat environments as represented by high-thrust in-space propulsion systems; rapid turnaround, reuse, and recovery of spacecraft.

The most important recent step in formalizing what had most been an ad hoc NASA-USAF interface was the designation of Maj. Gen. Osmond J. Ritland, USAF, as deputy to the commander, Air Force Systems Command, for manned spaceflight, with special USAF-NASA liaison responsibility. A former commander of the Space Systems Division of AFSC, General Ritland succeeded Gen. Bernard A. Schriever at Space Systems when Gen. Schriever was named commander, AFSC.

General Ritland's assignment divides him between his two offices, one at AFSC headquarters at Andrews AFB, Md., the other down the hall from the suite of D. Brainerd Holmes, Director of NASA's Office of Manned Spaceflight and chief of the NASA Apollo moon-landing program, in downtown Washington, three blocks from the White House. His job is to serve as focal point within Systems Command for all USAF support of the NASA programs, as arranged through NASA-DOD agreements. All such support must be in terms of prior NASA-DOD agreements. And wearing his military hat at AFSC, he is also to direct booster and other development programs in support of military space systems efforts.

To implement his interface with NASA, General Ritland is gathering a staff of six USAF specialists in space technology who will correspond generally in function with the six staff divisions of NASA's Office of Manned Spaceflight. The general's staff, as he puts it, will match Mr. Holmes' staff on a point-to-point contact basis. The hope is that this point-to-point contact will minimize redtape and also provide a day-to-day exchange on the planning of joint efforts as well as provide a feed into NASA of possible ways defense space capabilities might be studied in cooperative efforts.

The establishment of General Ritland's new office came after discussions involving top USAF, NASA, and DOD planners out of the office of Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, with General Schriever and D. Brainerd Holmes contributing. In the exchanges that led to the planning and setting up of General Ritland's shop, there was acknowledgment of antagonisms between NASA and USAF over policy and priorities. One of the principal rationales of formalizing the interface was the expectation that closer coordination would dissipate some of the differences.

As noted, USAF's interface with NASA is no easy business. From the point of view of money and broadness of charter, NASA, understandably excited by its moon mission, has a natural tendency to think in terms of accomplishing its assignments as fast as possible. And it runs its own show. The Air Force, on the other hand, has to cope with much tighter money and policy controls, so far as military space programs are concerned. It is the White House and DOD that call the tune on what the Air Force is to do in cooperating with NASA as well as what the Air Force can go ahead with in the field of military space research and development.

Yet it is a plus that high NASA officials have increasingly expressed their acceptance of the concept that the space effort ought to be broad enough to meet national needs, including defense needs.

For example, Dr. Joseph F. Shea, the 36-year-old deputy to NASA Moon Project Chief Holmes, says he thinks of Air Force-NASA interface in two contexts. The first is the



direct Air Force support of NASA programs, the provision of personnel, range, launch support, and booster development. These include such items, for example, as the Air Force responsibility for development of Titan II as the booster for the NASA two-man Gemini orbital program, the Agena development which will make the Gemini rendezvous effort possible, and the Titan III booster development which will not only bring the X-20 (formerly Dyna-Soar) manned orbital glider project to fruition but also gain some needed answers on the future of solid fuels.

The second interface context, as Dr. Shea sees it—and here, hopefully, General Rittland's office will be especially significant—is in the area of overall consultation and planning as to "what the national space program ought to be, how it should be shared, and how missions can be planned to serve defense needs."

The latter interface is, of course, the most difficult, because of the Air Force's need for DOD (Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering) approval of military space projects. No matter how close people's offices are and how personally cordial the relationships are between those who directly interface in USAF and NASA, up the coordination ladder must go the ideas for cooperation.

As the chart suggests [chart not printed in Record], the money and priority decisions that affect NASA and USAF jointly are worked out at such cosmic levels as the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board, cochaired by NASA Deputy Administrator Dr. Hugh L. Dryden and Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering John H. Rubel. Most decisions involve action by Director of Defense Research and Engineering Dr. Harold Brown, and NASA Associate Administrator Dr. Robert C. Seamans, who is frequently described as "our general manager" by NASA Administrator James E. Webb. The Defense Secretary and Mr. Webb also make contact in person or on paper. Also involved are the Deputy Defense Secretary, Roswell L. Gilpatric, and the Air Force Secretary, Eugene M. Zuckert. The path over the Potomac between NASA on the Washington side and the Pentagon on the Virginia side is well trod these days. Add to that the important policy-advisory function of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, chaired by Vice President JOHNSON. The Council's Executive Secretary, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, one of the most experienced Government officials in the Capital, has played a significant role in coordinating administration policy on space goals, and has addressed himself candidly to the military potential of space technology.

Since the August Red tandem cosmonaut feat, there have been renewed reports that the Council has been circulating a policy paper raising questions on the military significance of the Red action and suggesting U.S. response.

Aside from the support—both personnel and development of hardware—that USAF is providing NASA, what is the outlook for a real two-way street operation between the Air Force and the civil agency? The answer to that question is out of Air Force hands. USAF can only propose, while the White House, DOD, and the highest levels of NASA dispose.

There are a number of obvious areas where viable contributions to military space capability can be made by the Air Force in joint development efforts with NASA. The Gemini program, which from the NASA point of view is a tightly scheduled prove-out of rendezvous principle and a crucial element in the agency's race to the moon, offers clear potential for the development of military capabilities. A properly time-phased "blue suit" direct- or separate-mission Air Force program

would give Air Force personnel the experience they will need for extended near-space orbital military operations. There is some significant support in NASA for such Air Force participation. But at the same time, no one can say at this writing whether DOD would approve such a plan, not to mention the possibility of fairly strong resistance to the idea by the burgeoning Manned Spacecraft Center operation of NASA at Houston, Tex., which in the organizational nature of things, could probably be expected to resist any encroachment on what it considers to be its mission. Yet there is talk lately of expanding Gemini to a 5-year program. Certainly this approach could allow for extraction of really valuable military orbital experience. Last month's new Soviet manned spaceflight achievements ought to underscore the need for such USAF capabilities.

Another increasingly important concept is the Air Force interest in orbiting, in association with the Gemini program, a military research and development laboratory, where vital long-term data on men and materials in the space environment might be obtained. Such a test satellite program could provide answers to questions that from a military as well as NASA point of view have to be gotten sooner or later, the sooner the better.

It is important, and not carping, to note that, having been assigned the job of going to the moon, NASA is under a new kind of pressure. The time is short if it is to meet the President's deadline, and NASA can be expected to divert people and money from its other efforts. This is a classical occurrence in research and development, and NASA is conscious that its sizable budgets will raise questions in Congress as the years of this decade fly by. In NASA, there is bound to develop the practice of feeding Apollo at the expense of other programs. The Air Force, with its considerable space technology capability, must be allowed to fill the breaches bound to develop, especially in the vital-to-defense near-earth orbital areas which may soon be crucial.

Another obvious area of potential NASA-USAF cooperation in terms of Gemini is the manned satellite-inspector program. There is much overlap in the techniques involved in rendezvousing with either friendly or unfriendly satellites, yet there are enough obvious differences in procedure to more than justify intensive efforts in the Air Force inspector effort. If DOD will approve, and if such an effort could be mounted in conjunction with the NASA Gemini program, then all the better for the country.

Other possibilities come to mind, such as the concept of manned ballistic missile interception from orbit—doubtless a difficult technique to master—an idea that might turn out to be without merit. \* \* \* We just don't know. The main point is that money has to be spent and personnel invested in finding out.

The onus is on DOD—and finally on the White House. And the accurate determination of DOD's current philosophy on the development of a broad spectrum of military capabilities in space is extremely difficult, because, depending on whom you talk to and what public statements you examine, you can come to either of two conclusions:

Either DOD is unconvinced as yet of the military significance of astronautics beyond the relatively well-accepted passive roles of unmanned strategic reconnaissance and early-warning vehicles—hence is concentrating on its "today" problems; the piling up of sufficient missiles to insure continuing nuclear deterrence, and concurrently upgrading conventional, nonatomic, military capabilities. It is sticking to the low-cost (for DOD) philosophy of relying on NASA to come up with capabilities that the military can use if they are needed. Or DOD is truly cognizant of the need for the country to develop the broad spectrum of mili-

tary space skills as an extension of deterrent power, but, for political reasons, will not acknowledge this fact, preferring to work quietly toward those capabilities through Air Force classified programs and through an earnest effort to negotiate a two-way NASA-USAF interface.

There is evidence for both possibilities. In view of the latest Soviet feats, it can only be hoped that the latter is the true case.

Yet, the publicly announced view of the Secretary of Defense that he is not concerned over the security significance of the latest Russian feats and sees no need for changes in the Nation's space programs is less than heartening.

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

#### URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1962

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer may lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3615) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on Wednesday, August 29, I made a statement on the floor of the Senate that when S. 3615, which provides for the subsidization of local governmentally operated mass transportation systems, was called up for consideration, I would move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce. I stated at that time that S. 3615, while it deals substantially with commerce, was referred for consideration to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and not to the Committee on Commerce, where it properly belongs.

The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], with whom I have discussed the subject in some detail, agrees with the Senator from Ohio that the bill deals primarily with subjects within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce.

The most recent example of a similar reference of a bill involving the Commerce Committee is H.R. 11040, the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. This bill was passed by the House on May 3, 1962. Prior to that time, the Senate satellite bill, S. 2814, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], was introduced February 7, 1962, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. On April 2, 1962, that committee reported the bill to the Senate, which referred it to the Commerce Committee. On June 11, 1962, the

Commerce Committee favorably reported H.R. 11041 in lieu of S. 2814.

I have described the proceedings with regard to the satellite bill to point out that, though the original bill on that subject was sent to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, subsequently, in accordance with the rules, it was referred to the Committee on Commerce, where it rightfully belonged.

The situation now before the Senate is similar to the one involved in relation to the satellite bill. The satellite bill dealt with foreign commerce. The broadcasting of messages from the satellite definitely cross the lines of foreign nations. The Committee on Commerce is normally the committee that deals with subjects involving foreign commerce. For that reason, although the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences had dealt with the subject, I assume the Senate, in its good judgment, deemed it advisable and proper to refer the bill to the Committee on Commerce.

There was a third aspect with respect to the satellite bill that was exceedingly interesting. The satellite bill was not only of great importance to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and to the Committee on Foreign Commerce, but it definitely dealt with foreign relations, and, since it dealt with foreign relations, after the bill had been referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and to the Committee on Commerce, the Senate determined that the bill should also be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was sent to that committee, where favorable action was taken upon the bill.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate another recent example involving Senate bill 3252, which would authorize a foreign government under terms and conditions prescribed by the President to operate at the seat of U.S. Government a low-power radio station for transmission of messages to points outside United States provided the foreign government offered reciprocal privileges to United States.

That bill was introduced on May 3, 1962, and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, which committee favorably reported it. The bill, on July 9, was referred to the Commerce Committee and the committee, in turn, held hearings on the bill.

Of a different nature was the action by the Commerce Committee with respect to the 1958 Transportation Act. As introduced, the bill contained provisions to repeal the various transportation taxes. Since taxes are not within the Commerce Committee jurisdiction, the committee removed these sections from the bill and by committee resolution referred them to the Finance Committee with a plea for enactment.

That bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce because it dealt with interstate commerce. Inasmuch as three sections of the bill dealt with taxes, the Committee on Commerce referred those sections to the Committee on Finance for consideration.

As to Commerce Committee jurisdiction, the 1946 Reorganization Act granted, among other things, jurisdic-

tion over, first, interstate and foreign commerce generally; and, second, regulation of interstate railroads, buses, trucks, and pipelines.

I respectfully submit that inasmuch as the so-called mass transportation bill would deal with buses and mass transportation systems crossing State lines from New York into New Jersey particularly, it is inescapable that the proper situs for the consideration of the bill is in the Committee on Commerce.

To Senators who do not agree with my proposal I submit the question, How can the Committee on Commerce be prevented from considering a bill before the Senate when admittedly it deals with items that cross State lines? When an answer to that question is sought, those who will try to answer it will find that, under the language of the bill, interstate commerce definitely would be affected and, if it would be affected, the answer to the question must be in the affirmative. The bill should be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

In February 1960 the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee held hearings on the mass transportation problems in the Nation's metropolitan centers. Witnesses who testified included the mayors of St. Louis, Philadelphia, New York City, and Cleveland; the Governor of Pennsylvania; the chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. Their testimony clearly indicated that the commuter problems of these larger areas were in interstate commerce and, as such, clearly within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee.

Mr. President, S. 3615 deals primarily with commuter problems as the basis upon which the program was originally recommended. The subject had been under discussion for the past 4 years. Not all, but some of the railroads of the East sent representatives before the Committee on Commerce at the time the 1958 act was being considered. They suggested that if the commuter service in the Eastern States was to be continued, subsidies would be required from the Federal Government. If in 1958 and 1960 the subject properly belonged in the Committee on Commerce, I cannot see how it can now be argued, contradicting my presentation, that it no longer belongs in the Committee on Commerce.

If there should be adverse views about the bill going to the Commerce Committee, I believe the inference will be justifiable that the bill was sent to a committee where, because of the weak provisions of the bill, it was thought it would have better opportunity of success.

What is the bill? In its original form it contemplated the allocation of \$500 million to subsidize local governmentally operated transportation systems. My recollection is that there are approximately 1,300 transportation systems in the country and that 70 of them are governmentally operated. Over a 3-year period the taxpayers of the United States will pay taxes into the Federal Treasury to provide a grant of \$500 million for the purchase of equipment and the operation

of local transportation systems. If \$500 million is a mere beginning, I ask the question, What will be the ultimate cost of this bill? The conclusion is inescapable that the ultimate cost will run into billions of dollars. If the Federal Government is to subsidize only governmentally operated systems, as was originally intended in the bill, I ask the question, What will become of the private systems?

The answer to that question is that ultimately all transportation systems will be driven into governmental ownership. It will not be done with my approval. If we are to drive local transportation systems into public ownership, when will we approach the railroads and drive them into public ownership? The provisions of the bill contemplate creating the rails on which the transportation systems of the Nation, carrying passengers and cargoes, will be headed for governmental operation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does the Senator believe that that is why the railroads, the bus companies, and all the other carriers support the bill?

Mr. LAUSCHE. They did not all fight it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. They supported it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The eastern railroads sponsored it. The Senator from New Jersey, of course, is vitally interested in the program. In my opinion the bill was originally intended to serve the eastern communities. It was finally rewritten so as to include all the communities of the country, small and large. All the railroads do not support the bill. Some of them do; others do not.

When the witnesses came before the committee in 1960, the mayor of Cleveland, who is now the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, expressed opposition to subsidies, and said, "Provide us with loans, but do not put the Government into further aid and start a system of subsidization."

My answer is that certain railroads, including the New Haven and the Pennsylvania, are begging for it. However, I suggest that there are methods of solving the problem other than by subsidization.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We heard not one word from the New Haven Railroad. We heard testimony from the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. There was no opposition from the western roads, although we understand they are not interested in the bill because they are interstate systems. Of course this is an urban transportation bill; it has nothing to do with the vast interstate network of the railroads in our great West.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The officials of western railroads, of course, have said nothing. That does not mean that in their own minds they are not against it. The Pennsylvania Railroad wants it. I suppose if the bill is passed, eventually we will subsidize the Pennsylvania Railroad



and other railroads carrying commuter service. I would like to ask the Senator from New Jersey, if this is a bill to solve mass transportation problems in metropolitan communities, by what theory has it been changed so as to make the aid available to practically every community in the country that wants to buy buses or equipment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The benefits of the bill are not available to every community in the country that wishes to buy buses or equipment. The bill would grant money to those areas that can demonstrate, first, that they need mass transportation; second, that they are planning a coordinated system of mass transportation; and, third, that they are developing their mass transportation system into a comprehensive plan for the development of their urban areas.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad the Senator from New Jersey is in the Chamber. I believe that last year we appropriated \$15 million to make experiments to show what could be done. How much of that money has been spent for experiments?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is referring to the provision of last year's bill which provided grant money for the demonstration of improved ways of moving people with mass transportation facilities. I believe three grants have been made under the program. One was to analyze the use of buses in the city of Detroit. Another was for the acquisition of transit equipment in the city of Chicago. A study is also being undertaken in universities of the feasibility of the monorail as a means of mass transportation.

I should think that the senior Senator from Ohio would rejoice that the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the administering Agency, has been conservative in granting money under this program, and has been insisting that the demonstration be well organized before money is given out.

As the Senator knows, the problem of mass transportation is very complex. We have given very little attention to it in terms of thinking of today's needs and planning for tomorrow's needs. Really, mass transportation is an infant industry in terms of research and understanding; therefore, when we go slow, we are acting conservatively, to make certain we are doing the right thing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Have any of the experiments or researches or arrangements under last year's authorization been completed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I misspoke when I said that buses were purchased under this program. Transit equipment for the city of Chicago was acquired under the loan program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am sure that none of the experiments and none of the researches have been completed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not believe there has been a final report on the major demonstration—conducted in the city of Detroit. I believe the study is complete, but I have not seen the final report.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My point is that when that bill was before the Senate for consideration, I asked the Senator from

New Jersey specifically what type of experiments would be made. He answered that they would relate to the use of parking space in outer areas of metropolitan communities; monorail systems; and other experiments. But no experiment has been finished. No research has been completed. Yet we are now considering entering into a final program.

My view is that all we are doing now belies the claim that the \$50 million provided last year was for experimental purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure the Senator from Ohio does not believe that all wisdom lies in the Federal Government. I am sure he realizes that back in the metropolitan areas and communities of the country there are people who understand their own needs and who program their transportation. That is exactly what is being done.

I feel certain the Senator has read the hearings, but if he will read them again, he will know that across the country are urban areas which are now planning or which have planned and are ready to enter into programs of mass transportation. These communities range from Los Angeles and San Francisco to Chicago and Cleveland, and on the east coast, including southern cities like Atlanta and small towns like Laurel, Miss. The mayor of Laurel, a town of 40,000, appeared before the committee and said, "If we could get a little of the new money needed for our plan, we could put it into operation."

It was hoped that through the demonstration money, new ideas could be demonstrated or experimented with by private carriers which do not have the money with which to do this work. What railroad has the money to demonstrate the feasibility of the monorail? The railroads are having a hard enough time keeping their figures in the black. What is sought to be done with Federal money is to demonstrate new ideas for tomorrow, although there are ample plans for today under the grant program in the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The fact is that no research or experimentation has been completed. The point which I made last year has been corroborated. Plans and experiments were already in existence prior to 1961. Cleveland had them. Cleveland experimented with parking lots on the outskirts of the city where travelers into the center of the city could park their cars.

My judgment a year ago was that the money which was appropriated was the wedge in the door for subsidization by the Federal Government of transportation systems.

Can the Senator from New Jersey answer the question, Why did the original bill make money available only to government-operated systems?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Under the bill, the administering agency is authorized to make contracts with public bodies—States, counties, groups of counties, and regional authorities. The grant of money to a public body would be made for a number of reasons. The bill requires the greatest degree of cooperation in planning.

It cannot be expected that a bus company will undertake coordination of transportation and the comprehensive planning of urban development. So the money would be made available to a governmental authority, a public body. However, under the bill the public body not only can, but must, consider how it can bring private carriers into the coordinated transportation plan. This requirement is spelled out in many ways in the bill. We insist that wherever feasible, the public body weave the private carriers within its transportation system. So ultimately the money could be used for the acquisition of equipment for a private carrier, for improving the right-of-way of a private carrier, or for improving other facilities of a private carrier.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Through governmental support, coordination would take place back home?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Exactly. A carrier would have to adapt its program of rehabilitation or revitalization or rebuilding to the public body's comprehensive transportation plan.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill. How many transportation systems are there throughout the country?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator's earlier estimate is fairly close.

Mr. LAUSCHE. About 1,300. How many are government operated?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. According to my best recollection, 60 or so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Five hundred million dollars has been provided for 3 years. What does the Senator from New Jersey estimate the ultimate cost of the program will be if the Government is to subsidize it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. By the year 2000?

Mr. LAUSCHE. To put the systems into the shape in which he thinks they ought to be.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I cannot answer what the total cost, including Federal contributions and local contributions, would be to keep us the strongest nation in the world, and to eliminate the confusion, wastefulness, and delays resulting from traffic jams. I have heard various estimates. If there is to be commuter transportation efficiency, the present estimates are that the total cost of providing better systems would be \$10 billion. We know that the Federal contribution is not a pittance. It is more than a pittance. But it is a small part of what will be needed for urban commuter transportation in the next decade.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill provides a subsidy of three-quarters or two-thirds of the cost of the equipment, does it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The bill provides that the Government shall pay two-thirds of that part of the project which cannot be reasonably financed out of the fare box.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the final analysis, then, there would be a potential possible expenditure by the Federal Government of two-thirds of \$10 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. No. The estimates I have heard are that if

all the existing plans for improved commuter transportation were to be put into effect in the next 10 years, the cost would be about \$10 billion. All these systems operate through the fare box; this is not to be public-free transportation. The commuter pays a great deal of his way. Today he has to pay the full cost, and we know what is happening to the rapid-transit bus commuter: He is a lonely soul in a car in a traffic jam.

At any rate, only the part of new construction which cannot be reasonably financed out of the fare box is included here, and only two-thirds of that.

To give one simple, easily understood example: The city of San Francisco has, in broad, rounded out figures, a program for 10 years of \$800 million which will be used for a rapid transit system. The representatives of San Francisco spoke eloquently before our committee of how they, themselves, are raising—or it is hoped that they will—from their community, through taxation, most of the money for this program. Of course, the fare box will have a great deal to do with it, too. It is said that if the Federal Government could help to the extent of \$20 million for 5 years, that program would be possible.

So we can see the part of the cost which would come from the Federal program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I still reaffirm my position that this is the beginning of the transition of the transportation systems into governmental ownership. It will be inescapable that in the end there will be a socialization not only of the local systems, but also of the railroad systems of the country.

It would be a simple thing for any Senator or any Member of the House of Representatives to return home and say to the people who ride in the buses and on the railroads, "I, as a Member of Congress, am going to bring you a gift: The Federal Government is going to give you money with which to operate your local transportation systems. They will not cost you anything. Good old Washington will run your transportation systems and will finance them for you."

Mr. President, that is the easy course to follow. But I submit it is not the course that is in the best interests of the country. More and more we are moving into governmental ownership. More and more we hear representatives of industries argue, before congressional committees, that they cannot survive unless their industries are subsidized. The inland water carriers, the airlines, and the lead and zinc industry are already subsidized. We already subsidize, in great degree, metals. Each year more are being subsidized or are requesting subsidies. Today, the railroads are asking for subsidies. I should like to know where this will end. There is only one end in sight, and it is final centralization of operations in the Government.

I will not stand for it, and I will not support it, regardless of the impact my stand may have on my political future. I think it is wrong. It is not in accord with the fight we are making throughout the world against communism. We are trying to preserve the free enterprise system. But this bill does not do that.

If this bill is enacted, it will destroy the free enterprise system, first in local transportation, and eventually in the railroad systems.

I am going to urge people in Ohio to remember with joy and pride the achievements we have made in our country. With about 6 percent of the world's population, we have produced one-third of the goods and services of the world. On the other hand, Russia, with about 10 percent of the world's population, produces about 12 percent of the world's goods and services. All that we have achieved has come through our system of free enterprise; and I am not going to be one of the parade which supposedly is going down the easy path and the good path, but which is completely in conflict with what our system of government means.

Eventually this bill should go to the Commerce Committee, so that the Secretary of Commerce can be called to testify about it. I would wish to hear, also, from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the former mayor of Cleveland. He has testified against subsidies. I would also wish to hear the views of taxpayers in the Nation, to learn what they have to say about this subsidy program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does the Senator from Ohio believe that, generally, when the chamber of commerce comes to express its view, it expresses the viewpoint of the taxpayers?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It does so indirectly. But there are taxpayers who should likewise be heard. I should say that the chamber of commerce and the AFL-CIO have their views; but indirectly both of them try to express the view of the general public, as they see it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does the Senator from Ohio agree also that, generally speaking, the chamber of commerce expresses itself in favor of economy and conservation of the tax dollar?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I assume that it tries to do so. It is my understanding that it has views on the tax question; but I have grave doubts about the propriety of its judgment in connection with the ultimate impact on the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does the Senator from Ohio feel that there is a high circumstantial probability that when representatives of the chamber of commerce speak for a program, they believe the program is in the interest of efficiency and economy?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not feel that I should be appraising that issue generally. There are some chambers of commerce which look at the subject shortsightedly, thinking only of the good which will immediately come to their communities, but not thinking of the ultimate impact upon the Nation. I have seen that happen time and time again—that is to say, whenever they are to get money for nothing and whenever they believe it will help their communities, they stop thinking about the tax burden and the national debt and the deficit operations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I regret that the Senator from Ohio feels that he must in some degree criticize the approach of the chamber of commerce.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not. I welcome its testimony, and I think it renders a good service in giving information. But if the Senator from New Jersey asks that I approve everything the chambers of commerce state, he is asking me to do something which I cannot honestly do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Finally, I believe that when we heard from many local chambers of commerce, including the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, not only were they thinking of meeting the immediate transportation problems in their particular urban areas, but they were also mindful of the fact that if they do not in some degree have mass transportation facilities within their areas, with the result that they have to move people exclusively over the highways—and we must remember that people are going to move; they are not going to stay home; they are going to travel to work—in a decade they will spend vastly more millions of dollars and, indeed, billions of dollars more than they will if they make it possible for a part of their people to move by means of mass transportation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad the Senator from New Jersey raised the issue of Boston. Testimony was given on several occasions before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee that one of the principal railroads serving Boston wanted to give to the city of Boston, for nothing, its terminal, solely to be relieved of the payment of taxes. The city of Boston would not take it. I suggest that there are remedies back home by which this problem can be solved.

I do not think the Senator from New Jersey will refute the statement I made. I believe it was the Boston & Maine that has been begging the city of Boston to take, for nothing, a \$5 million building.

In due time, I will make the motion that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Will the Senator give the Senate some idea of what "due time" means?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator ask when I will make the motion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot answer that question at this time. I have considerably more to say on this whole item.

The Senator from New Jersey knows that the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee conducted hearings for 1 year on this subject. It dealt with the plight of the railroads. We heard about the local mass transportation problem, and the idle time in which the equipment and personnel are not working. We heard various suggestions for curing the problem. I shall want to have put into the Record all of that testimony, before I conclude, concerning whether the problem can be solved better than by sub-



sidization. I cannot answer the question of the Senator at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the Senator will yield for a moment, the question of committee, and jurisdiction, and reference has been decided on other occasions. I am sure the Senator from Ohio realizes that. Just last year the chairman of the Committee on Commerce—I can still see him standing before this Senator's desk saying this—stated that the transportation bill belongs in the committee that deals with urban problems.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I spoke to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in our committee and asked him why the bill went to the Housing Subcommittee. He said it went there because it deals with urban redevelopment, but it ought to come back to our committee when the Banking and Currency Committee is through with it. I spoke to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] 10 days ago, and he agreed that it should come to our committee. I now ask the Senator from New Jersey, why should it not go to the Commerce Committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not believe the senior Senator from Washington is in the Chamber. I would rather not quote my conversations with him when he is not present. However, last year he said:

I understand the reason why this particular provision is in the (housing) bill. It is logical that in any type of urban renewal or urban development there must be coordination between the building of houses, highways, and a transportation system. Otherwise, urban development is not going to work.

I think the purpose of the provision is good. I think it will be money well spent. I think we should make a move in the direction proposed. I am glad to see this provision as a part of the bill.

He said this when the provision was in the housing bill. He has not indicated this year that he would move, or join the Senator from Ohio in the motion, to have the bill referred to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator still has not answered my question. It view of the rules of the Senate, what justification is there for not sending this bill to the Commerce Committee, when it definitely deals with interstate traffic?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Interstate travel could be a part of it. The concentration of this bill is in urban centers. It is not for interstate railroads or interstate buses. It is a bill for the metropolitan area, the urban area. All measures dealing with urban problems go to the Banking and Currency Committee, and this is the subcommittee that deals with it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the provisions of the bill be available for urban transportation between Newark and New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the governing body, if the public body, in charge of transportation there developed a comprehensive program of mass transportation, if it were coordinated, if it were part of a general comprehensive plan for development of the area, if it were sound, if it were found

sound enough to save a great amount of money, for example, and protect us from another highway tube or more highways in the area, if it met all of the tight tests of this particular bill, the funds in the bill could be approved for such use.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There are bus and transportation systems connecting New York and Newark that would be covered by the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If all of the tests were met, they could come under the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, the bill does deal with interstate commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It can deal with carrier systems that serve an urban area that happens to be in two States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the Senator from New Jersey is interested in this bill principally because of the New York and Newark problems?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If we want to be philosophical, I approach this as a national question. I have been a sponsor of measures that have hurt me at home. The Senator knows that the migratory labor bill is a part of the program that I have sponsored. I do so because I know there is a national need for it. I know there is a national need for the bill before us. The New Jersey testimony is less than one-fiftieth of the total testimony in this volume of hearings. People from all over the country testified. Those who spoke for transportation systems that might be in two States are small, indeed, in number when compared to those who testified about transportation systems that were wholly contained within one State. For example—perhaps this name will ring a bell—Mr. Donald C. Hyde, who is vice president of the Institute for Rapid Transit, testified. I believe the Senator knows who I am talking about.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think he operates the Cleveland Transit System.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not believe the Cleveland Transit System goes into Pennsylvania or Indiana; it is self-contained. It is urban Cleveland self-contained. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it, but I refer Senators to page 273 of the hearings, wherein he tells us very dramatically why rapid transit is needed—because 2.85 miles of the Cleveland beltway cost \$70 million.

The bill would provide \$100 million for all the country for the first year. This is in the nature of "seed money." The \$100 million could stimulate four or five times that amount of spending for transportation within the year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Frankly, never in my State, from any city or community, did I hear the words "ask the Federal Government to subsidize our bus systems." It was only when word came out regarding the railroad system joining Boston and New York and Newark, which has been in trouble, that I heard the cry for a subsidy from the Federal Government. It was the New Haven Rail-

road, with which Mr. George Alpert was connected as president and chairman of the board. He was the only one originally calling for subsidies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. He properly came to the Senator's committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He did.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That did not involve urban transportation, but involved interstate or intercity transportation. It was not mass transportation for commuters.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request, so that I may be recognized to ask for action on various House amendments to Senate bills? Then I will suggest the absence of a quorum, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I withdraw my suggestion.

#### REDUCTION OF WORKWEEK OF FIRE DEPARTMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill, S. 3086.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3086) to provide for a reduction in the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 7, strike out "fifty-two" and insert "forty-eight"; on page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out "Provided, That no workweek shall exceed seventy-two hours"; page 2, line 11, strike out "and (e)" and insert "(e), and (f)"; on page 2, line 15, strike out "and (5)," and insert "(5), and (6)."; on page 4, line 4, strike out "Five and two-tenths" and insert "Four and eight-tenths"; on page 4, line 7, strike out "Eight" and insert "Seven and five-tenths"; on page 4, line 10, strike out "Ten and four-tenths" and insert "Nine and six-tenths"; on page 4, line 15, strike out "thirteen-fifteenths" and insert "four-fifths"; on page 4, line 17, strike out "thirteen-fifteenths" and insert "four-fifths"; and on page 6, line 2, strike out "twenty-six" and insert "twenty-four".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the amendments of the House are acceptable to the Senate committee. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments. This proposal has been checked on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to interfere with the Senator's presentation, but at this time I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BIBLE. This proposal has been checked with both sides of the aisle, but I have no objection to a quorum call.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to insist on that, for a few minutes.

Mr. BIBLE. Certainly. I have no objection.

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.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to make it abundantly clear, insofar as the House amendments to the Senate bills are concerned, they have been cleared not only with the other side of the aisle but also with the entire membership of the District of Columbia Committee. I think everyone will find them in complete order.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 3086.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OWNERS FROM CERTAIN ASSESSMENTS RELATING TO REPAIR OF ALLEYS AND SIDEWALKS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill S. 3315.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3315) to relieve owners of abutting property from certain assessments in connection with the repair of alleys and sidewalks in the District of Columbia, which was, on page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out "which repairs were completed or shall be completed" and insert "the completion of which repairs shall occur".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the amendment of the House is acceptable. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

This is merely a technical correction. I am sure it poses no problem.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada. The motion was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OF PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO PERSONAL PROPERTY COMING INTO THE CUSTODY OF THE PROPERTY CLERK, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill, S. 3317.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3317) to amend provisions of law relating to personal property coming into the custody of the property clerk, Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes, which were, on page 8, line 19, strike out "fail" and insert "fails", and on page 9, line 23, strike out "Department. When" and insert "Department, when".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, these amendments are technical in nature. The amendments of the House are acceptable. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada. The motion was agreed to.

#### REGULATION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill S. 2357.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2357) to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia, which were, on page 4, line 5, strike out all after "be" down through and including "amount" in line 6, and insert "repayable: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained herein shall be deemed to supersede or repeal the limitation on the amount of group insurance", and on page 5, line 20, strike out "charged" and insert "discharged".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, these amendments likewise are technical in nature and are acceptable. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OF LIFE INSURANCE ACT AND THE FIRE AND CASUALTY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives pertaining to S. 2356, to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2356) to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 11, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That sections 26 and 29 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1139, 1141; sec. 35-425 and sec. 35-428, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), are hereby amended by adding after the second sentence of each such section the following: "Any such applicant who willfully files with or otherwise submits to the Superintendent, orally or in writing, any material statement, knowing such statement to be

false, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than two years."

Sec. 2. The second sentence of section 32 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act approved October 9, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1078; sec. 35-1336, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended to read: "The person to whom the license may be issued shall file sworn answers to such interrogatories as the Superintendent may require, and any such person who willfully files with or otherwise submits to the Superintendent, orally or in writing, any answers to such interrogatories, knowing such answers to be false, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than two years."

Sec. 3. Section 35 of chapter II of said Fire and Casualty Act, as amended (54 Stat. 1079; sec. 35-1339, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended by adding: "Any applicant who, in connection with such application for renewal of an expiring license, willfully files with or otherwise submits to the Superintendent, orally or in writing, any material statement under oath, knowing such statement to be false, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than two years."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon; and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BEALL, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, and Mr. MILLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BIBLE. 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 may be rescinded.

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

#### URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3615) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of the urban mass transportation bill, all staff members of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted access to the floor.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this is the third year that proposed legislation has come before the Senate to help alleviate the ghastly strangulation of traffic congestion in our cities and to help deal with the increasingly serious financial difficulties of our commuter bus, rail, and transit carriers throughout the country, both in



large cities and in smaller communities. The details of the proposed legislation have changed, but the basic purpose has remained the same.

In 1960 the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings. The Senate passed a bill having exactly the same scope and purposes of the bill now before the Senate. Only the form and amounts of assistance were different then. The House held hearings but did not act on the bill because, as Senators will recall, in 1960 there was a shortened session.

Last year the committee held extensive hearings on a somewhat broader bill. The hearings filled almost 500 pages of testimony. Witnesses came from all over the country. Modified provisions of that bill were incorporated in the general housing bill, and subsequently that formula was enacted into law.

Since then the subject has received intensive study by independent consultants in the executive branch of the Government, culminating in a special message to the Congress and a joint report on the subject by the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The bill bears the imprint of that study as well as the knowledge and experience gained through the administration of the temporary program enacted last year. I, together with 21 other Senators, had the honor of introducing the bill. The 21 other sponsors of the bill included Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I am happy to say that the legislation has received bipartisan support throughout its entire course.

More than 50 witnesses testified for the bill this year, with only 2 or 3 expressing any opposition to it. A representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation and, I believe, a spokesman for the National Chamber of Commerce, expressed opposition to it, although I believe that the American Farm Bureau Federation did not express opposition to all Federal transportation programs. I believe the 50-50 farm-to-market highway program met with its approval.

Among the organizations supporting the legislation are the American Municipal Association, the National Association of County Officials, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Homebuilders, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the National Housing Conference, the American Institute of Planners, the AFL-CIO, the Association of American Railroads, the Railroad Labor Executives Association, the American Transit Association, the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, and a number of State and local chambers of commerce around the country.

Briefly the basic purpose of the bill is to provide assistance to State and local public bodies to help preserve and improve essential mass transportation service in our urban areas. The aim is to help all kinds of commuter service: rail, bus, and transit, whether that service is publicly or privately owned and operated. The aim is to help those cities that have a genuine mass transportation

problem and a legitimate need for public transportation service, whether it involves the giant metropolitan areas of the Nation or the rapidly growing smaller towns of 25,000 or 30,000 population. The aim is not to subsidize unprofitable or inefficient service, but to help finance the capital improvements that will end the causes of the deficit. The assistance could be used to acquire, construct, or rehabilitate such capital facilities and equipment as land, rights-of-way, stations, terminals, buses, rail rolling stock, maintenance facilities, signal equipment, and parking facilities, as long as they are necessary to the development of coordinated and improved public transportation service in the urban area.

Above all, everything is contingent on the development of detailed comprehensive plans for a coordinated urban transportation system that is itself a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area. What this means is that there must be plans for the urban area as a whole, not just a small part of it, which spell out the proposed transportation system for the areas, including both highways and transit. On top of that, the transportation plans must be consistent and coordinated with general comprehensive plans for the urban area which have been prepared in sufficient detail to provide a satisfactory basis for determining the transportation plans.

This is a key provision of the bill, and if I may say so, this provision together with several others, make this one of the most tightly drawn pieces of legislation to come before the Senate.

In fact, I have some fear that the legislation is so tightly drawn that the program may have considerable difficulty getting off the ground once it is enacted. I only hope the administration will exercise discretion and good judgment in drawing the regulations, if this program is enacted, to make sure that the worthy planning ends are not thwarted by the lack of any beginnings.

The committee made several changes which I think have materially strengthened and improved the bill. For one thing, it added language to require that local bodies make their contributions to the project cost in cash. It also added language to protect the rights of private transit carriers and to insure their participation under the program to the maximum extent feasible. The committee incorporated, either in the bill or in the committee report, about 15 or so changes recommended by the General Accounting Office to improve the auditing and administration of the program. And the committee also made sure that no assistance will be used to aid any such ostensible mass transportation system as the monorail at Disneyland, the horse-drawn carriages at Williamsburg, Va., or the cog railway on Mount Washington.

In addition, the basic legislation contains safeguards against more serious matters such as the disappearance of the assistance down a dark hole. It requires that there be satisfactory continuing control over the use of the equipment and facilities to insure that it is used for the purposes intended. For example, if new buses are acquired

to augment service in a certain area of the city to reduce rush-hour traffic congestion, the provision would insure that the buses are not sold off a few months later or used for sightseeing service in conflict with the agreed-upon plan or arrangement.

In essence, the bill provides for a program of matching grants over a 3-year period, not to exceed two-thirds of the net project cost, and not to exceed one-half the cost if the planning is underway but not yet completed and there is an urgent need for the facilities or equipment.

The bill provides \$100 million for the first year, and if I may put this figure in some perspective, this amount to help all the cities throughout the country is just about enough to build 5 to 10 miles of highway in most of our cities today. In Manhattan this amount would build 1 or 2 miles of highway across town.

I had an interesting discussion with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] earlier in this debate, and we recalled that the beltway in Cleveland, consisting of 2.85 miles, cost \$70 million. So, in perspective, the \$100 million for the whole country, when compared with highways, is modest. In a moment I shall explain how this modest amount of money could trigger a great deal more spending throughout the country.

This program would put to work in the Federal Government to solve the mass transportation problems of the country just about as many people as there are policemen engaged in a special program to lessen traffic congestion in lower Manhattan.

The bill provides \$200 million for each of the next 2 years. So you can see that this is a modest program indeed.

Nevertheless I think the amounts in this bill would go a long way and would be of enormous benefit to a great many cities and towns, both large and small.

The reason is simply that the legislation is designed to use the Federal funds as "seed money," as a stimulator to much larger amounts of local and private investment.

The key here is the fact that the Federal funds would be used to share up to two-thirds of the net project cost—that is, that portion of the project cost that cannot be privately financed and supported by revenues from the transit system.

As we know, every transit system derives revenue from the fare box. That revenue, to the extent possible, would be used to float a conventional bond in the private market. Any gap that remained between the cost of the project and the amount that could be privately financed would be met by matching contributions from the Federal and local governments. This calls for a great deal of local effort for the transit program.

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 in the private

market and supported by the estimated surplus revenue of the system. The port authority will cover the remainder of the cost out of its surplus funds.

If the port authority did not have those surplus funds available, and required Federal assistance, the gap or net project cost would be \$25 million, not \$50 million.

Thus a Federal grant of \$16.5 million and a State or local grant of \$8.5 million would trigger a \$50 million project.

Furthermore the Federal grant could be spread over the construction period of several years, thus lessening still further the impact on the Federal budget.

I have used the Delaware Port Authority and Pennsylvania-New Jersey rapid transit program as an example to show how a net project cost is determined; but I emphasize that this program is to be financed locally, out of the local farebox and out of Delaware Port Authority's surplus funds. I take it that that system would not be an applicant under this program.

Another example of how relatively modest amounts of Federal assistance can go a long way can be seen in Los Angeles. Representatives from that city testified eloquently this year on the need for a modern rapid transit system to cope with the burgeoning of the metropolitan area. They outlined a proposal to construct a 22-mile backbone route along the most heavily populated corridor of the city, which would incorporate the latest features in technological development and streamlined style. They made a very impressive case, and I for one earnestly hope the city's efforts will succeed. Those who have studied the proposal estimate that a Federal grant of approximately \$20 million a year for 5 years and a State or local grant of \$10 million a year for the same period would be sufficient to make possible the construction of this \$270 million project. When one thinks of the hundreds of millions of dollars from the Federal Government that have gone into highway construction in Los Angeles, \$20 million a year for rapid transit seems very small indeed. A rapid transit system is essential to the future if Los Angeles is not to lose itself in traffic strangulation.

But there are far more benefits from a modest amount of Federal investment than the multiplier effect I have just described. The San Francisco story is a truly remarkable and dramatic illustration of what I mean.

This November the voters of the San Francisco area will be asked to give their approval to a \$790 million bond issue to finance the most ambitious rapid transit plans in the Nation.

The officials of that city testified that a Federal grant of \$20 million a year over a 10-year period—in effect sharing about 25 percent of the cost of the entire project—would produce measurable savings of over \$600 million to the taxpayers of that area.

First, the Federal grant would reduce the principal and interest on the bond issue by \$383 million. Another \$120 million would be saved in travel time, accident costs, traffic control costs, and the like. It would put the system in opera-

tion 4 years earlier than would otherwise be possible, and that would increase the possibility of saving another \$100 million by meeting the time schedule of the highway department and incorporating the rapid transit in the highway median strip.

Thus I am confident that a little money will go a long way. But that little money is absolutely essential. We have had plenty of plans and studies. The missing ingredient is and always has been money.

I know there are some Senators who think this is just another spending program, and that the taxpayers money will be saved if this program is defeated. The only thing they forget is that people must move, and unless we are willing to undertake a real social and economic upheaval, we must recognize the fact that there are certain periods when great numbers of people must travel at the same time. There are the rush hours, 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours at night, when people must get to and from work. Either they will use public transportation or they will use their automobiles and the highways.

Essential as urban highways are—and they are essential for mass transportation as well as for the automobile user—we have simply not faced up to the enormous social and economic costs of trying to rely exclusively on the highway and the automobile to meet the rush-hour demand.

As I stated earlier, urban highways in built-up areas are extremely expensive, ranging between \$5 and \$20 million a mile. Then once the highway has been built, it will be necessary to improve and widen the local street system to handle the cars pouring off the limited access artery. This usually means the loss of a good many trees, which are one of the most important amenities of any city. Then there is the problem of family dislocation, which is very severe under the urban renewal program; the loss of tax ratable property; increased maintenance; and traffic control costs. When all is said and done, there is still the gigantic problem of finding places to park all the cars.

While much of this confusion may be unavoidable, it seems fairly obvious that where mass transportation can provide a feasible alternative—and it is not necessarily a feasible alternative in every instance—it would be considerably less expensive to preserve or provide the necessary public transportation service than to incur the costs of trying to meet the rush-hour travel demand by highways and automobiles alone.

To give just one example, at the present time about 75,000 New Jersey residents commute by rail into New York City each day. This is not a very large number of people in terms of the total population of New Jersey. But can Senators imagine what it would be like trying to squeeze 75,000, or even only 35,000, more cars through the Lincoln and Holland Tunnels during the rush hours? Unquestionably this additional traffic would create tremendous pressures to widen the approaches on both sides of the tunnels—perhaps even to build another tunnel. And again there would be

the maintenance, traffic control, and parking costs. I hesitate to think how many millions upon millions of dollars this expansion would cost in comparison with the relatively minor amounts which would be needed to preserve the existing commuter service.

So while the bill involves additional spending, there is no question in my mind that we will end by spending much more if this program is not enacted.

But there is an even more important factor than the minimizing of our overall urban transportation costs. That is the relationship between transit and the revitalization of our cities and suburbs. Witness after witness testified that it is an important key to the realization of other urban development goals. It is easy to see why.

We are at present engaged in a vast urban renewal program which depends on private investment for its success. Clearly, traffic congestion discourages private investment in central cities, and thereby makes the task of urban renewal that much more difficult and costly. In the suburbs, transit can be a vital tool to help curb the vast waste and inefficiency of suburban sprawl and help to structure better patterns of suburban development.

With the growing capacity of residential, commercial, and industrial developers to lay out whole new communities and cities in one fell swoop, the opportunities are unparalleled to coordinate transit and highway systems with these land-use developments to create new environments with a vastly higher level of diversity, efficiency, and attractiveness than we have ever before been able to achieve.

So far, I have been talking mostly about the economic factors involved in the bill, but we cannot measure the worth of everything with a dollar sign.

One of the elements that are difficult to measure is the effect of declining transit service on people who are more or less dependent on public transportation to move around.

We like to think of ourselves as a mobile nation. Yet the fact is that perhaps upward of 40 percent of our urban population cannot drive because they are too poor, too young, too old, or too infirm. There are low-income workers to whom a 5-cent or a 10-cent increase in fare each day represents a very serious financial burden.

There are elderly families, I know, who are turned into virtual hermits because the bus or trolley no longer serves their neighborhood.

And I am sure there are numerous suburban wives who wish their husbands would leave the car at home for them once in a while. Also, there are plenty of average-income suburban families who are forced to assume the unwanted financial burden of a second car, because there is no transportation service in their area and there is no other way to meet the needs of both the husband and wife.

There is also the long-suffering commuter, who deserves better transportation vehicles than the vintage relics of another century. And that is not much



of an exaggeration, because I know that on one of the most vital rail links between New Jersey and New York, the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad, some of the cars are more than 50 years old.

And there is the equally long suffering automobile commuter who simply wishes some of the other people would get off the road and leave him a little more room.

Some people suspect that everyone takes this view of mass transportation; but we know that enough people will get off the road if provided with a reasonable alternative.

The New York subway system, which is undertaking an extensive modernization program, had an increase of 20 million riders last year over the number the year before.

Several years ago, the Boston & Albany Railroad was down to about 3,000 riders a day on its highland branch, and was petitioning strenuously for authorization to eliminate all its service. I think the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] in previous colloquy described some of the haste of the Boston & Albany Railroad to end its commuter service. The Boston MTA took over the 11-mile line, linked it up with the subway system, provided some fringe-area parking, and the line is now pushing the figure of 30,000 riders a day.

On Chicago's Congress Street Expressway, a rapid transit line in the median strip, which is operating at only 25 percent of capacity, is already carrying more rush-hour traffic than the highway itself, which, needless to say, is jammed to capacity morning and evening.

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 out to Chestnut Hill. This Operation Northwest, so-called, proved so successful that similar operations have been initiated on other lines coming into town. All told, the experimental operations are now carrying 6.2 million riders a year—an increase of 44 percent over ridership in the year before the experiments began.

#### THE PROBLEM

Thus, Mr. President, I am confident that people will ride transit if it is sufficiently quick, convenient, and reasonably priced. The problem, however, is the declining ability of our rail and bus carriers to maintain existing levels of service, much less make the capital improvements that are so necessary.

Almost all of them are caught in the squeeze of rising capital and operating costs, and declining patronage and revenue during the offpeak hours, even though peak-hour use has remained relatively stable, and is increasing in many areas. As a result, the carriers have been forced into a self-defeating circle of raising fares. Trimming service, and deferring maintenance—which simply drives away more and more riders.

#### PROBLEM OF THE SMALL TOWNS

This problem is particularly acute in the smaller towns, where just as many people, proportionately, are dependent

on public transportation, and where transit is especially important to the economic growth of the community. For example, the mayor of Laurel, Miss., a town of about 30,000, testified before the House committee that the establishment of a public transportation system was essential to the attraction of a new industry which was considering locating there. So he was appearing before the House committee to express very forcefully his opinion and his support of this proposed legislation.

The problem can be illustrated by referring to an editorial, to which I came across not long ago, from the *Fairmont, W. Va., Times*. The editorial, commenting on a fare increase, noted that—

More than 100 bus companies have been forced out of business in West Virginia within a little more than 10 years.

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 other than commuter rail in the country, compiled statistics showing that 145 transit companies have completely abandoned service since 1954; and, 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, service has been restored, but almost invariably at a greatly reduced level, accompanied by higher fares and reduced wages. In 83 cases no replacement at all has been made.

In addition, the American Transit Association estimates that about 60 cities of 25,000 population or more have no public transportation at all.

The only solution to the downward spiral I have been describing is the injection of public funds to bridge the financial gap between the abilities of the private carriers and the needs of the community.

But a very serious problem arises when a State or local government begins searching for an answer to a particular transportation problem. It is faced with the overwhelmingly powerful economic fact that in many cases it needs to put up only 10 percent of the cost of a highway solution, whereas it 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 for a local operator, providing fringe area parking adjacent to a rail or bus station, or whatever.

This situation is obviously not conducive to the establishment of a balanced urban transportation system, using transit where it is logically needed, using highways where they are logically needed, and combining both to achieve an optimum transportation mix.

This legislation is essential if we are to overcome the problem I have mentioned, and if we hope to bring order out of the traffic chaos plaguing so many of our cities today, and that will plague many more of them tomorrow and for years to come. I earnestly believe this program will be both economically prudent and tremendously beneficial to the cities and towns of this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the President on this subject and a joint report on urban transportation by the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator be printed in the *Record* at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and the report were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

REPRINT FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE OF THE PORTION DEALING WITH URBAN TRANSPORTATION

#### 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 areawide 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 carry-

ing 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. Provision 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 grants 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.

#### URBAN TRANSPORTATION—JOINT REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND THE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

Letter of transmittal to the President from the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

- I. Conclusions.
- II. Recommendations.
- III. Supporting information:
  - (a) Urban growth trends.
  - (b) Urban transportation planning: (1) Urban planning assistance programs (sec. 701), (2) highway planning and research program (1½-percent funds), (3) joint efforts.
  - (c) Federal-aid highway program.
  - (d) Present mass transportation programs.
  - (e) Capital requirements and financing for urban mass transportation.
  - (f) Assistance for displaced families and businesses.
  - (g) Research: (1) Highway, (2) mass transportation.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,  
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,  
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have the honor to transmit herewith a report on urban transportation prepared jointly by the Department of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This report was prepared pursuant to your instruction to undertake a study of urban transportation problems and the proper role of the Federal Government in their solution. In carrying out this survey we have drawn heavily upon the excellent reports earlier prepared by committees of the Congress, and staff research conducted over the years by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In addition, we commissioned the Institute of Public Administration to do a special study involving field investigations in some 40 representative urban communities in various parts of the country.

Transportation is one of the key factors in shaping our cities. As our urban communities increasingly undertake deliberate measures to guide their development and renewal, we must be sure that transportation planning and construction are integral parts of general development planning and programming. One of our main recommendations is that Federal aid for urban transportation facilities should be made available only when urban communities have prepared

or are actively preparing up-to-date general plans for the entire urban area which relate transportation plans to land-use and development plans.

The major objectives of urban transportation policy are the achievement of sound land-use patterns, the assurance of transportation facilities for all segments of the population, the improvement in overall traffic flow, and the meeting of total urban transportation needs at minimum cost. Only a balanced transportation system can attain these goals—and in many urban areas this means an extensive mass transportation network fully integrated with the highway and street system. But mass transportation has in recent years experienced capital consumption rather than expansion. A cycle of fare increases and service cuts to offset loss of ridership followed by further declines in use points clearly to the need for a substantial contribution of public funds to support needed mass transportation improvements. We therefore recommend a new program of grants and loans for urban mass transportation.

Even as we undertake this new program for mass transportation, we must press forward with our Federal-aid highway program. Effective mass transportation systems can significantly reduce the need for additional close-in highways, especially at peak hours. But even with extensive reliance on mass transportation and corresponding reduction of highway construction in the central city, total urban highway requirements in the next two decades will be considerably greater than the capacity that will become available if current levels of Federal outlays are sustained.

As you stated last year in your special message to the Congress on highways, we must not allow the progress we make in urban transportation to come at the expense of unnecessary personal hardship to American families. Those displaced by new highway and mass transportation construction should be given relocation assistance comparable to that required under the Federal urban renewal law. Such help becomes all the more imperative as the tempo of needed public construction is stepped up.

We are convinced that the program proposed herewith will contribute significantly to the welfare of our people and the sound growth of our economy.

Respectfully yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,  
Secretary of Commerce.  
ROBERT C. WEAVER,  
Administrator, Housing and Home  
Finance Agency.

#### I. CONCLUSIONS

1. Urban transportation is a major determinant of how people live and work in an urban setting. The type and quality of transportation bears heavily upon questions of concentration versus dispersion of urban populations, growth or decline of central business districts and core cities, the success or failure of urban renewal, housing and public improvement programs, recreational and cultural opportunities, and the relationships of suburbs and smaller outlying cities to the central city and to each other.

2. The different means of urban transportation are closely interrelated. Action on any one mode will affect the others. For example, decisions respecting suburban railroads serving large cities affect the level of automobile use, which in turn affect the efficiency of surface transit. Despite spectacular progress in highway facilities, in no metropolitan area has a freeway system yet been completed. There is need for improvement in coordination and increasing efficiency of transportation in urban areas.

3. Our highways play a vital role in urban transportation and will continue to do so. They provide for the movement of both peo-

ple and goods by private vehicle; and the roadbed for a substantial portion of public mass transportation.

The Bureau of Public Roads will in the future (a) permit the reservation of highway lanes for the exclusive use of specific types of motor vehicles when comprehensive transportation plans indicate this to be desirable, and (b) encourage the development of rail transit and highway facilities in the same right-of-way whenever more effective transportation will result.

4. Increased emphasis on mass transportation is needed because only a balanced system can provide for: (a) The achievement of land use patterns which contribute to the economic, physical, and social well-being of urban areas; (b) the independent mobility of individuals in those substantial segments of the urban population unable to command direct use of automobiles; (c) the improvement in overall traffic flow and time of travel within the urban areas; and (d) desirable standards of transportation at least total cost.

5. Comprehensive planning is the first step in achieving good urban transportation. Planning should be a continuing process and should include all of the interdependent parts of the urban community and all agencies and jurisdictions involved, and should be coordinated with policymaking and administration. Transportation planning should be a part of systematic land use and development planning. It should be for the system as a whole rather than for its individual components—private vehicles, buses, or rail transit.

The Bureau of Public Roads will, in the future, emphasize that highway planning must include the planning of adequate traffic control systems, parking facilities, and circulation systems on city streets commensurate with the volumes and composition of traffic anticipated on freeways and major arterial streets.

6. To make transportation plans effective will require coordinated direction of construction and operations for all parts of the transportation system. The form of direction or coordination will vary from one area to another because of the diversity of political jurisdictions and operating responsibilities for transportation.

7. Mass transportation must be viewed as a public service and often cannot be a profit-making enterprise. While mass transportation is provided on a more or less limited scale in hundreds of localities, it is generally not possible to support a large-scale investment program from the fare box. But the price to the community and the Nation of inadequate mass transportation can be uneconomic uses of land and higher than necessary costs of public facilities, excessive travel, and increasingly aggravated congestion at peak hours.

The most compelling need for mass transportation is during peak periods of movement to and from work. In many areas, it can meet this need better than other forms of transportation. But the offpeak slack means insufficient revenues to cover total operating expenses and needed capital investment. Efforts to cover total costs by increasing fares and decreasing service have proved self-defeating: those who can afford to pay are increasingly impelled to use autos; and the aged, low-income people and others heavily reliant upon public transportation are unduly penalized.

8. In view of the importance of mass transportation for urban development and the impossibility of financing a large capital improvement program from the fare box, a public contribution is clearly needed. Because of the fragmentation of local government in urban areas and their limited means for raising tax funds, substantial Federal financial participation is called for. Without Federal help the most that can be

expected are piecemeal efforts which cannot be effective. Federal assistance on a substantial scale for mass transportation along with continuation of the needed highway program would encourage rational local investment decisions leading to better balanced urban transportation systems. Federal aid for capital improvements would also facilitate levels of services and fares which will attract sufficient users so that mass transportation can make its potential contribution to urban growth and renewal.

9. Every urban community that seeks Federal aid must want good transportation enough to make a substantial contribution of its own. This will give the local people a stake in a sound capital investment program and a pocketbook concern with sound management and efficient operations.

10. Construction of highways and mass transportation facilities frequently cause great hardship to families and businesses which are displaced. Location decisions should take full account of effects on established neighborhoods, and when people and businesses must be displaced, their moving expenses should be paid from public funds and families should be assured of relocation in suitable housing.

11. Long-range progress in urban transportation, as in other fields, must be encouraged by a large and sustained research effort. Through extensive technological and economic research we can look forward to the creation of improved transportation systems which will serve the needs of future urban growth and renewal at minimum total cost.

## II. RECOMMENDATIONS

### General

1. To improve competence in the urban planning process, both the Bureau of Public Roads and the Housing and Home Finance Agency should be enabled to offer to the States and local governments more guidance, increased technical service, and training for personnel in the technical aspects of planning.

2. Suitable relocation housing should be assured to families displaced by federally assisted construction of highways and transit facilities. Also the moving expenses of families and business should be met from Federal funds. Legislative provisions for such assistance should parallel the provisions for the urban renewal program.

### Recommendations for urban mass transportation

1. Mass transportation projects which are parts of comprehensively planned urban transportation systems should be eligible for Federal grants covering two-thirds of project cost which cannot reasonably be financed from expected net revenues. Local or State contributions would have to cover the other one-third of net project cost.

2. For an emergency 3-year period, Federal grants of one-half net project cost should be made available where there is an urgent need to preserve an existing facility or service that otherwise probably would cease to be available for transportation purposes; where an official program for a coordinated transportation system is being actively prepared; and where the assisted project can reasonably be expected to be required for such a system.

3. An authorization for grant contracts of \$500 million should be made available over a 3-year period, with \$100 million authorized in fiscal 1963.

4. Federal loans should continue to be available where private funds cannot be obtained on reasonable terms for financing mass transportation projects. Where a Federal grant is involved, the loan could cover the portion of capital outlay financed from revenues where financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

5. Long-term Federal assistance should be made available only (a) where an organiza-

tion exists empowered to plan for substantially all of the urban area to be served, (b) where transportation planning as a part of comprehensive areawide development planning is being conducted as a continuing process, and (c) where the assisted project will be administered through a public agency as a part of a unified or officially coordinated transportation system for all or substantially all of the urban area.

6. Federal grants and loans should be made only to qualified local public agencies. Such agencies, however, could lease facilities and equipment or make other arrangements for private operation of assisted mass transportation systems.

7. In order to encourage and help finance needed economic and technological research in mass transportation, the \$25 million authorized for the demonstration grant program should be made available for these purposes and an additional \$10 million a year should be authorized for the next 3 fiscal years.

8. Legislative provisions should be made 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.

### Recommendations for urban highway programs

1. Federal-aid secondary funds should be made available for expenditure on extensions of that system in urban areas.

2. Use of Federal-aid highway funds should be permitted for the construction of highway facilities for the exclusive use of specific types of motor vehicles whenever comprehensive transportation plans indicate this to be desirable.

3. Funds for highway research should be augmented by providing that an additional one-half of 1 percent of the funds apportioned to the States for the Federal-aid primary system, the Federal-aid secondary system, and extensions of these systems in urban areas be available for this purpose.

4. The use of Federal-aid highway funds made available for planning and research purposes should be required rather than permissive; the matching of such funds by the States should be required in accordance with statutory matching requirements; and the funds not used for planning and research should lapse.

5. Beginning not later than July 1, 1965, approval of Federal-aid highway programs for projects in any metropolitan area should be made contingent upon a finding by the Secretary of Commerce that such projects are consistent with adequate, comprehensive development plans for the metropolitan area or are based on results of a continuing process carried on cooperatively by the States and local communities and that the Federal-aid system so developed will be an integral part of a soundly based, balanced transportation system for the area involved.

## III. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### A. Urban growth trends

The rate of the urbanization process in the United States in recent decades has been spectacular: 70 percent of the Nation's population now lives in urban areas. For these urban areas, transportation problems have been complicated not only by the tremendous population increase but by the changing pattern of urban growth. In the last decade (1950-60), metropolitan area growth constituted 85 percent of the total national population increase, but more than three-fourths of this growth in the metropolitan areas took place outside of the central cities.

Economic prosperity, coupled with improved mobility, have enabled an increasing number of American families to live in suburban areas. This residential outflow from the central cities has been accompanied by extensive commercial and industrial decentralization and, as a result, urban travel pat-

terns have changed materially from those of former years. There has been a relative decrease and sometimes an absolute decrease, in the numbers of trips to the central business district, while the numbers of crosstown trips have risen rapidly.

These changes, in turn, have greatly affected modes of travel. Since World War II, automobile usage has been increasing while transit patronage has been declining steadily. From 1956 to 1960, the number of revenue passengers carried by buses and streetcars declined by about 22 percent, while the number carried by grade-separated transit declined by only 4 percent. Today, in most urban areas, over 85 percent of the total daily travel is by automobile. On the other hand, at peak hours 40 to 90 percent of the travel to the central business district in our larger cities continues to be made by public mass transportation.

By 1980 the total population of the United States is expected to reach 250 million, and it is anticipated that 3 out of every 4 persons will be living within urban areas. Occupying only about 2 percent of the Nation's land area, the urban areas will contain not only a great concentration of the total population but of commerce and industry as well. Over half of the total population in 1980—some 140 million people—are expected to be living in 40 great urban complexes, each with a population exceeding 1 million.

By the year 2000, less than 40 years hence, the Nation's total population may well reach 350 million. If present trends continue, 85 percent of these people will live in urban areas; more than 50 urban complexes will have attained the million population mark.

These estimated increases and concentrations of population clearly indicate the tremendous demand for transportation facilities for which we now need to plan.

### B. Urban transportation planning

1. Urban planning assistance program (sec. 701): The purpose of the urban planning assistance program (sec. 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended) is to assist State and local governments in dealing with planning problems in metropolitan and other urban areas; to facilitate comprehensive planning for urban development on a continuing basis; and to encourage these governments to establish and improve planning staffs.

Planning grants may be made to State planning agencies for planning assistance to smaller cities and communities either singly or in groups with a population of less than 50,000. Agencies empowered to perform metropolitan or urban regional planning may receive grants directly or through State agencies. Special provisions are made for officially designated redevelopment areas, disaster areas, and federally impacted areas. Finally, grants are available for State and interstate comprehensive urban planning and for related research and coordination.

Emphasis is given to encouraging planning for entire urban areas. Needed technical assistance for planning and organizing to carry out plans on a unified metropolitan or regional basis may be provided by the Housing Administrator.

Under the law, comprehensive planning which may be assisted "includes the following, to the extent directly related to urban needs: (1) preparation, as a guide for long-range development, of general physical plans with respect to the pattern and intensity of land use and the provision of public facilities, including transportation facilities, together with long-range fiscal plans for such development; (2) programming of capital improvements based on a determination of relative urgency, together with definitive financing plans for the improvements to be constructed in the earlier years of the program; (3) coordination of all related plans of the departments or subdivisions of the government concerned; (4) intergovernment-



tal coordination of all related planned activities among the State and local governmental agencies concerned; and (5) preparation of regulatory and administrative measures in support of the foregoing."

The Housing Act of 1961 made two major additions in the basic authority. The first was to explicitly encourage the planning of "coordinated transportation systems" as a part of comprehensive planning. Such planning includes comprehensive urban transportation surveys, studies, and plans to aid in solving problems of traffic congestion, to facilitate the circulation of people and goods in the metropolitan and other urban areas, and to reduce transportation needs. Second, the authorization for appropriations was increased from \$20 million to \$75 million, and the amount of the grant permitted was increased from \$20 to \$75 million, and funds may be used jointly with funds available for planning surveys and investigations under other federally aided programs such as the 1½-percent funds of the highway program.

As of December 31, 1961, section 701 grants had assisted comprehensive planning for 1,922 small communities, 123 metropolitan or regional areas, and 16 States. Grants totaling \$22,285,000 had been approved to that date.

2. Highway planning and research program (1½-percent funds). The annual authorizations made by the Congress for Federal aid for highways are apportioned among the States by methods prescribed by law. Under the Federal-aid legislation, 1½ percent of the funds so apportioned annually to each State are earmarked for highway planning and research.

This provision, as initiated in legislation of 1934, applied to planning only; research was added by legislation of 1944. As now codified in section 307(c) of "Title 23—Highways," United States Code, the legislation provides that—

"Not to exceed 1½ percent of the sums apportioned for any years to any State \* \* \* shall be available for expenditure upon request of the State highway department, with the approval of the Secretary (of Commerce), with or without State funds, for engineering and economic surveys and investigations, for the planning of future highway programs and the financing thereof, for studies of the economy, safety, and convenience of highway usage and the desirable regulation and equitable taxation thereof, and for research necessary in connection with the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of highways and highway systems, and the regulation and taxation of their use."

While no specific proportion of the 1½-percent funds is designated for urban planning, it will be noted that both planning and research in planning are included in the descriptive list of work for which the funds may be used. The States are responsible for initiation of programs of planning and research projects to be undertaken with the 1½-percent funds, and the overall needs in each field in each individual State are the basic criteria used by Public Roads in reviewing the programs for approval.

In recent years the 1½-percent funds have been used to great advantage in many States in conducting a variety of studies related to urban highway planning. Many of the studies have ultimately produced actual capital improvement programs which are now under construction.

While the Federal-aid legislation does not require each State to use all of the 1½-percent funds allotted to it for planning and research, nor is statutory matching required (10-percent State matching for interstate funds; 50-percent State matching for A-B-C funds), it has been Public Roads' policy in the past to urge them to do so.

As with the Federal-aid funds for highway construction, the 1½-percent funds are

not advanced to the States prior to use. The Federal-aid share of the cost of projects is claimed by the States on a reimbursement basis, subject to Public Roads' audit.

3. Joint efforts. The Department of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Agency have agreed to the use of highway and urban planning funds jointly in an urban area where local and State bodies are prepared to establish coordinated planning. Both agencies are pledged to stimulate and cooperate in a continuing process of planning and development coordination which will—

(1) Give consideration to all forces, public and private, shaping the physical development of the total community.

(2) Cover land uses and controls as well as plans for physical development and combine all elements of urban development and redevelopment into a clear-cut, comprehensive plan of what the citizens want their community to become.

(3) Cover the entire urban area within which the forces of development are interrelated.

(4) Involve in the planning process the political jurisdictions and agencies which make decisions affecting development of the metropolitan area.

(5) Link the process of planning to action programs.

The objective of this joint effort is not merely a planning process but the development of effective cooperation and coordination both among the local governments within a metropolitan area, and between these governments and the State and Federal agencies involved in area development activities. In this way it can be assured that transportation will play its proper part in serving and helping to shape the community in the form its citizens desire.

Interagency committees have been set up at the national and regional level to promote better understanding of the cooperative approach and to aid in working out necessary arrangements. Although these arrangements have been in force for only a short time, excellent joint planning programs have been initiated in key areas and an increasing number are in the negotiation stage. Joint planning programs are underway in 16 areas, and consideration is being given to the initiation of programs in 22 additional areas.

#### C. The Federal-aid highway program

The Federal-aid highway program is contributing substantially to the solution of the urban transportation problem. Construction of the 41,000-mile Interstate System is well underway. Financing of the 90-percent Federal share of its total \$41 billion cost has been assured by Federal legislation which has provided sufficient revenue to the highway trust fund for both the interstate and the regular Federal-aid highway programs. Over 5,000 miles, or 13 percent, of the Interstate System are in urban areas, and they will account for 45 percent of the total expenditure—the latter figure closely paralleling the proportion of total system travel generated in the urban areas.

On the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems the urban portions total 33,000 miles of city streets and expressways. Federal-aid funds for the improvement of these systems (commonly called the A-B-C program) are traditionally authorized biennially by the Congress, the latest provision being \$925 million for each of the fiscal years 1962 and 1963. These funds are matched 50-50 by the States. Under the Federal legislation, 45 percent of the A-B-C Federal aid is for work on the primary system (either rural or urban portions), 30 percent for the secondary system, and 25 percent specifically for the urban portions of the two systems. Projects costing \$1.5 billion were completed in fiscal year 1961 under the A-B-C program,

and 29 percent of this was spent in urban areas.

The construction of new highways and the improvement of existing streets and highways is an essential part of the urban transportation program. New and improved facilities are needed to provide for the movement of goods as well as for personal travel by automobile. In addition, freeways, with improved feeder routes, make possible the development of freeway bus systems to serve public mass transit needs.

It is essential that the Federal-aid highway programs, including the provisions for urban highway construction, continue undiminished. No increases in authorizations are recommended at the present time. However, greater flexibility in the use of Federal-aid highway funds to meet urban transportation needs can be provided by amending the Federal-aid highway legislation to permit the State highway departments to use Federal-aid secondary funds on extensions of that system in urban areas. Federal participation in projects on such extensions is now generally limited to urban funds. This will be particularly helpful in certain States containing many individual and grouped urban areas that are finding it increasingly difficult to improve the extensions of Federal-aid secondary routes into urban areas because the improvement of arterial streets in larger cities has a greater priority for the use of available urban funds.

Studies have indicated that under certain conditions the reservation of highway lanes for the exclusive use of specific types of motor vehicles will assist in solving urban transportation problems.

Also, in some instances, more effective urban transportation will result from the development of rail transit and highway facilities in the same right-of-way. However, the additional cost occasioned by the rail facilities could not be borne by highway funds; moreover, many rail rights-of-way needed for a balanced system will require corridors separate from freeways.

#### D. Present mass transportation programs

As recommended by the President in his special message on our Nation's housing, national concern with the importance of mass transportation for urban development was first recognized in Federal law by the enactment of the Housing Act of 1961. That act provided for two new assistance programs for urban mass transportation to be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. These were in addition to strengthening the urban planning assistance program, as discussed in an earlier section.

First is a program of loans for financing the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and improvement of mass transportation facilities and equipment. Loans may be made to State and local public agencies where such financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. Where economically warranted, loans may have maturities as long as 40 years, and they must be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment. The facilities and equipment acquired with such loan may be operated by the borrowing agency or by private firms or other public agencies under a lease or other approved arrangement.

In order to assure that proposed improvements are in conformance with sound planning, the law requires that there is being actively developed (or has been developed) for the whole area served by the applicant, a program for the development of a comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation system and that the proposed facilities or equipment will be required for such a system. There is a further administrative requirement that the mass transportation program shall be a part of a comprehensively planned transportation system, including highways, to serve the urban growth and

renewal needs of the area. These requirements may be waived where there is an immediately urgent need for the provision of facilities or equipment to be commenced prior to the time that the planning program could reasonably be expected to be completed.

Loans up to a total of \$50 million are authorized. Loan commitments under the present program cannot be made after December 31, 1962.

The second new program provides contract authority of \$25 million in Federal grants for mass transportation demonstration projects. The Federal grant may cover two-thirds of the cost of projects which will assist in carrying out urban transportation plans and research. They may include the development of data and information of general applicability on the reduction of urban transportation needs, the improvement of mass transportation service, and the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost. Federal grants may not be used for major long-term capital improvements.

The purpose of the program is to stimulate fresh thinking and experimental undertakings which will bring about improved service and greater efficiency in the mass transportation field. Small as well as large cities all over the country are interested in experimenting with changes in levels of service and fare structures, technological improvements, and improvements of the relations of mass transportation to other parts of the urban transportation complex. They have difficulty in raising their one-third contribution to the cost, however, since the demonstrations are expected to have general applicability to similar localities. The exclusion of major long-term capital improvements from eligibility for Federal assistance also makes many worthwhile projects ineligible.

A combined appropriation of \$42.5 million is available in the fiscal year 1962 for both the new mass transportation demonstration grant program and the loan program.

#### *E. Capital requirements and financing for urban mass transportation*

Total capital requirements for mass transportation in the next decade are estimated at \$9.8 billion by the Institute of Public Administration in its report to the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing Administrator. The estimates are rough approximations and probably on the conservative side, but they are based on intensive study of published information and on-the-spot investigations in 26 urban regions.

In the smaller cities, a recent survey by the American Transit Association revealed that 69 percent of their membership responding to a questionnaire indicated that replacement of buses was their most pressing problem, and 42 percent indicated that an outright subsidy was the only form of assistance which could be effective because of their condition.

The major purposes to be served by the estimated \$9.8 billion total investment requirements are presently planned new systems, \$2.8 billion; extensions of existing systems, \$1.7 billion; rehabilitation and replacement, \$4.3 billion; new projects now being considered for initiation in the next decade, \$1 billion. For all these purposes, rights-of-way and structures are estimated at \$6.4 billion and rolling stock at \$3.4 billion.

It is not possible at this time to estimate precisely the amount of Federal grant and loan assistance that will be needed in the next decade to enable urban areas to make the investments that will be required if mass transportation is to make its proper contribution to sound urban development and renewal. As the first stage in a long-range program, we recommend that \$500 million in Federal grants be made available over the next 3 years, that the present \$50 million

loan authority be made permanent, and that adequate funds be provided from grant authorizations for undertaking and stimulating badly needed economic and technical research and development in urban transportation. The progress that cities and urban regions can make in the next 3 years in planning and programing their comprehensive transportation systems and the experience gained in analyzing applications for Federal assistance will give a greatly improved basis for estimating long-term needs.

The recommended program of Federal grants would cover two-thirds of the net cost of capital outlays for mass transportation projects. Any net revenues which can reasonably be expected from transit operations would be used to support as much as possible of total project cost. The amount that fare collections can reasonably be expected to exceed operating costs depends on detailed analysis of each situation.

Many bus systems can meet most of their equipment costs from revenues if they can obtain loan funds on reasonable terms. To make their proper contribution to urban transportation, however, service of many systems must be improved and offered at reasonable fares. Such service improvements may cost more than the fare box will carry. There may also be requirements for substantial investment in fixed facilities such as separate rights-of-way and boarding facilities which cannot be fully amortized from revenues.

Net receipts also may cover a large part of the cost of rolling stock for urban rail systems, depending on the total position of the system. But experience indicates that in most circumstances the heavy investments now required for rights-of-way, rail installation, and subway construction cannot be covered from the fare box.

Except in truly emergency situations, the investment of Federal, State, or local public funds in mass transportation is justified only where the facilities are part of a comprehensive transportation system which is designed to serve the prospective growth and renewal needs of the whole urban area and is administered on a fully coordinated basis. This kind of planning, programming, and organization takes time to develop. Many areas have undertaken the process, but only a few are well advanced in making it truly comprehensive.

Federal planning assistance through the section 701 urban planning assistance program and the use of 1½-percent highway research and planning funds is stimulating a great increase in State and local urban planning efforts. Mass transportation will not receive proper attention in planning and action programs, however, unless local officials see the realistic possibility of installing and effectively operating the systems which would be called for in good planning. Such a possibility usually is doubtful if the urban areas must look forward to covering the total public cost of good mass transportation from their own limited tax resources. This is the basic reason for recommending a Federal program to cover two-thirds of such cost.

The demand for Federal grants probably will be moderate in the early years of the program because of essential planning and administrative requirements, but if these requirements for sound urban development are to be met, local communities must have reasonable assurance that Federal support will be available when needed for investments in mass transportation.

#### *F. Assistance for displaced families and businesses*

Thousands of families and businesses are caused great hardship by the construction of highways, mass transportation routes, and other public improvements. The Bureau of Public Roads estimates that about 15,000 families and 1,500 businesses will be displaced each year in the next 6 to 8 years by the completion of the Interstate Highway

System. Family displacements by federally assisted urban renewal activities are running about 30,000 a year and are expected to average more than 35,000 a year over the next decade. Around 4,000 businesses are being displaced annually by urban renewal. Another 30,000 to 35,000 families a year are estimated to be displaced by other public actions in urban areas. This means that some 85,000 urban families have to move each year because of public action, much of it assisted with Federal funds.

Under the federally assisted urban renewal program, families must be assured the availability of decent, safe, and sanitary housing when they are displaced by demolitions, code enforcement, and other urban renewal activities. Also the moving expenses of families and businesses are paid from Federal urban renewal program funds. For families needing such assistance, the average payment is about \$65. The average payment to businesses is about \$1,150.

In order to alleviate hardship caused by public action and to provide equity in treatment, provisions similar to those for urban renewal should be made in the Federal-aid highway program and also in other federally assisted programs causing displacements.

#### *G. Urban transportation research*

Extensive research must be undertaken to improve the technology of urban transportation and to furnish public officials and industry dependable information on the relations among different forms of transportation and the rest of the urban economy. As summarized by the Institute of Public Administration:

"Topics on which work is needed include improvement of vehicles, roadbeds, power systems, traffic control systems, and other technology; methods of projecting demand for urban transportation; influence of different modes of transportation on urban development and land use; determinants of individual transportation behavior; costs and pricing of different transportation modes; and administering and financing urban transportation systems."

1. Highway research.—The Bureau of Public Roads, since its very beginning in 1893, has had an important influence in highway research, both through the efforts of its own staff and through its leadership and guidance to others. With the authority for use by the States of the 1½-percent funds for research, since 1944, the Bureau's influence has been broader than ever.

In addition to studies related to the physical problems of roadbuilding and maintenance, a great deal of Public Roads research in more recent years has been directed toward the problems of planning, design, and operation of highways. Mathematicians, geographers, city planners, and psychologists are now included in the Public Roads staff. Work accomplished or underway, either directly or by sponsorship, varies broadly. As examples may be cited studies of human behavior as related to driving; evaluation of economic and social effects of highways; methods of forecasting highway usage, tax revenues, and needs; correlation of travel with such factors as land use and employment; and evaluation of electronic controls for driver and vehicle guidance. Much of this research is oriented directly toward urban transportation problems.

Since 1944 the Bureau of Public Roads has participated with the State highway departments in conducting travel habit studies designed to provide factual data needed for urban transportation planning. The early studies were pioneering efforts and their analyses left much to be desired, especially in projecting future travel desires. However, these studies continue to be a basic planning tool, and analyses of the data collected and tabulated in one city after another have led to the establishment of quantitative measures of the basic relations between travel



desires and land use and other social and economic factors of the metropolitan area. The establishment of these quantitative measures has made possible the integration of transportation and general land use planning, which is now deemed essential for realistic planning. It is now possible to study the interaction that exists between transportation and economic development and land use.

It is essential that research be continued and expanded to provide more precise planning study techniques; to search more deeply into the factors affecting urban development; to quantify more accurately the relationships between land use and travel; and to learn more about the attitudes and desires, with regard to all aspects of urban living, of the individual citizen.

Research is also essential in transportation technology—both of the vehicle and of the roadbed—if planning is truly to prepare for the future.

It is believed that the Federal Government has a responsibility to stimulate additional highway research activities in the Federal-State cooperative area. To accomplish this, an additional one-half of 1 percent should be made available from funds apportioned to the States for the Federal-aid primary system, the Federal-aid secondary system, and extensions of these systems in urban areas (the A-B-C program) for highway research purposes. This additional one-half of 1 percent, together with State matching funds, would amount to almost \$10 million annually. This sum would be in addition to the present 1½ percent which is currently being used for highway planning and highway research.

2. Research in mass transportation.—Work is needed to improve transportation facilities and equipment including model and prototype construction, with emphasis on transit vehicles and power systems, traffic signaling, automatic controls, and methods of construction. It is essential to stimulate and support experimentation with new equipment and systems to test their practicality and demonstrate their effectiveness in improving and reducing the total cost of urban transportation.

Outstanding among the many studies which need to be made of the economics of urban transportation are questions of why groups of people choose different means of urban travel under various conditions and how their choices would be affected by changes in the quality and cost of different kinds of private and public transportation that might be made available. Planning and investment decisions for highways and mass transportation are profoundly affected by what people believe about the answers to these questions. But there is little systematic knowledge on which to base these beliefs. The administration, therefore, has requested the Congress to appropriate funds for a substantial study of these problems by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This study would start with analysis of information which has been developed in the course of urban transportation planning and would be coordinated with related studies supported by the Bureau of Public Roads.

The Housing Administrator should be given broad authority to conduct urban transportation research and development projects. Depending on what is most appropriate for the particular project, the studies and research should be carried on by Agency staff or be made under agreement or contract with other Government agencies, universities, the National Academy of Sciences, nongovernmental research agencies, State and local governments, or individuals. It is recommended that the funds authorized last year for mass transportation demonstration grants be made available for those purposes by modifications of present legislation. An additional \$10 million a year for the next 3 years also should be provided from the capital grant funds proposed for the new

mass transportation assistance program. Such broad authority and substantial financing are required to make a good start toward basic improvements in urban mass transportation technology and economics.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is a source of great satisfaction and pride to me to be chairman of a great committee of the Senate, the Banking and Currency Committee. It was organized to consider the Federal Reserve Act, which was sponsored by my predecessor, Carter Glass. It has brought to the Senate some very fine bills for the improvement of our banking and other financial institutions, housing, transportation, and many other matters.

It is always a source of regret to me when I find myself in disagreement with a majority of the members of that committee. Unfortunately, this is a bill with respect to which that occurs. I could not support the bill as finally agreed upon in the committee. Therefore, I filed minority views, indicating my objections to the bill and, unless the bill be materially changed, I intend to vote against it on final passage.

Since it is not contemplated that we shall complete action on the bill—in fact, I understand that very shortly it will be set aside to take up several other less controversial measures—I send to the desk three amendments and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

I also ask unanimous consent that the three amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD, accompanied by brief explanations of each amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEARSON in the chair). The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments and explanations will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments and explanations ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ROBERTSON to the bill (S. 3615) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

In section 202(d) of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, strike out in the proviso "1962" and insert in lieu thereof "1963."

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

I submit an amendment to the mass transportation bill, S. 3615, which would be in the nature of a substitute. My amendment would strike out all after the enacting clause, and in lieu thereof would extend the present experimental mass transportation program for 1 additional year, until December 31, 1963.

Under present law, the experimental program provides for demonstration grants and for loans. No time limit is placed upon demonstration grants, but on loans the act provides "that no such loan shall be made, except under a prior commitment, after December 31, 1962." My amendment would change the year to 1963.

While my amendment would extend the time limit of the loan program for another year, it would provide no additional grant or loan funds. None are needed beyond provisions in existing law. The Housing Act of 1961, which established the temporary ex-

perimental program, authorized as much as \$25 million in grants to local public agencies for demonstration projects from grant funds authorized for urban renewal. Through September 11 of this year, only two applications, totaling \$234,400, had been approved for demonstration grants.

Active pending applications totaled \$7,275,000, according to preliminary estimates made by applicants to the Office of Transportation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In other words, more than two-thirds of the original grant authorizations would remain unobligated even if all active pending applications were approved.

For loans under the experimental mass transportation program, the Housing Act of 1961 authorized \$50 million. Through September 11, two loans, totaling \$10,734,400, had been approved. An active loan application for \$300,000 was on hand. Nearly \$40 million, in other words, remained available.

I submit for the RECORD at this point a table, prepared by the HHFA Office of Transportation, showing the application status for grants and loans under the mass transportation program as of September 11, 1962.

For both grants and loans, therefore, unused authority substantially exceeds the amount of approvals and active pending applications. Unused authority well exceeds the amount of approvals likely to be made within the coming year.

Adoption of my amendment would permit the present demonstration grant program to continue unchanged. It would permit the present loan program to be extended for an additional year to the end of 1963. Meanwhile, we can analyze further the many controversial features of the proposed permanent mass transportation spending program before coming to a final decision.

*Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of Transportation—Application status as of Sept. 11, 1962*

APPLICATIONS APPROVED	
Demonstration grant program:	
City of Detroit, Mich.....	\$224,400
University of Washington (Seattle monorail study) ..	10,000
Loan program:	
Passenger Service Improvement Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.....	3,000,000
Chicago Transit Authority..	7,500,000
Total.....	10,734,400

APPLICATIONS PENDING	
Demonstration grant program:	
Massachusetts Transportation Commission, Commonwealth of Massachusetts .....	3,600,000
National Capital Compact Negotiating Commission...	30,000
Southeastern Pennsylvania transportation compact....	3,000,000
Tri-State Transportation Committee (New York-New Jersey-Connecticut):	
New Brunswick project....	175,000
Long Island project.....	180,000
Memphis Transit Authority..	190,000
*Greater Orlando Port Authority .....	(12,600,000)
Port Authority of Allegheny County .....	100,000
*City of Minneapolis.....	(1,200,000)
*City of Ithaca, N.Y.....	(100,000)
Loan program:	
City of Fresno, Calif.....	300,000
*Bi-State Development Agency (St. Louis metropolitan area) .....	(15,000,000)
Total.....	7,575,000

NOTES.—1. Federal loan or grant figures shown under "Applications pending" are approximate and are based on preliminary estimates by applicants.

2. Applications marked with an asterisk (\*) have been awaiting further information from the applicants for some time and appear to be inactive. Amounts shown are not included in totals.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ROBERTSON to the bill (S. 3615) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes:

On page 5, line 24, strike out "two-thirds" and insert in lieu thereof "one-half".

On page 7, line 15, strike out "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof "one-third".

On page 7, line 17, strike out "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof "one-third".

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

I submit an amendment that would place Federal grants for mass transportation on a 50-50 basis, under section 4 of S. 3615. The bill now calls for two-thirds Federal and one-third local grants. A 50-50 formula would be in line with the grant ratio prevailing in a number of programs in the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. amendment would place the emergency program, under section 5 of the bill, upon a one-third Federal and two-thirds local grant basis. The bill now provides for one-half Federal and one-half local grant. Under my amendment, localities would be encouraged to complete their planning programs as soon as feasible in order to move away from the one-third Federal grant formula in the emergency program to the regular long-range program with one-half Federal grants.

Under S. 3615, a total of \$500 million would be made available for Federal grants over a period of 3 years. My amendment, permitting grants under the long-range program to be made on a 50-50 basis, could spread this \$500 million in aid over mass transit projects with a net cost of as much as \$1 billion. The present provision of S. 3615, requiring two-thirds Federal grants under the long-range program, would limit the \$500 million in Federal grant aid to projects costing \$750 million.

If deficits in the Federal budget occur in the future as often as in the past, this new mass transit spending program would, in effect, be underwritten by deficit financing through Treasury borrowing and increased public debt. To assure that such aid would go as far as possible, I believe that grants under the long-range features of this proposed program should be made not on a two-thirds basis but under a 50-50 ratio.

The two-thirds Federal and one-third local grant formula now in this mass transportation bill is the same ratio that is applicable to most projects in the urban renewal program. But no detailed calculations were presented to the committee to justify why a Federal grant formula for mass transit should be equivalent to the two-thirds Federal grant formula for most urban renewal projects.

Evidence from other permanent Federal transportation programs, on the other hand, indicates that a 50-50 grant ratio for mass transportation would represent a consistent policy. Such a ratio now exists, for example, in the Federal grant program for local airport development. A 50-50 grant formula is also applicable to Federal programs for primary, secondary, and urban highway construction.

This mass transportation bill would establish a permanent Federal spending program. According to the proponents of the bill, we know that \$500 million will represent only the beginning. In fact, the bill would provide that after the first year, the

annual rate of grant authorizations would be as much as \$200 million a year. The HHFA Administrator himself, in testifying before the Senate Housing Subcommittee at page 84 of the hearings, indicated that:

"The proposed authorization of \$500 million in Federal grants for a 3-year period represents the first stage in a long-range program."

Under the circumstances, I believe that a 50-50 grant-aid ratio would help to assure that available Federal funds for this permanent program would be used more widely than under the ratio now in the bill. By requiring a substantial local financial stake in a proposed project, a 50-50 grant-aid ratio would help to encourage the development of economical—rather than extravagant—local mass transportation plans.

For all these reasons, I offer my amendment to place the long-range program on a sound 50-50 basis.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ROBERTSON to the bill (S. 3615) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes:

On page 6, beginning with line 5, strike out all through line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) To finance grants under this Act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated at any time after enactment of this Act not to exceed \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 1963, \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 1964, and \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 1965: *Provided*, That any amount authorized but not appropriated for any fiscal year may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, the Administrator may make advance or progress payments on account of any grant made pursuant to this Act."

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

I offer an amendment to restore the language of the original bill (S. 3126) calling for mass transit grants to be made through the normal appropriations process rather than through contract authority as S. 3615 provides.

My amendment would reinstate the original appropriations authority in the bill. It would be the same financing provision that the HHFA Administrator supported in testifying before the Senate Housing Subcommittee.

In requiring annual appropriations rather than contract authority, my amendment would not change the maximum amount of funds that would be authorized for the fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965. My amendment would, however, permit the Congress to review the mass transportation program each year before it appropriates whatever money it believes to be needed.

Under the present bill, on the other hand, the HHFA Administrator would be authorized to enter into contracts to spend up to the limits set by the bill before any money was actually provided. Then the Congress would have to appropriate whatever funds were required to honor the contracts.

My amendment, calling for prior appropriations before contracts could be entered into, would tend to encourage the conservation of Federal funds. It would help to assure that available Federal aid was used with maximum effectiveness and timeliness. The contract authority now in the bill would tend to encourage spending in the absence of annual congressional appropriations control over the program.

As the Comptroller General of the United States pointed out in a letter, dated May

16, which appears in the printed hearings beginning at page 45:

"\* \* \* the need to appropriate funds supplies the best incentives and the most effective techniques for congressional control of agency activities."

The recent differences of opinion between the House and Senate Appropriations Committees indicate, in my opinion, the importance the Congress attaches to the appropriations process.

I understand that some proponents of S. 3615 favor contract authority, rather than appropriations authority, as a means of assuring continuity in the mass transportation program in order to encourage the development of long-range local plans. Nothing in my own amendment would hinder the formulation of such plans. In supporting the original mass transit bill, the HHFA Administrator himself called for appropriations authority. He said in his testimony before the Senate Housing Subcommittee (at p. 84 of the printed hearings) that:

"We anticipate that grants (under prior appropriations) would be made rather slowly in the initial period of the program. The knowledge that such grants are available, however, would give local officials the assurance that it would be possible to finance the investments in mass transportation which would be called for in good planning. The authorization would therefore provide an incentive and underpinning for proper attention to mass transportation in planning and action programs."

In presenting the original bill (S. 3126) calling for appropriations, the administration apparently felt that \$100 million in appropriations authority for the first year and \$200 million for each of the following 2 years would be adequate to provide continuity of aid for whatever long-range local plans might be under development. Once appropriated, these funds would, of course, remain available until expended. In this connection, section 10(d) of the present bill reads in part as follows:

"All funds appropriated under this Act for other than administrative expenses shall remain available until expended."

Substantially the same language was in the original bill (S. 3126).

Actually, the contract authority provided in the present bill would assure no greater continuity of Federal aid than would be provided under the annual appropriations authority in my amendment. Under contract authority as well as appropriations authority, no aid could be extended in excess of the limits set by the bill. In this sense, contract authority would merely assure that congressional control over this new permanent Federal spending program would be minimized. That is no way, in my opinion, to protect the public interest.

Even without this mass transit bill, we are confronted today by back-door and side-door permanent Federal spending programs of excessive dimensions. Unfunded contract authorizations exceeded \$11.7 billion at the end of June 1962, according to the Treasury Department. Unused authorizations outstanding to expend from debt receipts exceeded \$27 billion. These authorizations, in effect, represent blank checks on the Treasury that could be tendered without prior notice, regardless of other needs for funds.

My amendment should help to assure that the mass transit spending program will proceed in a more orderly manner. It should help to assure that this new program will receive adequate annual congressional scrutiny. It will also restore to the bill the original financing provision that has been supported by the administration.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, one of the amendments is a brief substitute for the whole bill. It strikes out everything in the bill and merely provides



that the present law on this subject be continued for 1 year. This gives us more time to consider more fully the step that we are taking, which will ultimately cost billions of dollars in the future.

In case that amendment is not adopted, in an effort to bring the bill more in line with my thinking on the subject, another amendment would provide that the Federal contribution toward the net project costs of mass transit projects shall be no more than 50 percent. Most cities are now in better financial condition than is the Federal Government. We closed this past fiscal year with a budget deficit of \$6 billion-plus. We can now see a \$4½ billion deficit for the current fiscal year. If the President spends all of the emergency funds, including the \$900 million public works expenditure which Congress recently authorized, and if, in addition, there is a tax cut in the neighborhood of \$10 billion, we could easily have a \$16 billion deficit in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

If the pending bill passes, it will be an additional unbudgeted item. Therefore I have proposed an amendment that the contributions by the Federal Government be cut to no more than 50 percent.

The third amendment would provide that only appropriated funds may be spent. That is in accordance with the language of the House bill. The bill as reported by the Senate committee authorizes what is called contract authority, but we know from experience in highway and road matters and in other Federal programs that when contracts are entered into with the approval of the Federal Government, an obligation is established which must be honored. We cannot contract and then repudiate the contract.

So I have submitted these amendments, which I intend to offer, and have asked that they be printed in the *RECORD*, along with brief explanations—one a substitute for the whole; one for a 50-50 sharing of net costs; and one for the expenditure of no money except pursuant to appropriations bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I take this opportunity to express a personal observation. For 4 years I have felt that one of the greatest privileges I have enjoyed has been the opportunity to serve on the committee of which the junior Senator from Virginia is the distinguished chairman. I have thanked him for his aid and assistance before, and would like to do so again. I was on the Housing Subcommittee when this transportation bill came to it. In every way the junior Senator from Virginia has expedited the work of that subcommittee, and also the work of the full committee, notwithstanding some reservations about certain minor parts of the bill. He has been gracious enough, to designate one of the junior members of the committee to report the bill and be in charge of it on the floor.

I wish to make a final observation, which is not germane to the amendments which have been sent to the desk by the Senator from Virginia. The peo-

ple of my State of New Jersey have a great affection for the junior Senator from Virginia. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I talk about my chairman in New Jersey. It was my privilege and pleasure to propose that the junior Senator from Virginia be a part of the New Jersey Tercentenary Commission, which he is; and in that connection we have battled side by side to get a little money for our commission. I hope we shall be successful.

These are purely personal observations, but I feel them very deeply.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am deeply touched by the tribute my friend and colleague has paid me. It has been a great pleasure to serve with him on the Banking and Currency Committee. It has been a pleasure to work with him both for bills that I personally have approved and for bills he has advocated, whether I have approved of them or not.

In our committee we are tending somewhat toward the British system in the House of Commons, a man is assigned to the chairmanship of a committee for each bill that goes before it, and he is merely the presiding officer. He is not supposed to be either for or against the bill, or to try to tell the committee what it has to do. While under our system it is the privilege of the chairman, especially if he is senior to other members of the committee, to give some indication of his personal views, his primary purpose as chairman is to preside and to let the committee vote what the majority thinks the committee should do.

It was in that spirit that I felt that, while personally I thought this bill went too far, the proponents were entitled to be heard. The majority wanted the bill; the majority got it reported; the majority will have an opportunity to ask the support of the entire Senate body within the near future on final passage.

In the meantime, it is with personal reluctance, because of my great friendship and high regard for my colleague from New Jersey, who is so interested in this subject and has performed such an excellent service over a period of months in preparing this measure, that I interpose any objection.

I will not belabor the point. I have submitted three amendments. I have indicated what they are. I have sent to the desk three brief statements. I am not going through the statements at length. I have asked that they be printed in the *RECORD*, so that any Senator who wishes to do so may read them. When the amendments are called up, they will be explained briefly and the Senate can then work its will.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE UNITED STATES IN THE SPACE RACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, speaking at Rice University on September 13, President Kennedy announced the determination of this administration to compete in the space race with all our might and vigor. He rightly pointed out that space is there and that it is going to be penetrated and conquered by man. The United States cannot sit back and let others win control of space merely because it is a new element with respect to which the practical advantages of space exploration and manned space flight may not be immediately apparent. The fact is, as the President emphasized, space will be used for harmful purposes if it is not preempted by the United States for peaceful and scientific purposes. We have the skill and resources to be first in this race. We cannot afford to be second.

I ask unanimous consent to make the transcript of President Kennedy's remarkable address a matter of full public record.

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

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 1962]

### TRANSCRIPT OF KENNEDY REMARKS ON SPACE CHALLENGE

Following is President Kennedy's speech at Rice University in Houston yesterday, furnished by station KPRC, Houston, and recorded by the New York Times:

President K. S. Pitzer (of Rice), Mr. Vice President, Governor, Congressman (Albert) Thomas, Senator (Alexander) Wiley, and Congressman (George P.) Miller, Mr. (James E.) Webb, Bell scientists, distinguished guests and ladies and gentlemen.

I appreciate your president having made me an honorary visiting professor and I will assure you that my first lecture will be very brief.

I am delighted to be here and I'm particularly delighted to be here on this occasion. We meet at a college noted for knowledge, in a city noted for progress, in a State noted for strength. And we stand in need of all three.

For we meet in an hour of change and challenge; in a decade of hope and fear; in an age of both knowledge and ignorance. The greater our knowledge increases the greater our ignorance unfolds.

Despite the striking fact that most of the scientists that the world has ever known are alive and working today, despite the fact that this Nation's own scientific manpower is doubling every 12 years in a rate of growth more than three times that of our population as a whole, despite that, the vast stretches of the unknown and the unanswered and the unfinished still far outstrip our collective comprehension.

No man can fully grasp how far and how fast we have come, but condense, if you will, the 50,000 years of man's recorded history in a timespan of but half a century. Stated in these terms we know very little about the first 40 years, except at the end of them advanced man had learned to use the skins of animals to cover him.

### PACE CALLED BREATHTAKING

Then about 10 years ago under this standard man emerged from his cave to construct other kinds of shelter. Only 5 years ago man learned to write and use a cart with wheels.

Christianity began less than 2 years ago. The printing press came this year and then less than 2 months ago, during this whole 50-year span of human history, the steam

engine provided a new source of power. Newton explored the meaning of gravity.

Last month, electric lights and telephones and automobiles and airplanes became available. Only last week did we develop penicillin and television and nuclear power.

And now if America's new spacecraft succeeds in reaching Venus, we will have literally reached the stars before midnight tonight. This is a breathtaking pace and such a pace cannot help but create new ills as it dispels old, new ignorance, new problems, new dangers.

Surely the opening vistas of space promise high costs and hardships as well as high reward. So it is not surprising that some would have us stay where we are a little longer, to rest, to wait. But this city of Houston, this State of Texas, this country of the United States was not built by those who waited and rested and wished to look behind them.

This country was conquered by those who move forward and so will space. William Bradford, speaking in 1630 of the founding of the Plymouth Bay Colony, said that all great and honorable actions are accompanied with great difficulties and both must be enterprised and overcome with answerable courage. If this capsule history of our progress teaches us anything, it is that man in his quest for knowledge and progress is determined and cannot be deterred.

#### SEES GREAT ADVENTURE

The exploration of space will go ahead whether we join in it or not, and it is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space.

Those who came before us made certain that this country rode the first waves of the industrial revolution, the first waves of modern invention, and the first wave of nuclear power. And this generation does not intend to founder in the backwash of the coming age of space. We mean to be a part of it—we mean to lead it.

For the eyes of the world now look into space—to the moon and to the planets beyond—and we have vowed that we shall not see it governed by a hostile flag of conquest, but by a banner of freedom and peace.

We have vowed that we shall not see space filled with weapons of mass destruction, but with instruments of knowledge and understanding. Yet the vows of this Nation can only be fulfilled if we in this Nation are first, and therefore we intend to be first.

In short, our leadership in science and industry, our hopes for peace and security, our obligations to ourselves as well as others all require us to make this effort to solve these mysteries, to solve them for the good of all men and to become the world's leading spacefaring nation.

We set sail on this new sea because there is new knowledge to be gained and new rights to be won and they must be won and used for the progress of all people.

For space science like nuclear science and all technology has no conscience of its own. Whether it will become a force for good or ill depends on man, and only if the United States occupies a position of preeminence can we help decide whether this new ocean will be a sea of peace or a new terrifying theater of war.

I do not say that we should or will go unprotected against the hostile misuse of space any more than we go unprotected against the hostile use of land or sea. But I do say that space can be explored and mastered without feeding the fires of war, without repeating the mistakes that man has made in extending his writ around this globe of ours.

There is no strife, no prejudice, no national conflict in outer space as yet. Its hazards are hostile to us all. Its conquest deserves the

best of all mankind and its opportunity for peaceful cooperation may never come again.

But why, some say, the moon? Why choose this as our goal? And they may well ask why climb the highest mountain? Why 35 years ago fly the Atlantic? Why does Rice play Texas?

We choose to go to the moon. We choose to go to the moon.

#### GIVES REASONS FOR CHOICE

We choose to go to the moon in this decade, and do the other things—not because they are easy; but because they are hard; because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills; because that challenge is one that we're willing to accept; one we are unwilling to postpone, and one we intend to win—and the others, too.

It is for these reasons that I regard the decision last year to shift our efforts in space from low to high gear as among the most important decisions that will be made during my incumbency in the office of the Presidency.

In the last 24 hours, we have seen facilities now being created for the greatest and most complex exploration in man's history. We have felt the ground shake and the air shattered by the testing of a Saturn C-1 booster rocket many times as powerful as the Atlas which launched John Glenn, generating power equivalent to 10,000 automobiles with their accelerator on the floor.

We have seen the site where five F-1 rocket engines, each one as powerful as all eight engines of the Saturn combined, will be clustered together to make the advanced Saturn missile assembled in a new building to be built at Cape Canaveral as tall as a 48-story structure, as wide as a city block and as long as 2 lengths of this field.

Within these last 19 months, at least 45 satellites have circled the earth. Some 40 of them were made in the United States of America, and they were far more sophisticated and supplied far more knowledge to the people of the world than those of the Soviet Union.

#### LAUDS MARINER CRAFT

The Mariner spacecraft now on its way to Venus is the most intricate instrument in the history of space science. The accuracy of that shot is comparable to firing a missile from Cape Canaveral and dropping it in this stadium between the 40-yard lines.

Transit satellites are helping our ships at sea to steer a safer course. Tyros satellites have given us unprecedented warnings of hurricanes and storms and will do the same for forest fires and icebergs.

We have had our failures, but so have others, even if they do not admit them and they may be less public.

To be sure—to be sure, we are behind and will be behind for some time in manned flights but we do not intend to stay behind and in this decade we shall make up and move ahead.

The growth of our science and education will be enriched by new knowledge of our universe and environment, by new techniques of learning and mapping and observation, by new tools and computers for industry, medicine, and the home as well as the school, technical institutions such as Rice will reap the harvest of these gains.

And finally the space effort itself, while still in its infancy, has already created a great number of new companies and tens of thousands of new jobs.

#### NEW FRONTIER DISCERNED

Space and related industries are generating new demands in investment and skilled personnel. And this city and this State and this region will share greatly in this growth.

What was once the farthest outpost on the old frontier of the West will be the farthest

outpost on the New Frontier of science and space.

Your city of Houston, with its manned spacecraft center, will become the heart of a large scientific and engineering community.

During the next 5 years, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration expects to double the number of scientists and engineers in this area; to increase its outlays for salaries and expenses to \$60 million a year; to invest some \$200 million in plants and laboratory facilities and to direct or contract for new space efforts over \$1 billion from this center in this city.

To be sure, all this cost us all a good deal of money.

This year's space budget is three times what it was in January, 1961, and it is greater than the space budget of the previous 8 years combined. That budget now stands at \$5.4 billion a year—a staggering sum though somewhat less than we pay for cigarettes and cigars every year.

#### EXPENDITURES TO RISE

Space expenditures—space expenditures will still rise some more from 40 cents per person per week to more than 50 cents a week for every man, woman and child in the United States.

For we have given this program a high national priority, even though I realize that this is in some measure an act of faith and vision, for we do not now know what benefits await us.

But if I were to say, my fellow citizens, that we shall send to the moon 240,000 miles away from the control station in Houston a giant rocket more than 300 feet tall—the length of this football field—made of new metal alloys some of which have not yet been invented, capable of standing heat and stresses several times more than have ever been experienced, fitted together with a precision better than the finest watch, carrying all the equipment needed for propulsion, guidance, control, communications, food, and survival, on an untried mission, to an unknown celestial body and then return it safely to earth reentering the atmosphere at speeds of over 25,000 miles per hour, causing heat about half that of the temperature of the sun—almost as hot as it is here today—and do all this—and do all this and do it right and do it first before this decade is out—then we must be bold.

I'm the one who's doing all the work, so we just want you to stay cool for a minute.

#### JOB FOR THE DECADE

However, I think we're going to do it, and I think that we must pay what needs to be paid. I don't think we ought to waste any money, but I think we ought to do the job—and this will be done in the decade of the sixties.

It may be done while some of you are still here at school at this college and university.

It will be done during the terms of office of some of the people who sit here on this platform.

But it will be done, and it will be done before the end of this decade, and I am delighted that this university is playing a part in putting a man on the moon as part of a great national effort of the United States of America.

Many years ago the great British explorer, George Mallory, who was to die on Mount Everest, was asked why did he want to climb it. He said:

"Because it is there."

Well, space is there, and we're going to climb it. And the moon and the planets are there, and new hope for knowledge and peace are there. And therefore, as we set sail, we ask God's blessing on the most hazardous and dangerous and greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked.



# COOPERATION OF THE AMERICAN BANKERS' ASSOCIATION AND THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the success of the American form of Government rests, in large part, on mutual trust, understanding, and cooperation between private business and Government.

This is why I rise now to take note of an outstanding example of such trust, understanding, and cooperation that has been developed between the American Bankers Association and the Small Business Administration.

The American Bankers Association and the Small Business Administration have cooperatively worked out a new program of financial assistance to the Nation's small businesses, which, as I see it, has two major and most desirable objectives:

First, it will increase the volume of term financing available to small business concerns, and

Second, it should shift a large part of this financing from the Government to the commercial banks of this country, where it rightly belongs.

Under this program it is expected that the commercial banks will greatly increase their participation with SBA in loans to small firms. The banks are expected to take at least a 50-percent share of these loans, and they will handle virtually all of the details of processing and servicing the loans, thus reducing costs to the Nation's taxpayers.

The Government, through the Small Business Administration, will continue to play a vital role in providing term financing for small firms by underwriting a large part of the transaction. But the Government will defer repayments on its share of the loans until after the banks have been paid in full.

The American Bankers Association believes that under this arrangement a large number of the commercial banks of our country will find it to their advantage to participate with the Small Business Administration in term loans to small firms.

Thus the resources of the Nation's commercial banks will be made available to finance small businesses in close cooperation with the Government.

John E. Horne, SBA Administrator, and Sam M. Fleming, president of the American Bankers Association, deserve the highest praise for developing and putting into operation this new loan plan which offers so much promise to our more than 4½ million small business concerns.

I ask unanimous consent that a release of September 6 by the SBA explaining this new program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A new program to provide term loans for small businesses was announced today by John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and Sam M. Fleming, president of the American Bankers Association.

"I wish to commend the American Bankers Association for its efforts in helping us to develop this new bank participation program," Mr. Horne said, "This cooperative effort on the part of Government and the banking industry to help meet the credit needs of small businesses is most gratifying."

"Under this new program it should be easier for small businessmen to obtain secured term loans—up to 10 years—from their banker, with the Government underwriting large part of the transaction."

"The essence of the program is this: The banks will make and service the loans for the Small Business Administration, and will provide a large share of the loan funds. The bank's share will be repaid before the SBA starts collecting a cent on its share of the loan principal."

Here is the way the program works: If a small businessman needs \$100,000 for qualified business purposes—and he can repay the loan in 10 years—the SBA will advance up to \$50,000 of the money, with the bank taking a corresponding share.

For servicing the loan, the bank may deduct from the interest collected for the account of SBA one-half of 1 percent a year on the unpaid balance of the SBA portion of the loan—plus its regular interest on its share. All repayments on the principal of the entire loan will go to the bank for the first 5 years. The SBA will defer collection on its share until after the bank's share has been retired.

The new loan program was developed by C. R. Lanman, Deputy SBA Administrator for Financial Assistance, and Arthur Maxwell, chairman of the Small Business Credit Committee of the ABA.

Mr. Lanman said, "One of the greatest needs of small businessmen is long-term loans to help them expand and create more jobs. We are aware that banks have ample resources to finance small business, but many banks are understandably reluctant to enter the term financing field, particularly as to the longer maturities. Yet longer maturities often are essential to properly finance some needs of the business concern."

"We believe we have developed a loan plan which meets our dual objectives of providing small business financing, while at the same time utilizing the resources of the private banking system," he said. "SBA will, in most instances, rely substantially on the bank's credit judgment, but, since the plan is still selective from SBA's standpoint, sufficient safeguards are provided to protect the Government's interests."

"The American Bankers Association not only has assisted us in working out this new loan program," Mr. Lanman said, "it also is cooperating with us in explaining the program to the Nation's 15,000 commercial banks."

Mr. Fleming said, "I am pleased that the American Bankers Association and the Small Business Administration, working together, have entered into this cooperative venture which should make it possible to greatly increase the amount of credit extended to the small business concerns of this country by commercial banks."

"Ultimately, we hope that the program will produce the desirable result of decreasing Government lending in the small business area, with commercial banks and other private lenders increasing loans in keeping with their traditional role."

"I hope," Mr. Fleming said, "that ABA member banks will participate in the new program to the fullest extent possible so that we may give more help to small business and also reemphasize the principle of providing private rather than Federal Government credit for this important segment of the Nation's economy."

Here are the essential details of SBA's new simplified bank participation loan program with the early maturity feature:

All loans under this program will be of the immediate participation type only, i.e., SBA stands ready to advance its share of the loan as soon as the bank is ready for disbursement. The loans will be serviced by the banks. As a service fee the banks will be permitted to deduct from the interest collected for the account of SBA one-half of 1 percent a year on the unpaid principal balance of SBA's share of the loan.

The bank's participation will be the greater of (a) 50 percent of the total amount of the loan, or (b) an amount equal to the bank's loan or loans to be repaid with a part of the new loan.

The loans shall be amortized on a level principal payment basis, plus interest.

The period of time during which the bank's share will be repaid will be based on the same proportion of loan maturity that the bank's participation bears to the total amount of the loan. For example, the bank would be repaid over a period of 3 years if it participates 50 percent in a 6-year loan; the bank would be repaid over a period of 6 years if it participates 60 percent in a 10-year loan, etc.

Since SBA will not receive any repayment of principal for at least the first half of the term of the loan, it will be necessary that these loans be adequately secured generally by fixed assets, and that the reasonable depreciated value of the fixed assets will at all times be in excess of the outstanding loan balance.

No preference shall be established in favor of the lending institution in any collateral security for the loan.

Applications for such loans will be made by the bank on SBA's simplified one-page form No. 527. Because of statutory requirements, a one-page certification is required from the bank's borrower. With the exception of the note, the bank may use its own forms of mortgages, agreements, etc., and need not submit copies of the loan documents to SBA until after the bank has received the funds from SBA and effected disbursement.

It is contemplated that the banks will submit only the stronger credits for loans under this program—not the weaker or marginal ones.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, ON "PLANS FOR IMPROVED COORDINATION OF INFORMATION"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to announce that there will be a public hearing of the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations on Thursday, September 20, 1962.

The hearing will be devoted to the future plans of the U.S. Government to improve the management of information, particularly scientific and engineering information.

I emphasize "future plans," because the subcommittee is well familiar with the record of the past and the activities and problems of the present.

### FOUR YEARS OF SUBCOMMITTEE STUDY

For 4 long years, this subcommittee has compiled testimony, issued reports and statements as to what has been done, what has not been done and what should be done.

We propose now, very frankly, to ask the agencies exactly what they propose to do in the future—starting with next year's budget.

They must do a great deal. The fact is that my associates and I are deeply dissatisfied with the relatively modest progress which has been made to date in response to our and others' repeated suggestions.

#### INFORMATION CHAOS INTOLERABLE

The full committee and the subcommittee have been patient. We have been understanding. We are interested now as to who proposes to do exactly what, when, and how, so as to end situations which, in many instances, amount to information chaos.

This is not a talk-oriented hearing; it is an action-oriented hearing.

We are frankly tired of endless discussions which go round and round and lead nowhere—to no action, no results, nothing but limited management improvement.

The agencies are now being called to account. They are expected to come up with action plans—not alibis for inaction.

#### THE DISTURBING STATUS QUO

A recent private report sponsored by the National Science Foundation states:

No centralized Government information distribution system now exists.

There is no coordinated, Government-wide policy for dissemination of scientific information.

Without this kind of coordination the vast amounts of moneys which are expended by this Government for scientific research are in many instances wasted or at least temporarily lost because of the unavailability and lack of access to the information as to that scientific research.

As many as 55,000 reports were generated by three agencies alone in the 1961 fiscal year—Defense, Space, and Atomic Energy Agencies.

However, the main Defense Department information system is "out in left field" so far as tens of thousands of missing reports are concerned. It receives less than 1 out of 5 of all prime contractor reports and no reports whatsoever from 300,000 sub-tier and lower tier contractors.

This Nation can no longer afford to be so haphazard in its information policies. We can no longer be "prodigal sons," wasting the investment of our scarce scientists and engineers.

#### TWELVE BILLION DOLLARS FOR SCIENCE—PERHAPS \$1.2 BILLION WASTE

In the 1963 fiscal year, the U.S. Government will be spending some \$12 billion for research, development, testing, and evaluation. Some estimates have been made, including by Federal officials, to the effect that 10 percent or more of this vast expenditure consists of needless, unintentional, wasteful duplication. That would amount to \$1.2 billion.

Meanwhile, in our civilian economy, we are losing some momentum. We are not converting research findings into new technology—new and improved products—so as to increase gross national product and improve our peacetime standards of living.

Yet, with each passing day, U.S. industry and agriculture are getting into a tighter and tighter competitive race with other Western nations, particularly

those now in the Common Market or requesting admission to it.

My comments above are made solely as regards coordination of scientific and engineering information.

#### OTHER INTERAGENCY INFORMATION BEYOND SCIENTIFIC

But, as our committee has shown, there are serious shortcomings in the coordination of other types of information among the agencies. I refer to foreign policy information, regulatory-type information, law enforcement information, as well as many other types, which lend themselves to rapid electronic data processing.

As chairman of the subcommittee and as a loyal supporter of the administration, I expect the agencies to come forward with an effective program. The purpose of the hearing will be to call to account every Cabinet officer and every agency head as to why these programs are not being properly budgeted, and what every governmental agency is doing, particularly in the field of science and technology.

#### TWO LEADOFF WITNESSES

As regards witnesses and format, I have invited two distinguished officials to testify as regards the plans of the executive branch, as a whole: There will be the Honorable David Bell, Director, Bureau of the Budget, who will speak on the theme of "Budgeting for Information in the Executive Branch." I say most respectfully to my friend Mr. Bell, for whom I have the highest regard, that we do not need a philosophical dissertation. We need action plans. As this RECORD may be read by the respective agencies of Government, I hope they will come prepared to tell the committee what they are budgeting next year for purposes of information improvement, for the retrieval of information, for the coordination of information, and for centralized information control, for example, in the National Institutes of Health, in the Department of Defense, in the Federal Drug Administration, in the Space Administration, and in the Atomic Energy Commission.

With few exceptions these agencies are 25 years behind any other information system. Perhaps one of the reasons why the Soviet Union makes such phenomenal progress in the field of science and technology is that its research is put to work. The Government knows what has been done. In the Soviet Union there is a centralized information system on science and technology. There is none in this country. We have been asking for it for years. Each time hearings are held on the subject, an officer of the Government says, "We are working on it."

They can work on it, and also do something about it.

When I visited the World's Fair at Seattle I saw the retrieval system which was established by the American Library Association. It proves what can be done. No such information system is available in the Library of Congress. None is available in the medical library. None is available in our Government, except for the good system in the Strategic Air Command. It proves that it can be done.

If people are worried about miracle drugs—and some of them are not so miraculous such as thalidomide—and about the proper testing of drugs, we should have centralized information in this field, put together in one place, so that the agencies of Government and individual citizens can find it.

Another witness will be Dr. Jerome Wiesner, Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, who will speak on "Improving Systems of Scientific and Engineering Information in the Executive Branch." Dr. Wiesner is one of the most competent public officials, who has earned my wholehearted respect and admiration and support. However, there has been a tendency to downgrade the information program.

I serve notice again, as a representative of the Committee on Government Operations, with the support of the chairman of the committee and the membership of the committee, that we have waited a long time, and we expect some results, particularly in the field of medical research, drug research, scientific research, research in defense and in space, and in the Atomic Energy Commission.

Thereafter, there will be a roundtable type discussion in which representatives of a half-dozen agencies will be asked to answer specific questions and make comments on others' answers.

Since I anticipate a heavy schedule in the Senate that day, the hearing will start at 9 a.m. It will be held in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

#### BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM ON HEARING

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, a background memorandum which I have prepared on this hearing.

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

#### PLANS FOR IMPROVED COORDINATION OF INFORMATION

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

This memorandum describes the background, nature, and purpose of the subcommittee's forthcoming hearing.

1. Place and time: Room 3302, New Senate Office Building; 9 a.m. (prior to the opening hour of the Senate).

2. Topic: The hearing is designed to consider what actions may or should be taken by the U.S. Government, so as to improve the management and coordination of information in the interest of efficiency, economy, national security, and progress.

As the title of the hearing indicates, it is oriented to the future; i.e., to needs, opportunities, and challenges in the days ahead.

3. Reasons for emphasis on future plans: The reasons for the stress on the future (rather than mere reporting on past achievements or present activities) are several:

(a) The parent Committee on Government Operations and this subcommittee have been studying the overall information problem since as far back as 1957. We do not wish to needlessly repeat past reviews.

(b) Much progress has occurred within and outside the executive branch in improving information systems.

(c) The committee and the subcommittee have kept themselves constantly informed as to what has and has not been done to improve systems. (The hearing record, for example, will contain many ex-



hibits, describing past achievements, present activities, and current problems.)

(d) In a series of printed and processed analyses, the committee and the subcommittee have, we believe, proved that serious deficiencies do exist in the status quo.

(e) The committee and the subcommittee wish, therefore, to determine exactly what Federal officials propose to do to improve the status quo—when and how.

Time will necessarily be limited at the hearing to cover so vast a subject. It is, however, hoped that at least the highlights of future activity can be announced and discussed, if only briefly.

4. Format of meeting: The plans for the hearing includes two parts:

(a) Two brief, 10-minute prepared statements on policies of the executive branch as a whole.

(b) Questions, answers, and comments in roundtable fashion on individual agency interests.

5. Two foci—scientific and nonscientific: The principal focus of the hearings is on scientific and engineering information, per se. The Special Assistant to the President and representatives of individual agencies will speak only on this type of information.

However, the initial comments by the Bureau of the Budget will also concern coordination and systems improvement of other types of information which are crucial to interagency interest. Examples are—

Foreign-policy-type information (involving such agencies as the State Department, Commerce Department, Department of Defense, Central Intelligence Agency, Department of Agriculture, etc.)

Law-enforcement-type information (involving many units in the Departments of Justice, Treasury, etc.)

Regulatory-agency-type information (involving the independent Commissions—FCC, FTC, SEC, ICC, FPC—i.e., caseload-type information).

6. Participants invited:

(a) Opening prepared statements: David Bell, Director, U.S. Bureau of the Budget, as regards "Budgeting for Information in the Executive Branch"; Jerome Wiesner, Director, Office of Science and Technology, as regards "Improving Systems of Scientific and Engineering Information in the Executive Branch."

(b) Roundtable (partial list of policy and operating officials).

Library of Congress: Laurence Mumford, Librarian.

Department of Agriculture: Foster Mohrhardt, Director, National Agricultural Library.

Department of Defense: Roswell Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary; Col. James Vann, Director, Armed Services Technical Information Agency.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Melvin Day, Director, Office of Technical Information.

National Science Foundation: Burton W. Adkinson, Head, Office of Science Information Service.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Dr. Luther Terry, Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service; Dr. James A. Shannon, Director, National Institutes of Health.

Department of Commerce: Herbert Holloman, Assistant Secretary for Research and Development; John Green, Director, Office of Technical Services.

#### AUTHORITY FOR THE PRESIDENT TO ORDER UNITS AND MEMBERS IN THE READY RESERVE TO ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside

and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1984, Senate Joint Resolution 224.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 224) to authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "January 31" and insert "February 28"; in line 5, after the word "unit", to strike out "and any member not assigned to a unit organized to serve as a unit, in" and insert "or any member"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "until", to strike out "January 31" and insert "February 28"; in line 17, after the word "duty", to insert "or whose period of active duty was extended"; and after line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 4. This Act becomes effective on the day after the Eighty-seventh Congress adjourns sine die.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, until February 28, 1963, the President may, without the consent of the persons concerned, order any unit, or any member, of the Ready Reserve of an armed force to active duty for not more than twelve consecutive months. However, not more than one hundred and fifty thousand members of the Ready Reserve may be on active duty (other than for training), without their consent, under this section at any one time.*

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until February 28, 1963, the President may authorize the Secretary of Defense to extend enlistments, appointments, periods of active duty, periods of active duty for training, periods of obligated service or other military status, in any component of an armed force or in the National Guard that expire before February 28, 1963, for not more than twelve months. However, if the enlistment of a member of the Ready Reserve who is ordered to active duty under the first section of this Act would expire after February 28, 1963, but before he has served the entire period for which he was so ordered to active duty, his enlistment may be extended until the last day of that period.

SEC. 3. No member of the Ready Reserve who was involuntarily ordered to active duty or whose period of active duty was extended under the Act of August 1, 1961, Public Law 87-117 (75 Stat. 242), may be involuntarily ordered to active duty under this Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 224 would provide standby authority until February 28, 1963, for the President to, first, recall not more than 150,000 members of the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months, and, second, extend enlistments, appointments, periods of active duty, or other obligated

periods of training, service, or status for not more than 12 months.

The President of the United States requested this authority in a letter to the Congress dated September 7, 1962.

The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified before the Committee on Armed Services on September 10 about the need for the authority and the circumstances in which it might be used.

The Congress and the Nation will recognize the authority as being similar in many ways to that contained in Senate Joint Resolution 120 of the 87th Congress, which became Public Law 87-117. Like the 1961 resolution, the resolution now before the Senate would grant permissive authority for the involuntary recall of the Ready Reserve and the involuntary extension of enlistments, appointments, and other periods of service. The chief differences in the resolutions are that the authority in Senate Joint Resolution 224 would exist over a period of not more than 6 months, as compared with the earlier authority that extended over approximately 11 months, and the number of reservists that may be recalled under this resolution is a maximum of 150,000, as compared with 250,000 under last year's resolution.

While the form of the resolution is similar to that of last year, the circumstances on which the authority is sought are somewhat different. The resolution of 1961 was primarily directed toward the Berlin crisis. At the time that resolution was approved, we knew that the executive branch intended to use the authority granted as a part of a program to improve the effectiveness of our active duty forces.

In contrast, the pending resolution is not designed to counter a problem in one location. Instead, the authority is sought as a response to the situation throughout the world, or the "total confrontation," to use the words of the Secretary of Defense.

Another important difference this year is that there is no present and definite intention to use the authority contained in this resolution. The committee was informed that there are no specific plans to use it and the committee shares the hope that world conditions will not further deteriorate to require implementation of the authority.

In summary, the resolution may be described as an interim measure to provide standby authority while the Congress is out of session and during a reasonable period overlapping the convening of a new Congress.

To use a colloquialism from my part of the country, this is a shotgun behind the door.

If the President's judgment in this period is that security requirements dictate additions to our active duty forces, he would have the necessary authority without proclaiming a national emergency or calling the Congress into special session.

Under the Reserve laws now in effect, the President has authority to order as many as 1 million members of the Ready Reserve to active duty involuntarily for as long as 24 months, in the event of a

national emergency declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President. In view of this authority, it is reasonable to ask why the executive branch has sought congressional approval of this more limited authorization to use the Ready Reserve. The Secretary of Defense informed the committee that there are at least two reasons for this approach. First, approval of the resolution by the Congress would demonstrate a unity between the executive and legislative branches reflecting the unity of our people in our determination to make an adequate response if one of several trouble spots in the world deteriorates sufficiently to require decisive action. The second reason suggested is that a proclamation or declaration or national emergency would confer powers not needed now, and that such action might create a climate of greater tension and alarm than is justified merely to secure authority for making relatively small additions of manpower to the active duty forces. Approval of the resolution would permit a response to trouble that is less serious than a condition requiring the invocation of national emergency powers.

The President hardly should be criticized for requesting authority much more limited than he could assume if he proclaimed a national emergency. The authority contained in this resolution is less extensive than the President's authority to use the Reserves in a national emergency in three respects: First, the number of Reserves affected is a maximum of 150,000 under this resolution, while it could be as high as 1 million in a Presidentially proclaimed emergency; second, the authority to order members of the Reserve to active duty under this resolution would expire on February 28, 1963, while this authority would continue throughout the duration of a proclaimed emergency; third, the members of the Reserve who may be called under this resolution would be liable for service of only 12 months, instead of 24 months if they were called in a Presidential emergency.

When the Congress was asked to approve the resolution to meet the Berlin crisis, we were informed that the utilization of Reserves on active duty and the extension of enlistments were only a part of plans to improve the effectiveness of our Armed Forces. The Armed Forces have, in fact, been substantially improved since last summer, both in manpower and in weapons. Both our conventional and nuclear forces are stronger now. For example, the Army now has 16 combat divisions, instead of 11 slightly more than a year ago. Our capability to respond to attack with intercontinental and intermediate range missiles is greater. The active duty strength of the Marine Corps has been increased and improvements are being made in the tactical forces of the Navy and the Air Force.

Despite the very considerable progress in all these fields, we might face a situation during the fall in which specialized skills and trained units in the Ready Reserve would be needed quickly to augment the standing forces.

Members of the Senate have not forgotten the vehemence of protests from

some of the reservists ordered to active duty last fall and some of the persons on active duty who had their service extended. There were errors and defects in the procedures employed last year and there were some very real hardships experienced. Considering the callup as a whole, however, I think it was accomplished in a relatively satisfactory manner. The experience of that callup has resulted in actions intended to avoid a repetition of some of the problems encountered.

Before commenting further on this subject, let me say quickly that, although the complaints last year seemed quite strong at times, the overwhelming majority of those called upon to serve did so cheerfully and effectively. The Reserve components are entitled to a great deal of praise for their significant contributions on active duty during the last year.

Many of the problems of last year's callup occurred because many of the units that were called to duty had not been manned at levels near their authorized strengths. When these units were called, the vacancies in them were filled from the replacement pool of the Reserve. Many of the reservists in this placement pool were persons who already had served 2 or more years on active duty and who were not participating actively in the Reserve, although they had a vulnerability under law for service as members of the Ready Reserve. It was not unnatural that these fillers should complain about being required to perform additional duty when they observed that persons receiving 48 days of military pay annually for Reserve participation and persons whose only active duty was in the form of only 6 months' active duty for training were not being called. I am not suggesting that the drill pay reservists and the 6-month trainees were shirking their duty; they were not.

In most instances, these persons were not called because they were members of units not needed on active duty. Still, it is understandable if persons with long periods of active duty who were not being compensated for their Reserve membership would feel that they should not be in a priority status of vulnerability.

The Secretary of Defense informed the committee that two remedies have been undertaken to avoid a repetition of some of the inequities of last fall. The first of these is that the personnel strength of priority inactive duty units has been raised, thus lowering the number of fillers that must be added when these units are ordered to active duty. The second remedy is that the military departments have established a pool of some 45,000 6-month trainees who have been identified by occupational specialty and this pool would be relied on for fillers before non-drill-pay personnel who have served longer than 6 months would be called.

For the information of the Senate, I should like to furnish a summary of the personnel actions last year: 328,000 persons were added to the active-duty forces, through a series of actions: 70,000 of these persons voluntarily enlisted or reenlisted; 47,000 of the total were procured through the draft; 63,000

persons had their enlistments or periods of active duty involuntarily extended; and 148,000 reservists were ordered to active duty. Of the 148,000 reservists ordered to active duty, 66,000 were 6-month trainees, of whom about 50,000 were also in a drill-pay status; 54,000 were other reservists in a drill-pay status; and 28,000 were unpaid reservists who previously had served longer than 6 months. Many of the complaints of inequities came from the 28,000.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that the two remedies undertaken by the Department of Defense to which I referred earlier will alleviate disproportionate service if it is necessary to use the authority of this joint resolution.

One of the committee amendments should also contribute toward a fairer sharing of the responsibilities of military service. The effect of this amendment is to permit the departments to reach into units that are not called to active duty in order to select individual reservists who either are 6-month trainees or are receiving drill pay and who possess the military skills needed by the Active Forces. There was some question whether such action was possible under the language of the joint resolution approved last year which empowered the President to order "any unit and any member not assigned to a unit organized to serve as a unit."

There may be cries of alarm that the committee action destroys the unit-integrity concept. The committee intent is not that units be disbanded, but that a few persons might be selected from several units as fillers for active duty forces. I am confident, Mr. President, this can be accomplished without destroying any existing units. Unit integrity is desirable, but it is not more desirable than an equitable sharing of the responsibilities of military service. There are approximately 1 million reservists on a drill-pay status. When it is remembered that the authority of this joint resolution applies to not more than 150,000 members of the Ready Reserve, it is difficult to believe that the relatively small part of the 150,000 who might be fillers could not be procured from a drill-pay force numbering about 1 million without causing the dismantling of units.

Now a word about those who may have had their enlistments or periods of active duty extended under last year's resolution. In the form in which it was referred to the committee, the resolution prohibited the recall of a member of the Ready Reserve who was involuntarily ordered to active duty under last year's resolution. The committee amended the resolution, so as to prohibit the recall of a member of the Ready Reserve who had his period of active duty extended under the resolution of last year. There probably are a few members of the Armed Forces who had their periods of active duty extended last year and who are still on active duty instead of being in the Ready Reserve. The committee report indicates the intent that the authority of this resolution is not to be used to add another extension of active duty to one accomplished under last year's resolution. This is not a limi-



tation, however, on the authority of the resolution as it would apply to a person who was subjected only to an extension of 1 year in his membership in the Reserve as distinguished from active duty.

I think it is unnecessary for me to dwell on the variety or the intensity of the dangers which our country faces. The Senate knows them, and the people we represent are informed about them. Unhappily, solutions for this multiplicity of trouble are not nearly as easy as the identification of them.

In times of international stress it is absolutely vital that we support the leadership of the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, the President of the United States. In times such as these, we must disregard whatever differences we may have had or may now have over the approach to domestic affairs and internal problems. Fortunately, Mr. President, we have a proud tradition of subordinating political differences when our security as a free people is threatened.

I am confident that congressional reaction to this resolution will be another reminder to those hostile to us that we are united, and are determined to protect our interests, and that the President will be fully supported in the actions he takes as our leader.

Mr. President, I urge that the joint resolution be unanimously passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me, in order that I may submit a Senate resolution?

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit, and send to the desk, a Senate resolution, which I ask to have referred to the appropriate committee.

However, first I wish to express the hope that no amendments will be attached to the pending joint resolution. I think the addition of amendments would minimize the effect of the joint resolution. I believe it would create a picture which would not be true in its entirety.

I anticipate that we wish to follow the normal procedure, and that amendments or resolutions which may be offered in connection with the pending joint resolution will be referred to the appropriate committee, and that the pending joint resolution will be considered on its merits, and only on its merits.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resolution I have submitted be read and then be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Montana will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 388) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

#### S. RES. 388

Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared to the Congress that we should consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any por-

tion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that "an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations."

Whereas the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 unanimously declared—

"The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extracontinental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union";

Whereas since 1958 the international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States is supported in his determination and possesses all necessary authority (a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Castro regime from exporting its aggressive purposes to any part of this hemisphere by force or the threat of force; (b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported offensive military base capable of endangering the United States Naval Base at Guantanamo, free passage to the Panama Canal, United States missile and space preparations or the security of this Nation and its citizens; and (c) to work with other free citizens of this hemisphere and with freedom-loving Cuban refugees to support the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cuba for a return to self-determination.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to make a brief statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, Mr. President, I yield the floor, in order that the Senator from Massachusetts may be recognized.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to make a brief statement in support of the action of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

First, I desire particularly to commend the Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, on one of the closing paragraphs of his statement.

It is as follows:

In times of international stress it is absolutely vital that we support the leadership of the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, the President of the United States. In times such as these, we must disregard whatever differences we may have had or may now have over the approach to domestic affairs and internal problems. Fortunately, Mr. President, we have a proud tradition of subordinating political differences when our security as a free people is threatened.

I commend the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for the thoughtfulness and care with which he has drafted and amended his joint resolution, which was presented to us only last week.

Mr. President, as ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, I fully support Senate Joint Resolution 224 and urge that the Senate approve the measure. This resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services.

#### NATURE OF AUTHORITY

Mr. President, this resolution is similar to the one approved last year authorizing the President to recall up to 250,000 men from the Reserves. There are, however, several important differences. First, the pending measure is in the nature of standby authority for the purpose of meeting any emergency situation which may arise between the time Congress adjourns and February 28, 1963. A second difference is the fact that there are no present plans for using this authority. Last year, as the Senate may recall, authority was requested in order to recall personnel to meet the Berlin crisis. We all hope, of course, that the need will not arise for the President to use the authority contained in the resolution. The third important difference is the fact that the number which may be affected under the terms of this resolution is limited to 150,000 as compared to 250,000 in last year's resolution.

#### NEED FOR SPECIFIC AUTHORITY OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. President, as the chairman of the committee has observed, President Kennedy under existing law could declare a Presidential emergency and recall up to 1 million of the Ready Reserves. The question could therefore be raised as to the need for the authority contained in this joint resolution. This special authority is needed for two reasons: First, if the President were to declare an emergency for the purpose of recalling Reserves, additional emergency Presidential powers would be brought into play which might not be required; second, congressional approval for the pending measure demonstrates a national solidarity which shows the world our resolve to meet any crisis which may occur. It affirms a unity on this matter between the Congress and the executive branch and between both parties.

#### DISCUSSION OF TOTAL RESERVE FORCES

Mr. President, I think it would be helpful to indicate certain aspects of the total Reserve Forces we now have in this country. At the conclusion of my statement I would like to have inserted a certain chart which indicates the approximate total number of men in our Reserves.

Mr. President, in all of the Reserve components we have about 3,700,000 men of which 2,425,000 are in the Ready Reserves with the remainder in either the Standby or Retired Reserves categories.

Of those in the Ready Reserves, about 1,425,000 are in the Army Reserve and Army National Guard.

Mr. President, it is also significant that we now have in a drill-pay status for all of the Reserves approximately 1 million men. All of these persons are in the Ready Reserves and most are in units. I emphasize these figures in order to show that the authority of this resolution would permit only a small portion of the Reserves to be recalled even if the maximum figure of 150,000 were utilized.

#### INCREASE IN STRENGTH OF ACTIVE FORCES

Mr. President, it is also significant to note that the Active Army has been increased from 11 to 16 divisions since the beginning of the Berlin crisis last year. Secretary McNamara has indicated that this increase was a part of the 328,000 persons which were added to the active duty forces of the Department of Defense as a result of the action taken last year. In summary, I think it is fair to say that the country is much stronger in the terms of Active Forces and Reserve Forces and is much better prepared to meet any emergency that might arise.

#### EQUITY OF SERVICE

Mr. President, one aspect of this bill that should be emphasized is the desire of the committee to make certain that

there is an equitable distribution of military service among all the Reserves insofar as possible. The committee added language which makes it clear that the Secretary of Defense, if recall should be necessary, should order men to duty who have seen the least prior active service. The committee added language which would specifically authorize the Secretary to recall men from a unit even though the unit was not recalled. This language was added in order to make it possible to recall a 6-month trainee in a unit which was not recalled, and at the same time avoid calling some 2-year veteran in the same specialty who would otherwise be ordered to active duty.

Mr. President, this is a vitally needed measure and I urge the Senate to unanimously vote its approval.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a table of the Reserve strength of the Armed Forces.

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

TABLE OF RESERVE STRENGTH

This shows the Armed Forces Reserve strength not on active duty, by component, and by Reserve status, as of the end of fiscal year 1961:

Reserve component	Total Reserve	Ready Reserve	Standby Reserve	Retired Reserve
Army National Guard.....	1,400,455	1,400,455	0	0
Army Reserve.....	1,893,747	1,028,168	772,543	93,036
Naval Reserve.....	648,446	474,761	123,148	50,537
Marine Corps Reserve.....	242,691	209,489	26,190	7,012
Air National Guard.....	70,895	70,895	0	0
Air Force Reserve.....	500,012	213,871	265,593	20,548
Coast Guard Reserve.....	33,166	30,272	2,384	510
Armed Forces Reserve.....	3,789,412	2,427,911	1,189,858	171,643

<sup>1</sup> Includes 6,648 inactive National Guard.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. First, I commend the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Georgia for drafting this very important resolution and placing in it some important amendments with respect to individual reservists. The Senator from Massachusetts gave some figures with respect to the number of paid reservists that are available. I think that has some important bearing on the question before us. Did the Senator say there were 1 million?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One million drill-pay reservists.

Mr. STENNIS. Who would be ready for military service if needed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And some 2,400,000 in the Ready Reserves.

Mr. STENNIS. Those are in addition to the 1 million?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; the 1 million are a part of the total.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator have the figures showing those who were called up in the Berlin callup a year ago?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that there were 148,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Around 150,000?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Even though our Nation is grateful, I want to mention this, because I do not believe we fully realize

even yet the importance of the service of those men, the high degree of effectiveness in which they were found when they were called, the extraordinary way in which they reached their posts of duty, and the high efficiency they rapidly attained within a very few weeks from the beginning of their active training. I think that fact ought to be emphasized at every opportunity.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first I would like to query the majority leader with respect to the resolution which he submitted a moment ago. As I understand, it is an independent concurrent resolution that takes account of the situation developing in this hemisphere.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. It is a simple resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A simple Senate resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not a concurrent resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I assume it would be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be my belief, because I think that is the committee which should have prior con-

sideration of resolutions of this character.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite attention to the fact that on January 24, 1955, the resolution on the Formosa problem, offered by Senators George, Wiley, Green, Knowland, Russell, and myself, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, sitting jointly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct, but I also call his attention to the fact that when the so-called Middle East resolution later was brought before the Senate for consideration it was referred only to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, I believe the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has submitted an amendment directed to virtually the same subject matter.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is correct. I have pending at the desk a proposal in the form of an amendment to the pending joint resolution which deals simply with the Cuban situation and directly with it. I am very much interested in ascertaining what disposition is intended to be made of the resolution sent to the desk by the majority leader. I am very anxious that the Senate take action on my amendment, which is offered, incidentally, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and myself. I want the Record to show that, due to an oversight when I submitted my amendment, I neglected to make clear that the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] was a joint author of the amendment. I wish to make it very clear now.

I am desirous that the Senate take action on this amendment, but I am very glad to conform to the wishes of the majority and minority leaders, if we can establish a date certain on which the majority leader's measure and mine may be reported from the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope it may go both to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Before I call up my amendment, I should like to know from the majority leader whether we can expect a report from those committees on a date certain, so that we will surely be able to consider this subject within a few days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if some Senator will yield to me, I would say that that is a reasonable request. That is the normal procedure.

What I oppose is seeing something in the form of a resolution attached to the pending joint resolution seeking to bring about a callup of 150,000 members of the Reserve Forces. Those are two entirely different matters. We are not seeking to call up 150,000 reservists for the purpose of looking after Cuba. This is a worldwide proposal.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest that in addition to the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Connecticut, there is also an amendment to be offered by



the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and one to be offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. I am informed that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] either will offer amendments or will submit independent resolutions bearing on this general subject matter.

Under those circumstances, and in the hope that those proposals can be disassociated from the so-called callup resolution now before the Senate, in order to be sure that all the resolutions receive proper attention, I believe they could very properly be referred to a joint committee to be made up of the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations for consideration, and that a resolution could be reported to the Senate, let us say, by Thursday of next week at noon, to be made the pending business to remain before the Senate until disposed of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be agreeable with me. That is something the Senate itself will have to decide. It would go through the normal procedure, except that we are talking about including two committees. That has been done before, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was done in 1955 on a resolution of the same character.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I feel that this is a very serious question. I am entirely in sympathy with the suggestions made by the minority leader, of which the majority leader seems to approve.

Could there be a vote of the Senate today, to show the reference to those two committees of the proposal made by the Senator from Montana and the pending amendments in connection with the Cuban situation, with instructions to report on a date certain, so that the Senate may have an opportunity to work its will?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think a vote is necessary. I think the word of the Senate is good enough—and certainly, in a subordinate way, the words of the leadership of this body.

I would hope that the only vote to be taken today—and that would be a ye-and-nay vote—would be the vote on the pending joint resolution and the pending joint resolution only.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator ask for unanimous consent now?

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to make a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask unanimous consent that the proposal submitted by the majority leader, together with the amendments of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator

from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the one which I understand will be submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and any other amendments which might be pending or which might be proposed in this general field, may be referred jointly to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services and that as of Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon a resolution be reported to the Senate and be made the pending business of the Senate. The theory being, of course, that such joint committee, after due hearings and consideration, would contrive a resolution in this general field which could be reported to the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois contemplate having the resolution referred to each of the two committees, the committees to sit jointly?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I am very reluctant, considering the other duties we have, in that limited period of time to undertake to do justice to as vital and as delicate a subject as is involved in these resolutions.

Mr. President, to me, there is something absolutely incongruous about undertaking to amend the pending joint resolution with amendments which relate to the unfortunate and deplorable situation in the Caribbean. I think that it would be highly unfortunate, very disturbing to our relations in Europe, and would affect the prestige of the United States if it were necessary to call up 150,000 men to deal with Cuba when we have 2,800,000 men under arms.

I speak for the members of my committee, in whom I have implicit confidence. I know they will all strive diligently to do justice to this very important subject. I am sure our colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations will do the same. The distinguished majority leader is one of the stalwarts of that committee. I know that he and his colleagues on the committee will undertake to consider this subject thoroughly and expeditiously.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that the Presiding Officer is about to put the unanimous-consent request?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I have a question in my own mind as to whether that is sufficient time, but I am willing to accede to the request. I wonder about the wisdom of making the resolution the pending business at a date and time certain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is a certain urgency about this question. I had first contemplated requesting that

the report be made as of noon on Wednesday next.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I think perhaps an additional day ought to be allowed. If it is set further in the week, there will be some absenteeism, of course, because of a situation and a condition which prevails in a number of States of the Union. I had hoped to set it at a time when there would be a maximum attendance in the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask if additional resolutions with respect to the Cuban situation may be submitted, and how late they could be submitted and be printed so that they might be considered by the two committees? Would there be a limitation on that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there would be no limitation. Anything offered, submitted, or presented to the committees meeting jointly prior to the time of making the report at noon on Thursday next certainly would be in order.

Mr. BUSH, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. HRUSKA addressed the Chair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent that the amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and myself be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SEC. 4. (a) It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that the domination and control of the Republic of Cuba by the international Communist movement jeopardizes the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere and violates the basic right of the Cuban people to independence and self-determination.

(b) It is further declared to be the sense of the Congress that the United States, under the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, has the right and obligation to take all necessary actions, in cooperation with other Western Hemisphere nations if possible, and unilaterally if necessary, to end such domination and control and to restore the Republic of Cuba to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. BUSH. I reiterate once more, Mr. President, that this is not any new idea with us. I submitted a resolution dealing with the Cuban problem in January of 1960. My cosponsor on the resolution at that time was the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the second ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. That resolution was identical in purpose with this proposal.

I reoffered this proposal in January of 1961. It has been pending in the Foreign Relations Committee ever since, without any hearings or any attention having been given to it.

I wish to make the point very clear that this is not a new idea from our side. It is not a new idea from the Senator from Connecticut. Many of us

have felt for a long time that the Congress of the United States—and especially the Senate—should take cognizance of the Soviet buildup on the island of Cuba.

Mr. President, I fully support the remarks of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. All of us are members of the Committee on Armed Services. I am happy to support the callup resolution. I am much pleased to know that we have arranged an accommodation for consideration of the various important resolutions pertaining to the critical situation on the island of Cuba. I am grateful to the majority leader and the minority leader for arriving at that accommodation in a spirit of patriotism and consideration for all of us who are deeply interested in the issue.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very happy to be associated with the senior Senator from Connecticut in the resolution he has offered. The President has requested what amounts to a 5-month standby authority to call up reservists in order to meet whatever crises the Soviets may choose to create anywhere in the world. We must support that.

These crises may be in Europe, over Berlin, in Asia, over Laos or the offshore islands, or they may be closer to home, in Cuba. The purpose of our resolution, which refers specifically to Cuba, is certainly not to foreclose the possibility of determined U.S. action anywhere except Cuba, as some critics may charge. Instead I would regard this resolution as the answer of the Senate to the latest rocket-rattling comments put forth by the Soviet news agency Tass.

Mr. President, the people of the United States may be long suffering and patient. We may put up with a good deal of provocation from the Soviets that we might better have resisted from the start. But once aroused, the people of this country are prepared to take all necessary steps to defend this Nation and this hemisphere from Soviet tyranny.

In his role as dictator of a totalitarian state, Khrushchev has never faced the determination of freemen who are prepared to defend that freedom and have the wherewithal to do so. It may be a new and unpleasant experience for him. Even now the Russian people are unhappy and hesitant over Khrushchev's threats. What is more, self-determination is not an ideal to which we render mere lip service, as Communist propagandists do. Americans have more than once fought and died to preserve this right for ourselves and others. Khrushchev should know that we mean business.

Mr. President, this resolution in my judgment clearly expresses the convictions of the Senate and of the people of the United States with regard to Soviet intervention in Cuba and the Monroe Doctrine. No one can pretend any longer that the people of Cuba are happy with their new tyranny. No one can pretend any longer that Castro's government represents the will of the Cuban people or even considers the legitimate

interests of those people. Only Red troops and Red weapons keep Castro in power today.

Mr. President, this resolution should make it clear that whatever strong action the executive branch of the Government may decide to take over Cuba, it will have the backing of the Congress.

Anytime that the President goes ahead in a decisive, forward-looking and determined manner he can count on the support of the whole country. In short, the American people, in my judgment, will unanimously back a strong policy. What they will not back is a weak policy or no policy at all. This resolution should make that very clear to Khrushchev.

Mr. President, my colleagues may be interested in some of the language used via Cuban propaganda broadcasts in referring to American actions and statements. These broadcasts among other things describe the President of the United States as "lowbrowed and empty-headed."

Mr. President, I deeply resent that statement. I would resent it if it were said about any President.

Legislators are described as "a hysterical chorus of noisy candidates." Mr. President, I resent that, as I am sure does everyone in this body.

Among the other points made by the commentators is this: "I would like to see the American who would dare to stop a Soviet ship and search it on the high seas."

Mr. President, I think that excerpts from these broadcasts from Havana would be of interest to the Members of Congress, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that they may be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

WASHINGTON.—In the hysterical campaign being carried on by governmental circles of the United States for the purpose of creating an atmosphere favorable to direct U.S. military aggression against Cuba, three U.S. Senators made outrageous statements Sunday demanding intervention which, if carried out, would seriously endanger world peace.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, asked the United States to sponsor an international military organization among the nations of this hemisphere, similar to NATO, to "face up to the problem of Cuba." He said this military force should also intervene in other Latin American countries "to deal with communism." SMATHERS, who had magnificent personal and commercial relations with former Dictator Fulgencio Batista and officials of the Batista administration, suggested that the United States "and other nations of the hemisphere"—he did not specify which ones—should help the fugitive Cuban counterrevolutionaries set up "a government" and give them all necessary aid for taking action against Cuba.

Almost at the same time as SMATHERS was making his statement, another Senator from Kennedy's party, STROM THURMOND of South Carolina, released a note addressed to the people of his State calling for direct U.S. military aggression against Cuba on the groundless pretext that "Soviet military forces have arrived" in the island. THURMOND found it very easy to defend his request for direct military intervention in Cuba, pointing out that "if

circumstances in 1960 and early 1961 justified the decision of two administrations that a U.S.-sponsored invasion of Cuba was essential, how can today's much worse circumstances require less?"

Finally, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, joined the hysterical Yankee chorus against Cuba in a radio and television speech in which he tried to depict the little Caribbean nation—which is building socialism and fighting for peace—as a threat to the United States and Latin America. KEATING did not speak concretely of direct military intervention, but he suggested that the U.S. Government should ask the self-styled OAS to send a mission to Cuba "to investigate reports about the establishment of Cuban guided-missile bases." He did not explain how this proposed interventionist mission of the OAS could get into Cuba, a sovereign, independent nation that on one occasion has already flatly rejected such a maneuver.

On one September some years ago, the maniac Adolf Hitler unleashed what was later to be known as the Second World War, when, in 1939, he invaded Poland. Today, on the 23d anniversary of the outbreak of that war, another belligerent maniac, the son of a Hitler admirer, is bringing the flame of provocation dangerously close to the powder keg that may start another war.

John F. Kennedy yesterday issued a communique and a cynical note protesting the mendacious report that two small Cuban boats had fired their machineguns at an unarmed U.S. plane, which was on a training mission over the Caribbean waters. The communique threatens that the U.S. planes will fire back if the incident is repeated. The insidious communique says that the attacking boats are "believed to be Cuban," because if they were to say outright that the boats are Cuban, this would prove that their training missions are nothing else but real spy missions. Moreover, the tone of the communique shows how stupid they are when they threaten to fire back, should the incident be repeated. How are they going to fire back, if, as they say, the plane was unarmed?

However, the basic thing to keep in mind is that both the communique and the note of protest issued by the White House stress the danger of the moment and the unreasonable decision of that shallowbrained man to unleash a war that may lead to nuclear war.

Fidel's reply to the lie—which is trying to conceal the provocation acts committed almost daily by Yankee planes, ships, and the Guantanamo base and the repercussion of the shelling of Havana—again warns the obstinate warmonger Kennedy that Cuba "does not provoke, has not provoked, and will never provoke." Yet, if there should be a material aggression, as happened in Jamaica, he will get—as he did there—an impressive reply and impressive results.

Here, on the Malecon, without the need of a telescope, one can look at the sea and see the *Oxford* spying at the entrance of the Havana port and pinpointing positions for an attack, like that of that criminal Salvat. Yet, the Cuban people do not need evidence to keep up their guard and they are prepared, not only to resist but also—and let the "worms" digest this—to reject the enemy.

Before leaving for a weekend at Newport, Kennedy released the above-mentioned communique and the note protesting the mendacious report that our boats attacked a U.S. plane. Kennedy also scored the NATO countries that are supplying merchant ships to transport goods to Cuba and warned them that they may encounter difficulties in the Caribbean. Kennedy also sent notes to all the Latin American Foreign Ministries, warning them that trouble may start in the Caribbean area, if Castro does not behave. Yesterday afternoon at 2 p.m., Dr. Fidel



Castro received James Donovan, the U.S. lawyer, and also Alvarez Sanchez, Ernest O. Kireire (?), and Berta Barreto. During the long interview, those present discussed the problem of returning to the United States the mercenaries who are imprisoned on Pines Island. After the long interview, Donovan, the Yankee lawyer, released a communique thanking the officials for the facilities granted him in the fulfillment of his mission and expressing the hope that the negotiations will proceed well.

KEATING, the Republican Senator, joining the hysterical chorus of the noisy candidates on the eve of election, has outdone the Yankee tale about the 5,000 Soviet soldiers who are in Cuba by saying that we have rocket bases in Cuba in order to intercept the launchings at Cape Canaveral. The aims of this imbecile charge are to instill fear in the candid U.S. people and to justify Von Braun's continued failures at Cape Canaveral. Moreover, it is another of the many lies invented by the Yankee Senators during this pre-election period. It seems that Cuba is even to blame for the failure of the rockets at Cape Canaveral.

Coinciding with the uproar by the Yankees in connection with the arms which are arriving from the Soviet Union or which are going to arrive from the Soviet Union in Cuba, here is a cabled dispatch which says that the U.S. Defense Department has sent Yankee rockets and arms to bases in Japan. They seem to be authorized to send arms that far, to Japan, but they shout to high heavens because we are also receiving arms for our defense.

Yesterday, in an urgent meeting held with congressional leaders and all the members of his Cabinet, the lowbrowed and empty-headed President Kennedy after admitting that his information concerning Cuban arms indicates that they are defensive, hurled a dangerous threat when he asserted that the United States is ready to take "whatever means may be necessary to prevent the Castro regime," as he said, "from exporting its aggressive purposes against any part of the Western Hemisphere." He continued to say that information within the last 4 days establishes without doubt that the Soviets have given the Cuban Government a certain number of antiaircraft missiles with a (slant) parabolic range of 40 kilometers, similar to the Nike missiles, together with extensive radar and other electronic equipment required for the operation of these missiles. He said that "we can also confirm the presence of several armed torpedo boats carrying ship-to-ship guided missiles having a range of 25 kilometers."

He said that there are 3,500 Soviet technicians now in Cuba or on the way—and the quantity of personnel corresponds to the number required to help install the equipment and to train [Cubans] in the use of such equipment.

Mr. Kennedy therefore admits that the weapons we have, or which are going to arrive—he is not sure—are defensive. However he has insiduously insinuated that we are going to attack another part of the hemisphere and because of this he warns that he will take whatever measures are necessary.

The assertion or the insinuation is stupid because we do not have any ships with which to transport troops to attack anyone. This is elementary. But this gentleman becomes stupid and says the most stupid things in the world by announcing that we are going to attack other parts of the hemisphere.

Kennedy has also stated that there is no evidence of the existence of organized combat troops of any nation in the Soviet bloc, nor of military bases supplied by the Soviet Union, nor of the presence of ground-to-ground missiles. Were it to be otherwise, he continued saying, the gravest issues would arise. The Cuban question,

he said in conclusion, is part of the world challenge by socialist threats and has to be faced as part of a larger question as well as in the context of the special relations which characterize the hemispheric system.

The United States does not want us to get ready to deal them the blow which will perhaps be the final one for imperialism. This meeting yesterday was due, after all, to the fact that congressional leaders, Senators, and Representatives are giving demagogic outcries that Cuba must be invaded, because elections are coming up. Since he [Kennedy] does not want to or at this time, as he said before, he is not for it or is not ready for this aggression, he tried to explain to them why he did not do it.

However Senator KEATING keeps on shouting, and even after Kennedy's latest statements, he has asked that Soviet ships be stopped and prevented from bringing arms to Cuba. I would like to see the American who will dare to stop a Soviet ship and search it on the high seas. There is just a hairsbreadth from this and nuclear war. This request is of course ridiculous, but it is of extreme gravity. It indicates that at this time it is very serious because in the United States everyone is pushing and everyone is making very difficult situations.

The "worms" lawyer Donovan will supposedly consult with Kennedy, through his brother Bob, who has been the bridge between Kennedy and the relatives committee. Although the shallow-brained one denies it, the U.S. Government is responsible for the fate of the prisoner "worms" who all cried that they had been "given a ride" by being shipped to Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. My recollection is that the unanimous-consent request was agreed to some time ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Connecticut that the request has not yet been agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield the floor, so that others may make their observations.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished majority leader whether any further action on the part of us who have already filed amendments to the pending resolution would be necessary, so far as having them considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services acting jointly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the unanimous-consent request made by the distinguished minority leader is agreed to, as I anticipate it will be, nothing need be done. However, I suggest that the Senator not offer such amendments as amendments to the resolution now being considered, because if such amendments are offered, all bets are off.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am not quite sure I understand the purport of the last statement of the majority leader. Do I correctly understand that the resolution which the majority leader filed a few minutes ago will be automatically referred to the joint committee under the unanimous-consent agree-

ment, and that it is his desire that no amendments to that resolution be filed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I refer to the pending joint resolution having to do with the callup.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate that. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that reference was made to a joint committee. If the request is agreed to, the resolution will not be referred to a joint committee because there is no such joint committee. It will be referred to the committees named sitting jointly.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I merely wish to make certain that the joint resolution which I offered yesterday, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, will be considered along with other proposed resolutions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I particularized the joint resolution offered by the Senator from Vermont. Certainly it will be included in the reference to the committees sitting jointly.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I assume it is implicit in the unanimous-consent request, and is understood, that there would be hearings on the various measures so that various persons could have an opportunity to be heard. My experience leads me to predict that no one resolution in exactly the form submitted will be reported to the Senate. We all have our own ideas. The result will probably be an amalgam of the ideas of many Senators. I should like some assurance from the majority leader or the chairman of one of the committees to the effect that there will be an opportunity for Senators who are deeply interested and who have submitted resolutions to be heard before the committees sitting jointly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All Senators have that assurance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Chair put the request?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to see the unanimous-consent request agreed to. I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to be considered under the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as a further clarification, I should like to address a question to the majority leader. To assist Senators who contemplate offering amendments—and I am thinking of offering an amendment which I have not yet had an opportunity to draft—is it the desire of the majority leader that such amendments be submitted to the two committees without having been filed in the Senate as amendments to any particular bill? They are merely to be referred to the two committees as suggested amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. The majority leader has no choice. He

must make the best of the situation as he finds it.

Mr. SCOTT. I was seeking to ascertain his desire, because I wish to act in accordance with it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That procedure would be in accord with what the distinguished minority leader included in his unanimous-consent request, which the Senate granted.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in conclusion, the possible majority resolution submitted in my opinion does not go far enough. I think it is necessary to say more and to say it more clearly than merely to indicate that the President has certain authority. I think it is incumbent upon the Congress, in the exercise of its responsibilities, to indicate more specifically what it feels should be done and to indicate a willingness to give to the President such additional powers as he may desire. I contemplate an amendment somewhat along those lines.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand that resolutions may be sent to the desk, which will then be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly. I ask that question as a preliminary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send such a resolution to the desk and ask that it be referred in that way.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 389) submitted by Mr. JAVITS, was referred to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, jointly, as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(a) the establishment in Cuba of a Soviet military base would represent a direct and grave threat to the peace of the Americas which cannot be tolerated;

(b) the President should seek to have the Organ of Consultation under the Inter-American Treaty for Reciprocal Assistance meet for the purpose of agreeing upon measures to deal with the existing situation in Cuba as constituting a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States and endangering the peace of America, as defined in the Declaration of Solidarity adopted in 1954 at Caracas;

(c) the President should further, if in his judgment it is necessary, seek consultation with the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(d) the President should take such further action as he deems necessary to prevent the establishment of a military base by any foreign power on the soil of Cuba or of any of the other American Republics.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my reason for taking that action is that I am in accord with the majority leader, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that the action of the Reserve callup ought to be taken as a unit without any relation to this problem, although we all know it does have a relation; and I honor my colleagues who have expressed their views. What I had hoped to do was to submit a resolution—and I have prepared one—and offer it as an amendment, because I

thought it should be considered as a separate subject. As sometimes happens, we approach questions in a circuitous way, but we arrive at our destination. I think the country will be very grateful to the majority leader, the minority leader, and all those concerned for, first, fixing a definite date and, second, coping with what is on the hearts and minds of so many of us.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a great number of people are deeply disappointed over this resolution. It reflects a lack of determination on the part of the President and this administration to exercise the firmness needed to prevent further aggression of the international Communist conspiracy. This potential callup of 150,000 reservists is not going to impress Mr. Khrushchev and the other leaders in the Kremlin. As a matter of fact, it could well be what they want. It would fit in with their scheme to have an on-again-off-again series of crises, hoping that we would respond by calling up reservists and then sending them home; calling up more reservists and then sending them home—all a part of a plan to wear us down psychologically and financially. No responsible person wants to become involved in a shooting war, but powder puff diplomacy as a response to aggression will only whet the appetite of the leaders in the Kremlin.

This is why I prepared my amendment to the pending resolution. All of us recognize that the resolution is not related merely to the Cuban situation. It ties in with critical points around the globe. It is supposed to represent some psychological showing of firmness. But in the minds of the American people there is no question about the close relationship between the latest developments in Cuba and the request by the President for this resolution. I know a great many people are thrilled over our achievements in space and our program to lead in the space race. But we should not become so moonstruck as to falter in our leadership against the forces of tyranny on earth.

Mr. Khrushchev said that the Monroe Doctrine is dead. I think it then behooves the Congress to make a ringing declaration that it is alive. I think it is the duty of the President to take such action as is necessary to prevent any violation of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. And I trust that we shall find a resolution embodying these points on our desks as the pending order of business a week from today.

Mr. President, in connection with the sentiments I have expressed I ask unanimous consent that the lead editorial from the Wall Street Journal of September 10, entitled "The President's Responsibility," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 10, 1962]

#### THE PRESIDENT'S RESPONSIBILITY

It is hardly surprising that people have had mixed emotions about President Kennedy's request for authority to call up military Reserves once more. But the country should be of one mind about it.

First of all, the President must be supported.

The reasons for this are quite uncomplicated. The main responsibility of the President of the United States is to look to the safety of the country and he is the only man privy to all the information, military and diplomatic, upon which judgment must depend. Whatever others may think of that judgment, the Nation's safety is too great a thing to be put at hazard by denying him the weapons he asks for.

In this instance, there is one other thing. Whatever impression his request granted may make upon the world, his request denied, would leave the world to think that the people of the United States were lacking in resolution to do what is necessary. To the hostile part of the world that would be an invitation to greater boldness in aggression everywhere. Few things can be more dangerous than for our enemies to hold our will in contempt.

In short, the President must be supported in this simply because the Nation cannot do otherwise. The penalties of giving the President an unnecessary authority in this case are nothing compared to the forfeit we might pay from denying it.

But the matter should not end there. Having seen to it that the Congress promptly enacts the requested legislation, the country should also be of one mind in expecting of the President some clearer explanation of what he is doing and why.

It was only a few weeks ago that the last of the Reserves called up last year returned to their homes. On that return the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, explained to Congress that the callup had been a necessary improvisation. "But," he said, "improvisation is not a substitute for a sound long-term policy. It is not a practical policy to rely on Reserve forces to meet the repeated crises which inevitably lie ahead."

Not only is the present action thus left to appear as another piece of improvisation, it also has the appearance of an improvised gesture. And considering the present size of the armed forces which confront each other across the world, the idea of adding 150,000 more soldiers for a 12 months' duty is likely to strike everybody as a most trivial gesture.

The balance of pressures at Berlin and Cuba are hardly altered by changing the balance with a handful of soldiers. Mr. Khrushchev understands this very well, for on the very same day that Mr. Kennedy asked to call up these few Reserves, Mr. Khrushchev announced a reduction in the manpower of the Soviet Army. Yet no one supposes that this weakens the position of the Soviet Union at either Berlin or Cuba.

Thus from a military standpoint, the present action has every appearance of being totally irrelevant. This impression is hardly diminished by one of the reasons which is commonly given in Washington for the President's move—politics.

The idea that the action was taken to answer criticism of inaction is not merely the gossip of those unfriendly to the President. A New York Times Washington dispatch put it bluntly: "Officials conceded that there was a political advantage for the administration in meeting Republican criticism of inaction on Cuba and thus forestalling what threatened to become a divisive partisan debate during the congressional campaign this fall."

So taken all in all, the country is entitled to some better explanation than it has received. If it is the people's duty to respond promptly to all calls for the Nation's defense, they also deserve to know the reason and purpose of what they are called upon to do. It is dangerous to have the country feel that its leadership is indecisive and is substituting improvisation for policy. It is worse for the country to think that in the name of defense its leadership is making empty gestures and playing politics.



The President's responsibility for the Nation's safety requires that he give Americans confidence in his judgment and that he make our enemies respect that judgment. This requires more than an unexplained marching of men uphill and down.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have not offered a resolution referring to the Cuban situation. In fact, I have not mentioned the subject on the floor of the Senate for—as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said a few minutes ago—it is much easier to state the facts than to propose a solution. However, I am very glad that the minority leader, the majority leader, and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee agreed to the arrangement providing that resolutions referring to the situation in Cuba will be determined on their merits and not in connection with the resolution which we have before us today.

A number of resolutions have been submitted. These resolutions express the ideas and convictions of the Senators who have submitted them. They inform the President of their views, and the views of those who support them. They also inform the American public.

My purpose in speaking is to say that the Cuban situation with which these resolutions deal is, or can be, dangerous to our security, and to this hemisphere; it is also connected with other danger spots in the world. Any resolution which is passed must have the most thoughtful consideration, and must consider our treaty obligations and relations with other countries of this hemisphere.

When a resolution on this subject is finally adopted by the Congress, it must have purpose. The circumstances under which we are considering these resolutions are among the most dangerous since World War II. The Korean war, the pressure on Berlin and Western Europe in 1949 and 1950, the pressure on Berlin in recent years, mark other critical periods. And now we are faced with the intervention of the Soviet Union in the Western Hemisphere.

We in Congress have our constitutional powers concerning defense and foreign policy. By debate we can help develop policy. But we cannot direct the President of the United States to exercise his powers as Commander in Chief or as Chief Executive. We cannot add to the President's powers by attempting to give him authority to do what he is already empowered to do. We can by our resolution inform the President, our country, and the world, that we support him in the course of action that he prescribes in formulating and directing foreign policy, or as Commander in Chief, and thus strengthen him and our country.

I assume that what the Congress wishes to do, is develop a resolution of substance which will unify the two Houses of Congress and the two parties behind the President of the United States. In saying that our purpose should be to unify the parties and the country behind the President, I do not

mean that the resolution should not have substance. If we are going to pass a resolution referring to Cuba, it cannot escape taking into consideration the Monroe Doctrine in its present status. And in all circumstances, we have the duty of asserting our right of self-defense.

When we think of the Monroe Doctrine today, too often we think chiefly in terms of what Cuba is doing. The Monroe Doctrine was directed against European countries which might assert dominion in this hemisphere. Curiously enough, it was czarist Russia's attempt to exclude all shipping but its own from the Pacific Northwest that first prompted consideration of the Monroe Doctrine. I think we have to recognize that it is the intervention of the Soviet Union in this hemisphere, rather than anything that Cuba can do, which is the threat to our security, and to the security of this hemisphere.

Any resolution passed by the Congress should be a declaration of both Houses of Congress—a declaration which has the full support of both parties and of the administration—so that we stand unified before the world.

I believe it must have substance. I do not see how it can have any great substance unless it is directed not only to aggression by Cuba, but also to any intervention in this hemisphere by the Soviet Union which endangers our security.

Finally, I do not believe we ought to pass a resolution unless Congress and the administration are prepared, if need be, to carry out its terms.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky, who in my opinion is one of the great statesmen of our time, particularly one of the great students in the Senate of foreign policy, that I agree with every word he has said. I wish to associate myself with his observations.

I am very glad that there will be submitted to the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee several resolutions dealing with the Latin American crisis vis-a-vis Cuba. Of course, the final resolution might very well be broadened to cover the other critical areas of the world as well, for the Berlin situation is certainly many times more critical than that in Cuba. Also, the southeast Asia situation is many times more critical than that of Cuba, critical as it is.

However, as we proceed to our hearings on the proposed resolution, I would have Senators keep in mind certain matters that I now call to their attention.

The Secretary of State has already announced that it is planned in the very near future to have an informal meeting of foreign ministers and representatives of the American Republics.

All I can do, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, is to plead with my colleagues in the Senate that in regard to Latin American problems we move jointly with the Republics to the south of us, or try to obtain joint action. We may do great harm in our Latin American relations if we first proceed unilaterally, because

the situation in connection with many Latin American Republics is very delicate. We are subject to misinterpretation anyway, and misunderstanding.

We are a signatory to the Rio Pact. We are a signatory to the Act of Punta del Este. We are a signatory to the Act of Bogotá. We are a signatory to a whole series of Latin American treaties which we have signed since 1823, which put an entirely different perspective upon the Monroe Doctrine of 1823.

The essence of the Monroe Doctrine, as far as the United States commitment is concerned, to stand ready and willing to protect Latin America, and any other part of this hemisphere, from being overrun by any foreign power, is still binding upon us. However, it is not the same Monroe Doctrine as that of 1823, and our historians have been telling that to us now for some decades. They are correct.

Already in the public discussion of the so-called Cuban crisis there has been, I respectfully say, a false assumption on the part of many that the Monroe Doctrine of 1962 is the Monroe Doctrine of 1823. But it will not stand any such analysis.

Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. They would like to have the Senate vote now on the joint resolution in regard to the reservists. I am perfectly willing to have that done. I wish to make a speech in support of the position taken by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in regard to the entire matter of referring to the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee various proposals, now at the desk, dealing, really, when all is said and done, with the Cuban crisis. I feel that I owe it to my administration to call the attention of the Senate to certain facts which I shall bring out in the course of my speech.

But the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts do not think there will be long debate on the reservists joint resolution. If that is the case, why do not we proceed to act on it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am of the opinion that debate on the joint resolution has been exhausted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I had in mind speaking for about 1 minute on the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. But I, too, agree that the Senate should proceed to vote on the reservists joint resolution; and I shall not delay the taking of that vote.

I merely wish to say that as I understood the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky, with whom the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has agreed, the Senator from Kentucky is trying to preserve the essence of the bipartisan foreign policy in connection with the vexing and trying Cuban issue. It is on that point that I wish to associate myself;

and, for that reason, I did not contemplate offering any amendment to the joint resolution.

But I believe we should proceed step by step with bipartisan support. I am delighted that the chairman of the Latin American Affairs Subcommittee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], feels the same way.

In regard to the resolution submitted by the majority leader, I point out that I did not feel that I could associate myself with it or with any other of the resolutions submitted. Therefore, I submitted a resolution of my own. I point out that it calls upon the President to bring about the convening of the Organ of Consultation under the Inter-American Treaty for Reciprocal Assistance; and I also point out that I believe we should try to do anything we do in regard to this important matter in association with the other American Republics. In that connection, I emphasize the word "try," which is the word which was used by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky have expressed exactly my intention.

Mr. President, later this afternoon I shall discuss some of the treaty obligations into which our country has entered since 1823, and which, whether we realize it or not, have modified the Monroe Doctrine.

However, for the time being I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, as I have said, prior to that interruption, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, has announced that in the very near future he plans to have an informal meeting with the foreign ministers of the Latin American Republics. That is a very wise course of action for the Secretary of State to follow. I heartily endorse it. But I would also suggest a caveat to my colleagues in the Senate, that in our consideration of various proposals now at the desk in connection with the policy that the United States should follow toward Cuba, it might be the better part of wisdom for us to work very closely with the Secretary of State in view of the announcement that he has made, and follow no course of action in the Senate that might create any possible problem for him in his informal conferences with the foreign ministers of the Latin American Republics.

Part of the burden of my speech today is to seek to point out to the Senate some historic facts based upon developments since 1823, when the Monroe Doctrine was enunciated.

They are historic facts which in my judgment not only have greatly modified the Monroe Doctrine but also have placed some very definite obligations on the United States vis-a-vis our relations with the Latin American Republics to the south of us, which will be bound to result in a different course of action, as far as international law is concerned, from what would have been our rights in 1823.

#### POLICY OF SELF-DEFENSE IN HEMISPHERE CONTINUES

So that there will be no question of the position of the senior Senator from Oregon, let me reiterate what I stated earlier this afternoon. We still have both the obligation and the right, as the result of the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, to continue to serve notice on the entire world, and act accordingly, that we will not stand by and permit any foreign power to follow an aggressive course of action in the Western Hemisphere, although I wish to say that even in connection with that tenet, it would be the better part of wisdom, before we started out on any unilateral course of action, to confer with our Latin American neighbors to the south of us and attempt to bring about joint action, rather than unilateral action.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS NOT SOUGHT BY PRESIDENT

There have been sent to the desk, for reference to the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, a series of resolutions which, when simmered down to their essence, seek to make certain changes in American foreign policy toward Cuba.

Irrespective of the verbiage of these proposals, I cannot escape the interpretation that what is intended is to prepare the way for military actions against Cuba, but military actions to be taken by the President of the United States and not by Congress.

This is no new position for the Senate. The senior Senator from Oregon has been through this controversy before. In 1955 there was the Formosa resolution, followed later by the Middle East resolution. I point out that in connection with both the Formosa resolution and the Middle East resolution, the President of the United States had asked for them. Has the present President of the United States asked for any of the resolutions that have been offered? The Senate and the country have the right to know.

One of my major premises is that unless the President of the United States asks for the power proposed in any of these resolutions, in my judgment it is inappropriate for the Senate to seek to impose upon him a power he has not asked for. I believe that the President of the United States has all the power he needs under the Constitution as Commander in Chief to protect the security of this country. What worries me, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, is that by way of precipitate action in the Senate we may cause confusion rather than clarification of American foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere.

Delicate as this subject matter is from the standpoint of all of its political implications and complications, the senior Senator from Oregon does not propose to remain silent when he feels that in his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs he has a duty to perform. I am very much concerned about Latin America. I am very much concerned about the crisis that has been created by the Cuban situation, for it is a crisis.

I wish to ask my colleagues in the Senate: What is wrong with placing our confidence in the President of the United States? Do we need to pass a resolution to assure him that we have confidence in him? Do we need to pass a resolution in order to give him constitutional powers he already has? When the President sends a message to the Senate asking for a course of action on the part of the Senate, the senior Senator from Oregon can be counted upon to consider that request upon its merits.

I am a little disturbed about the Senate, in effect and to a degree, seeking to involve itself with the executive functions of the Presidency of the United States in connection with foreign policy, especially when the proposals are as ill-defined as these are. The job of the Senate is to give advice and consent to the President in the field of foreign policy. Under our system of checks and balances, we ought to keep ourselves in a position where we can pass a checking judgment upon a proposal of the President. I consider that to be our constitutional responsibility. I have kept faith with it in all my years in the Senate.

That is why in 1955, a group of us in the Senate exercised our checking prerogative by disagreeing with a request of the President of the United States for the Formosa resolution. If that resolution were before the Senate today, I would vote exactly in the same way that I did in 1955.

The same is true of the Middle East doctrine, for in neither resolution did we provide additional power for the President that he did not already have; nor could we add power to the President which the Constitution of the United States does not give him as Commander in Chief.

#### PARTISAN INTENT OF AMENDMENTS

But oh, Mr. President, what politics will not do to some people. Oh, Mr. President, to what lengths in a campaign year some politicians will not go in order to play politics with the foreign policy problems of the United States. Count me out. I have no intention of being a party to any group in this country that seeks to stir up a wave of alarmism across the country, trying to scarecrow the American people into the fear that they are about to be taken over by Cuba, or by Russia through Cuba.

Again I say to the American people as I said the other day from the floor of the Senate:

You have every reason to have complete confidence in the President of the United States in respect to his handling of the Cuban situation, for the President knows the facts about Cuba, and he is kept in momentary information about the facts in Cuba.

Yesterday afternoon the subcommittee of which I am chairman held an executive session briefing in regard to Cuba. We were briefed on the latest intelligence information concerning what is taking place in Cuba.

I say to the American people: "Fear not, for you have no cause for concern that there is any danger that your gov-



ernment is not taking all the steps necessary to make certain that the security of this country is and will be protected."

THOSE WHO WANT WAR AGAINST CUBA SHOULD  
PROPOSE IT

Mr. President, there is much talk these days about proposals for some type or form of congressional action over and beyond the action of the executive branch of the Government that I think it needs to be said that many of these proposals when they are analyzed to their essence really deal with the power to make war. Those who propose them should be challenged with the question: "Do you want to go to war with Cuba or not? If you do, why try to pass the buck to the President of the United States? Why not bring to the floor of the Senate a resolution declaring war against Cuba, and see how many votes you get?"

Mr. President, the war issue is too delicate to be played with as a political instrumentality in the midst of a campaign year. The power to declare war under the Constitution is vested in Congress. It cannot be delegated to the President. I am not interested in verbiage. I am not interested in semantics to conceal motivations. I want to know whether there are those in the Senate who believe we ought to declare war against Cuba. If there are such, then it is their senatorial trust and duty under the Constitution to come to the floor of the Senate with a resolution proposing to declare war against Cuba, and not in a political document seek to pass the buck to the President of the United States.

POLITICAL MOTIVE OF SOME CUBA PROPOSALS

(At this point Mr. HICKEY assumed the chair.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is also interesting to listen to some of the television programs and read some of the releases by Members of Congress who seem to be greatly concerned about whether or not the President of the United States is taking all the steps necessary to assure the security of this country.

They are concerned about the building up of a Communist beachhead in Cuba and apparently feel that some power he does not now have—although I find it difficult to learn what it is—ought to be delegated to him. They are some of the same politicians who have been telling the American people that the President of the United States, Hon. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, is power hungry; that he is seeking to build up some kind of power dynasty in this Republic. Yet apparently, they would give him more power. Indeed, they are trying to give him a basic function of the Congress—the power to make war. Presumably, they want him to exercise it even though he has not asked for it.

But I do not know whom they think they are fooling, for it is a decoy operation. They know that the American people do not know the facts about Cuba; and they know that many of the facts about Cuba cannot, for security reasons,

be publicly disseminated at the present time. So they play on the fears, the biases, the prejudices, and the emotions of the American people.

Again I say to the American people: "You have every reason to have complete faith in the President of the United States in the handling not only of the Cuban situation, but also the Berlin situation, the Asian situation, and every other situation that is critical in the field of foreign policy today."

Any resolution in the nature of the resolution suggested by the majority leader or suggested by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in the last comment he made a few moments ago on the floor of the Senate will have the very favorable consideration of the senior Senator from Oregon, because, as I understand those resolutions, they do not seek to transfer to the President any of the functions, duties, and trusts of the legislative branch of the Government.

However, I do not believe it is necessary to pass a resolution to assure the President of the United States that Congress is behind him. Whatever resolution is passed had better be so worded that it will not be subject to misinterpretation in Latin America, for reasons I shall develop in a moment.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Now a few words about the Monroe Doctrine as it relates to the discussion which is taking place across the country on television, over the radio, in the newspapers, and in the Halls of Congress. It would be fitting to place at this point in the Record that part of the message to Congress by President Monroe in 1823 which has become known as the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the message be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[Extracts from President Monroe's Seventh Annual Message to Congress, Dec. 2, 1823]

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

At the proposal of the Russian Imperial Government, made through the Minister of the Emperor residing here, a full power and instructions have been transmitted to the Minister of the United States at St. Petersburg to arrange by amicable negotiation the respective rights and interests of the two nations on the northwest coast of this continent. A similar proposal has been made by His Imperial Majesty to the Government of Great Britain, which has likewise been acceded to. The Government of the United States has been desirous by this friendly proceeding of manifesting the great value which they have invariably attached to the friendship of the Emperor and their solicitude to cultivate the best understanding with his government. In the discussions to which this interest has given rise and in the arrangements by which they may terminate the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

It was stated at the commencement of the last session that a great effort was then making in Spain and Portugal to improve the condition of the people of those countries, and that it appeared to be conducted with extraordinary moderation. It need scarcely be remarked that the result has been so far very different from what was then anticipated. Of events in that quarter of the globe, with which we have so much intercourse and from which we derive our origin, we have always been anxious and interested spectators. The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the Allied Powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole Nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, of controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between those new governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security.

The late events in Spain and Portugal show that Europe is still unsettled. Of this important fact no stronger proof can be adduced than that the Allied Powers should have thought it proper, on any principle satisfactory to themselves, to have interposed by force in the internal concerns of Spain. To what extent such interposition may be carried, on the same principle, is a question in which all independent powers whose governments differ from theirs are interested, even those most remote, and surely none more so than the United States. Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none. But in regard to those continents circumstances

are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the Allied Powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them. It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves, in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Monroe Doctrine is a very interesting document. When one starts talking with people, he is often asked, "Mr. Senator, when are you going to support the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine?"

If the person is then asked, "Will you tell me what the Monroe Doctrine is?" his mouth drops open, for on the part of many, the Monroe Doctrine has become a slogan.

There have been great slogans in our history which have stirred up strong emotional attitudes in the people. At the time of the great Northwest Territory boundary dispute, the slogan was: "54-40 or Fight."

Yet, Mr. President, as we read the history of that dispute, we realize that many of those who were shouting "54-40 or Fight" did not know what 54-40 was.

Today the emotionalists and the alarmists are arousing people in this country about the Monroe Doctrine, and they say we had better fight for the Monroe Doctrine. So it is fair to ask, "What Monroe Doctrine are you talking about? First, what do you understand the Monroe Doctrine to be? What was the Monroe Doctrine in 1823; and is it the same doctrine in 1962?"

There is at the desk a resolution which calls on the President of the United States to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. It is too bad that the resolution does not tell us what the Monroe Doctrine is in 1962. I should like to know whether those who are proposing that we instruct the President of the United States to enforce the Monroe Doctrine mean all of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 or only a part of it, because when we refer to the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, we find that a portion of it dealt with Europe. In regard to our taking no part in the affairs of Europe, the Monroe Doctrine said:

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none.

HALF OF MONROE DOCTRINE REQUIRES US TO STAY OUT OF EUROPE

Mr. President, if we were to carry out in 1962 the European part of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, in view of all the treaty commitments our country has

made since 1823, do you know what the President of the United States would have to do?

He would have to get us out of Berlin.

He would have to get us out of NATO. He would find it necessary to close all our European military bases, and to bring our troops home. He would have to recognize the government of East Germany.

However, of course all of us know that is not contemplated. So why do we not honestly admit that the European section of the Monroe Doctrine is as dead as a dodo, and has been for many years?

If there is anything that stirs up my blood chemistry it is attempts to mislead the American people by means of alarmist propaganda on the part of some who, thinking it will give them some political advantage, are inclined to spread it across our land. Mr. President, certainly there is too much of it at the present time on the part of those who, I believe, must be charged with knowingly seeking to raise in the minds of the American people such questions about our great President. I resent it. His powers, his authority, and his dedication to his position as leader of the Nation are ample. Until he sends to Congress a message requesting a resolution which he has concluded will help him in carrying out his duties as Commander in Chief, it will be my position that the burden of proof will be on those who propose to have us adopt some resolution dealing with Cuba.

I have some right to speak on this subject, because I stood for days on the floor of the Senate in 1959, in the midst of complete silence on the part of other Senators, when I was the first to lead the fight in the Senate against Castro's mass executions. It became obvious to me, almost immediately after he took over power in Cuba, that the situation there was merely a case of one dictator being substituted for another, that we were witnessing the substitution, in Cuba, of the procedures of communism for the procedures of Batista, and that certainly human rights suffer and are destroyed under all forms of totalitarianism, whether it be communism or fascism. Senators know whereof I speak. At that time, my early pronouncements against the Castro regime brought down on my head criticisms and castigations, from a great many commentators, journalists, editors, politicians, and jingoists.

But I point out that there is no escaping the rule of judgment which I keep laying down as I judge foreign governments, as well as our own Government; namely, to look at their procedures, and then one can tell what will be the substantive rights of their people.

Mr. President, of course the situation which exists in Cuba is a very serious one. But I repeat that it is being handled well by the President of the United States. I am sure that the proponents of the resolution which calls for enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine would not care to add to that resolution a bill of particulars to tell the President that when they ask him to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, they want him, for exam-

ple to repudiate—in effect—our NATO treaty program, and that they want our forces to be taken out of Berlin, and that they want our country to abandon its participation in European affairs. Of course, Monroe would have had none of these things in 1823—although I have no doubt that Monroe would have had all of them if he had been President during World War II or since then.

In other words, I am saying that times have changed, and the march of human events and world events has brought about the necessity for great changes in American foreign policy. Certainly they have occurred, and there have occurred great changes in American foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere, also.

#### CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF DOCTRINE TO WESTERN HEMISPHERE

When the Monroe Doctrine was enunciated by the President in 1823, there was not a country in Latin America that could have put up any effort in its own defense. They were all weak countries. Much of the area was colonial area.

What great changes have taken place in Latin America, and much of it, may I say to my Latin American friends, with the help of the United States. We have kept faith with our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine, because, if we are going to refer to the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, it raised concomitant obligations on the part of the United States to hold out a helping hand to strengthen those countries. And we have done it.

What I want to point out now is that there has been a whole series of hemispheric meetings resulting in treaties and agreements to which the United States and other American States in Latin America have put their signatures.

In recent decades we have sought to make the Monroe Doctrine not a unilateral policy fixed and enforced by the United States, but a hemispheric policy fixed and enforced by the American Republics.

Mr. President, let me take you back, for example, to the situation prior to World War II, when we were greatly concerned about Nazi Germany's conduct in Latin America. We knew what Germany was doing. We knew that Germany was attempting to do then what Russia is attempting to do now, through Cuba.

She was attempting to spread her Nazi propaganda through Latin America. She was seeking economic penetration by barter arrangements and other trade policies. She was attempting to intervene.

We could have taken the position that we were going to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, but we did not, because we well knew by then that there were great sovereign rights of sovereign powers that had grown to strength in Latin America since 1823. We recognized their sovereign rights and the fact that we had become cosignatories with them in treaty after treaty and agreement after agreement in respect to Latin America.

So instead, we negotiated agreements with our colleague nations of the hemisphere to forestall all the Axis powers from gaining economic or political footholds here.



This is not to say we were 100 percent successful; but in the main we accomplished our objective.

OUR SECURITY DEPENDS HEAVILY UPON TREATIES  
WE SHARE WITH OTHERS

So I want to stress in this speech this afternoon, Mr. President, a point which I think is being overlooked by too many persons, and that is the integrity of our obligations under international law in relation to treaties that we have signed. We are somewhat in the same position, and parallel, to that of Great Britain in the 19th century. Our security depends not only upon our own strength, but upon the strength of the other free nations of the hemisphere and of the world. We can count on their strength because they are bound to us and we to them, and the treaties that I shall discuss later in this speech leave no room for doubt upon the mutually binding effect under international law upon us and our neighbors to the south.

My plea to my colleagues in the Senate is that when they move into this field of international relations they take into account the feelings, the attitudes, and the rights of our Latin American allies. We are bound to them by treaties, and we are the last people in the entire world who can afford to play fast and loose with international legal obligations, not only for moral reasons—although they would be enough—but because our security depends upon our treaties. Britain understood this in the century from Waterloo to Sarajevo. She understood it largely because of her success in upholding the public law of Europe.

I make a plea this afternoon in the Senate that we make clear, not only to Latin America, but to the world, that we propose to uphold the public law of the Western Hemisphere. But if we uphold the public law of the Western Hemisphere, then I say we are going to have to do it on the basis of existing treaties which we have entered into since 1823, and not on the basis of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823.

Some time ago I suggested that for several decades there has been evidence of ill feeling toward the United States in some parts of Latin America because there has been a constant, repeated assumption that we set ourselves up as the guardian of the Western Hemisphere, and that we are going to follow a unilateral course of action and justify it under the Monroe Doctrine.

So the Monroe Doctrine has been challenged in Latin America time and time again in recent decades. Because of that challenge, and in no small part because of that challenge, there has been a great shift in American foreign policy toward Latin America, wherein we have sought to bring our Latin American friends in as allies. We have done it under treaties which have set up this mutuality of obligation and responsibility for the maintenance of the security of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, do you think the countries of Latin America are not concerned about Cuba? Come with me to Punta del Este, where I, along with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], represented the Senate, earlier this year,

as a delegate to the Punta del Este Conference, which brought forth the Act of Punta del Este, and which ended up with a unanimous commitment on the part of the Republics of Latin America to stand together in opposition to the spread of communism in Latin America.

Mr. President, in the debate this afternoon about Cuba, I plead for some reference to joining with our Latin American allies in carrying out the obligations of the Act of Punta del Este. To a certain extent the Act of Punta del Este, as well as the treaties I shall mention shortly, have modified the Monroe Doctrine.

I repeat, these have not modified the right of the United States under the original Monroe Doctrine to make perfectly clear to the world that we will protect our own security by opposing any course of aggression on the part of any foreign power coming into the Western Hemisphere; be it Russia, Red China, or any other.

I regret the degree to which some Americans seem to have become aroused over the slogan "The Monroe Doctrine." Instead of "54-40 or Fight" on the lips of many now is "Comply with the Monroe Doctrine or we shall go to war."

Someone must make an appeal to reason in the midst of the alarmist attitude which seems to be sweeping the country, and ask such questions as I ask this afternoon, "What Monroe Doctrine? What interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine is it asked that the President of the United States enforce?"

#### MEETING OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS DUE

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVRS] has laid stress in his discussion this afternoon on the importance of joint action in regard to Cuba. The position of the senior Senator from Oregon is that that should be tried first. Then, if the members of the Organization of American States are not willing to defend freedom in the Western Hemisphere they can be sure we will not stand idly by to see American freedom go down.

That is why earlier in this speech I made my plea that we ought to take a long, hard look at this subject, pending the Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Latin American Republics scheduled by Secretary of State Rusk. We ought to take a long, hard look at this issue until we know more about the proposals, plans, and programs of the members of the Organization of American States.

My subcommittee has called before it for a meeting next Monday afternoon at 4:30 the American Ambassador to the Organization of American States, Mr. Morrison. I have made clear to Mr. Morrison that I want him to be ready to tell my subcommittee everything he can tell it in regard to the plans of the Organization of American States; subject, of course, to his rights of privilege in his relationships with the Secretary of State and the President of the United States.

I also wish to say to the Senate, and from this desk today to the American people, that under the Kennedy administration my committee has yet to be denied any information that would be helpful to the committee in judging any

problem which confronts us in the field of foreign policy if it requests the information.

Our committee will have a full and detailed briefing next Monday afternoon in respect to the plans and programs of the Organization of American States, if any, in respect to the Cuban crisis.

It was our policy before and during World War II to take joint action in various declarations in order to show that we no longer relied on a unilateral Monroe Doctrine. We did not say "Uncle Sam will do it." To the contrary, we recognized the public law of the hemisphere. We recognized the international, legal, sovereign rights of every republic member of the hemisphere.

Yet today we are hearing very little about proposals for joint action on the part of the American Republics in the Cuban crisis. We are being treated to emotionally packed resolutions calling upon the President of the United States, in effect, to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, which could very well mean calling upon him to make war.

The situation does not call for that kind of alarmism. I do not think it is a service to the security of the country or to the peace of the world to propose such a course of action unless a better definitive job is done by those who are proposing so-called Monroe Doctrine action.

#### HISTORY OF DOCTRINE'S HEMISPHERIC APPLICATION

That causes me to ask the Senate to take a look at the whole question of collective security and the principle of nonintervention in the inter-American system.

I take the Senate to the steps whereby the Monroe Doctrine has been converted, juridically if not politically, from unilateral policies of the United States into multilateral rights and obligations of all of the American Republics.

The Latin American policy of the United States in the 20th century has evolved from the period of the "Roosevelt corollary"—under which the United States undertook to intervene in Latin American States for purposes of maintaining stability and compelling these states to discharge their international obligations—through the transitional period of the "good neighbor" policy of the 1930's to the present period of juridical equality and mutuality of rights and obligations among the American Republics.

The watershed of the transition was the Latin American policy of Woodrow Wilson, who repudiated the "Roosevelt corollary"—although decidedly more in principle than in practice. In a notable speech at Mobile, Ala., on the eve of the opening of the Panama Canal, Wilson declared that "the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest."

In November 1915 Wilson and Colonel House formulated the following articles for an inter-American pact—a pact which was not in fact concluded because of Wilson's belief that the Covenant of the League of Nations, which contained

similar clauses, would be wholly applicable to inter-American relations:

ARTICLE I. That the high contracting parties to this solemn covenant and agreement hereby join one another in a common and mutual guaranty of territorial integrity and of political independence under republican forms of government.

ARTICLE II. To give definitive application to the guaranty set forth in Article I, the high contracting parties severally covenant to endeavor forthwith to reach a settlement of all disputes as to boundaries or territory now pending between them by amicable agreement or by means of international arbitration.

The Republican administration of the twenties continued Wilson policy of pruning off the "Roosevelt corollary" from the Monroe Doctrine. The United States entered into a multilateral treaty for the conciliation of inter-American disputes—the Gonda Convention—at the Inter-American Conference at Santiago in 1923, supplanting thereby the bilateral Bryan conciliation treaties concluded under Wilson. The Inter-American Conference of 1928 at Havana adopted a resolution outlawing aggression—without defining it—and another for the obligatory arbitration of justiciable disputes.

After the Havana Conference the Department of State prepared the Clark memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine, which in effect repudiated the "Roosevelt corollary." Said Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson on February 6, 1931:

The Monroe Doctrine was a declaration of the United States versus Europe, not of the United States versus Latin America.

It is interesting that the Secretary of State should make that statement, but that is the Stimson statement. I repeat it:

The Monroe Doctrine was a declaration of the United States versus Europe, not of the United States versus Latin America.

A special conference meeting at Washington in 1929 concluded the General Convention of Inter-American Arbitration and the General Convention of Inter-American Conciliation.

#### GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY

Franklin Roosevelt's good-neighbor policy completed the repudiation of the "Roosevelt corollary." Roosevelt's policy banned future political interventions and was honored in practice by the liquidation of the Caribbean protectorates, including the release of Cuba from the limitations on her sovereignty imposed by the Platt amendment.

The Seventh Inter-American Conference at Montevideo in 1933 adopted a convention on the rights and duties of states, of which the most significant articles were the following:

ARTICLE 8. No state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another.

ARTICLE 9. The jurisdiction of states within the limits of national territory applies to all the inhabitants.

Nationals and foreigners are under the same protection of the laws and the national authorities and the foreigners may not claim rights other or more extensive than those of the nationals.

ARTICLE 10. The primary interest of states is the conservation of peace. Differences of

any nature which arise between them should be settled by recognized pacific methods.

ARTICLE 11. The contracting states definitely establish as the rule of their conduct the precise obligation not to recognize territorial acquisitions or special advantages which have been obtained by force, whether this consists in the employment of arms, in threatening diplomatic representations, or in any other effective coercive measure. The territory of a state is inviolable and may not be the object of military occupation nor of other measures of force imposed by another state directly or indirectly or for any motive whatever even temporarily.

A Special Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace convened at Buenos Aires in 1936. It adopted a convention for consultation among the American Republics for purposes both of maintaining peace in the hemisphere and of meeting external threats. The Conference adopted an additional protocol relative to nonintervention, which stated:

The high contracting parties declare inadmissible the intervention of any one of them, directly or indirectly, and for whatever reason, in the internal or external affairs of any other of the parties.

The United States is a signatory to that convention.

The Conference also adopted a Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation.

#### MULTILATERAL DEFENSE AGAINST AXIS

The Declaration of Lima of 1938 reaffirmed the principles adopted at Buenos Aires, declaring that the American Republics would consult in meetings of their foreign ministers, at the initiative of any one Republic, for defense of their peace, security, or territorial integrity.

This was the first declaration aimed at the Axis Powers, although it did not mention them. It did not go nearly as far as a lot of people thought it should; but it went further than a lot of others wanted to go. Above all, it was a recognition that the Axis Powers had a program of intervention underway in the hemisphere and that we must be united against it.

Secretary Rusk proposes now to consult with the foreign ministers of the hemisphere. It is his obligation to do it. That is what the Declaration of Lima pledged us to do. That was the check upon unilateral action by any power, including the United States.

Secretary Rusk is not only to be commended—and let me parenthetically point out that he is acting for the President of the United States—but also he has demonstrated again to the American people and to our friends in the Latin American Republics that we recognize our treaty obligations, and that we propose joint action if others will join us. We reserve the right, under the vital and binding part of the Monroe Doctrine, to take whatever steps are necessary to protect our security. But it does not follow that we have the authority to follow a course of action that the sovereign powers to the south of us believe was not connected with the protection of our own security, but invaded some sovereign rights of theirs. That is why I believe it is important that we go slow on a proposal for unilateral action

on the part of the United States or any proposal instructing the President of the United States to participate in some unilateral course of action, until we confer with the cosigners of the treaties and conventions to which we have attached the signature of the Government of the United States.

The first meeting of the foreign ministers met at Panama in 1939 for purposes of shaping a common neutrality policy in regard to the European war. The second meeting of foreign ministers met at Havana in 1940, again for purposes of shaping a common policy toward the European belligerents. The foreign ministers met again in Rio de Janeiro in January 1942 following the entry of the United States in World War II. The Rio meeting made plans for a nonshooting war against the Axis Powers by the Latin American States, belligerent and nonbelligerent, under U.S. leadership and coordination.

#### MULTILATERAL DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNISM

Acting under article 51 of the United Nations Charter, the American Republics met at Rio in 1947 and concluded the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. The essential articles of the Rio Pact are the first, second, and sixth:

1. The High Contracting Parties agree that an armed attack by any state against an American State shall be construed as an armed attack against all the American States, and consequently, each one of the said Contracting Parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

If we go back to the reports of that time, we find it very interesting to observe that many accounts subsequent to it and many scholarly articles referred to this as the great modification of the Monroe Doctrine, in that it spread the Monroe Doctrine to all the Republics of Latin America and that in a sense the Rio Pact under this article I resulted in all the nations in the Western Hemisphere saying: "We stand together to resist aggression from any foreign power."

Perhaps it would be appropriate and pertinent, when we come to consider the resolutions in regard to the Cuban situation, to call attention to the Rio Pact as really more controlling in the situation than the Monroe Doctrine. The resolution which has now gone to the committees and which was offered by the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], does refer to the Rio Treaty.

It is well that it does. The signatories to the Rio Treaty have a mutuality of obligation at the foreign ministers meeting to be called by Secretary Rusk, or through the Council of the Organization of American States, to serve notice that they intend to join in applying article I of the Rio Pact.

Article II of the compact reads:

2. On the request of the state or states directly attacked and until the decision of the Organ of Consultation of the Inter-American System, each one of the Contracting Parties may determine the immediate measures which it may individually adopt in fulfillment of the obligation contained in the preceding paragraph and in accordance



with the principle of continental solidarity. The Organ of Consultation shall meet without delay for the purpose of examining those measures and agreeing upon the measures of a collective character that should be adopted.

#### Article VI reads:

6. If the inviolability or the integrity or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extra-continental or intra-continental conflict, or by any other fact or situation which might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent.

The provisions for collective intervention contained in articles 2 and 6 were conceived predominantly with a view to action against overt military aggression. Infiltration and subversion as practiced throughout the world by the Communist powers was at that time an unforeseen condition. In the words of Prof. Jaro Mayda, professor of international law at the University of Puerto Rico:

Despite the clumsy wording \* \* \* the provision must mean, if interpreted in good faith, that a conference of American foreign ministers, like the one in Punta del Este, can take collective security measures. Neither in its text nor in its spirit does this provision exclude an action against an American state which has become incompatible with hemisphere peace and security.

#### CHARTER OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

The Charter of the Organization of American States was drawn up at the Ninth International Conference of American States at Bogotá in 1948. I now proceed to this very important treaty, to which is attached the signature of the Government of the United States, and with regard to which there is agreement among the scholars that it bears directly on the Monroe Doctrine. It represents, of course, a modification of the Monroe Doctrine, in that an underlying principle of the Monroe Doctrine involving any sovereign power that seeks to aggress against the Western Hemisphere has been spread from the United States to a joint obligation borne by all the Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

The basic provisions of the charter relating to nonintervention and collective security are contained in articles 15, 19, 24, and 25. The latter two repeat the pledges of the Rio Pact to cover not only "armed attack" but also "every act of aggression" or "any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America":

ARTICLE 15. No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements.

ARTICLE 19. Measures adopted for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties do not constitute a violation of the principles set forth in articles 15 and 17.

Article 17 stipulates that the territory of a state is inviolable.

ARTICLE 24. Every act of aggression by a State against the territorial integrity or the inviolability of the territory or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State shall be considered an act of aggression against the other American States.

ARTICLE 25. If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an armed attack or by an act of aggression that is not an armed attack, or by an extra-continental conflict, or by a conflict between two or more American States, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the American States, in furtherance of the principles of continental solidarity or collective self-defense, shall apply the measures and procedures established in the special treaties on the subject.

Article 19, it will be noted, maintains the principle of collective intervention to maintain measures of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties.

I cannot emphasize that article too much. I cannot stress it too emphatically. It is this article of the Act of Bogotá which is generally recognized as another commitment on the part of all the Republics, including the United States of America, for joint action as a substitute for unilateral action which the United States, since 1823, had announced would be its course of action under the Monroe Doctrine in relation not only to its own security, but in regard to the security of other nations in the hemisphere, as well. It is very difficult to make this distinction clear, but it is a vital one. It is one to which we had better give heed, in view of the treaty commitments we have made and in view of the attitude which exists in Latin America toward the United States, and has existed for years.

We very wisely helped to negotiate the Act of Bogotá. We very wisely sought to have the other countries of Latin America join in a multilateral commitment for joint action against aggression anywhere in the hemisphere. We knew how important it was to offset the widespread opinion that in this field the United States tended to look upon the rest of the Western Hemisphere as an American colony to be protected by the mother country. They did not like it.

We could not make a greater mistake than to assume that the Monroe Doctrine has been a popular doctrine in Latin America for the past 50 to 75 years, for it has not. Yet many leaders of many governments during that period of time have recognized the fine motives of the United States, in making clear to potential aggressors elsewhere in the world, "Don't tread on the Western Hemisphere." During the same period of time that the Monroe Doctrine has caused ill feeling in Latin America, there have been various manifestations and pronouncements of appreciation. We have overcome much of that ill feeling by the treaties, declarations, and pacts which I am outlining in my speech this afternoon, for those treaties are based upon a recognition of equality of sovereign rights among sovereign powers

in the Western Hemisphere. That has been very important—very important psychologically, very important diplomatically, and very important in dispelling the notion which the enemies of the United States try constantly to project in Latin America, namely, that we are a great imperialist colossus to the north, seeking to exploit and take unfair advantage of the countries to the south.

That notion has been pretty well dispelled. The good-neighbor policy of Franklin Roosevelt did much to dispel it.

In my judgment the great Alliance for Progress program of President Kennedy will eliminate it entirely in the next 10 years, unless some series of events develops which none of us contemplates or has any reason to expect.

It has been good for the United States, too, because unless the other Republics are sufficiently aroused to the danger and willing to put forth efforts in their self-defense, we would have to devote ourselves almost entirely to this hemisphere.

So I stress this language of article 19 of the Act of Bogotá by reiterating that it maintains the principle of collective intervention to maintain measures of peace and security in accordance with the existing treaties.

Again in the words of Professor Mayda:

Collective intervention in this hemisphere is a legally established procedure, which reflects vital common interests.

#### SUBSEQUENT HEMISPHERIC ACTIONS

The growing intrusions of communism in Latin America, especially in Guatemala, set the stage for the 10th International Conference of American States at Caracas in March 1954.

Despite communism in Guatemala, the 10th Inter-American Conference of American States did nothing much to frustrate it, or to implement the Rio Pact with a joint intervention to root it out. The Latin American aversion to intervention in the internal or external affairs of any of the Republics, whether by any one state or by a group of states, for whatever reason, so evident at Bogotá in 1948, canceled off at Caracas in 1954 any potential of the Rio Pact for joint intervention to deal with this situation. The 10th Conference concluded 3 conventions and voted 117 resolutions, recommendations, and declarations, but stopped short of sanctioning any joint intervention.

Resolution 93 at Caracas pointed directly, but gently, at international communism. It declared:

The domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extra-continental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a consultative meeting to consider the adoption of measures in accordance with existing treaties.

Resolution 95, called the "Declaration of Caracas," straddled the issue of joint intervention by reiterating the right of each state live its own life "without intervention on the part of any group of

states, directly or indirectly, in its internal or external affairs and, particularly, without the intrusion of any form of totalitarianism."

The fifth meeting of consultation of foreign ministers was held at Santiago in August 1959. The Declaration of Santiago added little, if anything, to the collective procedures of the inter-American system. The declaration states:

The existence of antidemocratic regimes constitutes a violation of the principles on which the Organization of American States is founded, and endangers the living together in peaceful solidarity in the hemisphere.

The foreign ministers at Santiago adopted a resolution entrusting the Inter-American Peace Committee to study general questions of collective security, including "methods and procedures to prevent any activities from abroad designed to overthrow established governments or provoke instances of intervention or acts of aggression" and the "relationship between violations of human rights or the nonexercise of representative democracy, on the one hand, and the political tensions that affect the peace of the hemisphere, on the other."

The seventh meeting of consultation of foreign ministers met at San José, Costa Rica, in August 1960 to consider, among other things, the challenge of Sino-Soviet intervention in the American Republics. The Conference adopted collective economic sanctions against the Trujillo regime in the Dominican Republic, but refused to make specific reference to Cuba. The Conference generally condemned Sino-Soviet intervention, and reaffirmed the principle of nonintervention. The relevant clauses are as follows:

1. Condemns emphatically the intervention or the threat of intervention, even when conditional, by an extracontinental power in the affairs of the American Republics and declares that the acceptance of a threat of extra-continental intervention by any American State jeopardizes American solidarity and security, wherefor the Organization of American States is under obligation to disapprove it and reject it with equal vigor;

2. Rejects, also, the attempt of the Sino-Soviet powers to make use of the political, economic, or social situation of any American State, inasmuch as that attempt is capable of destroying hemispheric unity and jeopardizing the peace and the security of the hemisphere;

3. Reaffirms the principle of nonintervention by any American State in the internal or external affairs of the other American States, and reiterates that each state has the right to develop its cultural, political, and economic life freely and naturally, respecting the rights of the individual and the principles of universal morality, and as a consequence, no American State may intervene for the purpose of imposing upon another American State its ideologies or political, economic, or social principles \* \* \*.

Meeting at Punta del Este in January 1962, the eighth meeting of consultation of foreign ministers reiterated the familiar principles of collective security and nonintervention, endorsed the program and objectives of the Alliance for Progress, and acted to exclude Cuba from the Organization of American States.

The key provision of the final act of Punta del Este is the resolution excluding Cuba from participation in any of the bodies of the OAS. This resolution was carried by a two-thirds majority of 14 votes, with 6 abstentions, and Cuba alone opposed.

However, I point out that the resolution was then added to the act of Punta del Este—to the final act voted upon at the Conference; and on that act the vote was unanimous. That procedural distinction has been overlooked by many. Although there was a two-thirds vote of 14 in favor of that separate resolution, with 6 abstentions, yet when the act of Punta del Este containing the resolution as one of the articles of the act was voted upon, the vote was 20 to 0.

By that time the Cuban delegation had left the Conference. As long as I live, I shall never forget the dramatic moments when either the Foreign Minister or the official representative of each one of the six Republics which previously had abstained from voting on that resolution, when called upon to disclose whether they would sign the Act of Punta del Este with the resolution and article contained therein or whether they would abstain from voting, did not hesitate for even the flash of a second, but each of them rose from his seat, walked down the full length of the conference hall to the signing table, and signed the act of Punta del Este.

During the debate which undoubtedly will occur in the days ahead in regard to what resolution, if any, we should send to the President, I would have all Senators keep in mind that there is a joint and unanimous commitment on the parts of the members of the Organization of American States to stand together jointly in opposition to aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

Equally important was a resolution, supported by all of the nations present except Cuba, declaring the Marxist-Leninist regime of Cuba to be incompatible with the inter-American system. In addition, the Conference adopted resolutions—in all cases unanimously except for Cuba—to recognize the dangers of Communist infiltration, to remove Cuba from the Inter-American Defense Board, which plans for joint military defense of the hemisphere, and to reassert support for the Alliance for Progress. Sixteen nations voted to ban all arms traffic with Cuba. It is important to note that all 20 American Republics signed the final act, thereby committing themselves legally and morally to uphold all of the resolutions adopted.

Declaring that the Marxist-Leninist government of Cuba has voluntarily placed itself outside the inter-American system, the final act of Punta del Este resolved:

1. That adherence by any member of the Organization of American States to Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system and the alignment of such a government with the Communist bloc breaks the unity and solidarity of the hemisphere.

2. That the present government of Cuba, which has officially identified itself as a Marxist-Leninist government, is incompatible

with the principles and objectives of the inter-American system.

3. That this incompatibility excludes the present government of Cuba from participation in the inter-American system.

4. That the Council of the Organization of American States and the other organs and organizations of the inter-American system adopt without delay the measures necessary to carry out this resolution.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say that this afternoon I have sought, in this speech, first, to point out that the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 is not the Monroe Doctrine of 1962; next, to point out that all the language of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 in regard to Europe is dead-letter language today; next, to point out that the language of the Monroe Doctrine, which some interpret to authorize blanket authority on the part of the United States to intervene at will in the affairs of any Latin American Republic if the United States believes that Republic is about to be invaded by some foreign power, has been greatly modified by treaties, pacts, and declarations to which our country and our Latin American allies have affixed their signatures; next, to point out that in my judgment there does remain of the Monroe Doctrine, a U.S. foreign policy as binding today as it was in 1823.

#### PART OF MONROE DOCTRINE REMAINS U.S. POLICY

The Monroe Doctrine is not needed to establish this right, Mr. President, because we would have that right, anyway. However, it is our policy to serve notice that if any foreign power seeks to carry on an offensive course of action in the Western Hemisphere, endangering the security of the American people and their Government, we intend to take action, and will.

A resolution is not required to give President Kennedy authority to do that. There is no question about the fact that President Kennedy would do it, as would any President, not only because it is his constitutional duty, under the Commander in Chief powers vested in him by the Constitution, but because every American President is imbued with the same patriotism that runs through the blood of every American.

So I have sought in this speech, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, to make a plea that we go slow in the passage of resolutions which cannot possibly add to the Presidency any power that he does not already have—for we cannot amend the Constitution on the floor of the Senate—but that we make clear, under our advise and consent obligations to the President, if that is the wish and the will of the Senate, that we are behind him. It seems to me almost an empty gesture, almost literary surplusage, to tell the President in written form what he already knows.

I do urge my colleagues to take a look at the treaty obligations we have entered into since 1823; to take a look at the reaction—and it is a very important factor—of the people of Latin America whenever the United States announces that it is going to take a unilateral course of action, without the consultation with



them, which is our commitment under treaties with them.

I have raised my voice this afternoon in an appeal for caution and recognition that there are hemispheric procedures already established under treaties to which we have affixed our signature which ought to be exhausted before there is any talk of unilateral action on the part of the United States or any recommendation to the President of the United States for unilateral action.

It is important that there be an early meeting of the foreign ministers, and I am glad the Secretary of State is going to call for one. I think it is very important that the Organization of American States discuss and decide on what action it is willing to take jointly with the United States and the other Republics in Latin America to meet the threat of a Communist beachhead in Cuba, which could develop into a threat against the security of the United States and that of each and every Latin American Republic.

I warn against precipitate action, for the Cuban crisis is a delicate crisis. I have urged that we demonstrate our complete faith in the President of the United States by not taking gratuitous action in the Senate by forcing action on him.

As I said earlier in my speech, any time the President of the United States thinks that his hand as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief would be strengthened by a resolution passed by the Senate of the United States, I shall give it very careful and favorable consideration, reserving the right to judge it on its merits as I see those merits.

But as to Russia and Cuba, let me say, in closing, that both Khrushchev and Castro had better take note of the fact that we will not be bluffed by any course of action of theirs nor by their threats. We intend to keep ourselves informed, and, as I pointed out in my speech, we are informed as to what is going on in Cuba. If they proceed with any program for aggression in Cuba, such as ground-to-ground missiles, or launching installations, that would endanger Miami, New York, Chicago, or any other part of the United States, let them understand that we have no intention of waiting for them to fire the first missile.

When intelligence reports come to my committee disclosing any such information as that, Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon will yield to no one in this body in urging that our Government take whatever measures are necessary to protect our security.

Mr. President, war and peace are in a delicate balance in the world today. We should put a very high premium upon the policies of the Commander in Chief, with his submission to us of the information which we are entitled to receive from him, and requests for assistance that, in his judgment, will be of help to him in carrying out his responsibilities as Commander in Chief.

I happen to think, Mr. President, that this position is the strongest position which can be taken in American foreign

policy. This is the position which maintains a united front. This is the position which prevents the stirring up of diversity of opinion and conflict.

In my opinion, this is a position, in keeping with the teachings of that great Republican who once sat in this body, who exercised the greatest influence over me in foreign policy of any Member who has ever sat here with me. I refer to the great Arthur Vandenberg. In short, the appeal I have made this afternoon is the appeal of the nonpartisanship, bipartisan foreign policy of Arthur Vandenberg.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the joint resolution be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

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 North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 254 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Allott	Gore	Morse
Bartlett	Hart	Mundt
Beall	Hartke	Muskie
Bennett	Hayden	Pearson
Bible	Hickey	Prouty
Boggs	Hill	Proxmire
Bottum	Holland	Randolph
Bush	Hruska	Robertson
Butler	Humphrey	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Scott
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Carlson	Keating	Smith, Maine
Case	Kefauver	Sparkman
Chavez	Kerr	Stennis
Clark	Lausche	Talmadge
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Curtis	Long, La.	Tower
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Wiley
Douglas	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McCarthy	Yarborough
Engle	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Fong	Metcalf	
Goldwater	Miller	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Fulbright	Morton
Anderson	Gruning	Moss
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Capehart	Johnston	Neuberger
Carroll	Jordan, Idaho	Pastore
Church	Kuchel	Pell
Cotton	McGee	Smith, Mass.
Dodd	Monroney	Symington

So the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 224) was passed.

#### FREEDOM IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the News Bulletin is a publication of the American GI Forum of the United States. It is actually a veterans' family organization and the Bulletin is published in Chicago.

In the April 1962 edition there appeared an editorial which I believe is a genuine inspiration to all. It certainly merits wide currency, and for that reason I ask that it be included in my remarks in the RECORD.

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

No matter how long we have been a citizen of the United States, fought its wars and paid

its taxes and served it with love and devotion, the sagas of heroism in the ancestral homeland always cause our hearts to beat a little faster, our heads to rise a little higher. This is how it should be, for we are partners in this heroism. This is part of what makes us a great nation; we thrill to the ancient heroisms of our ancestors, and are better citizens because of it.

High on the list of days that stir the soul of those of us with Mexican blood is the anniversary of the Battle of Puebla "en El Cinco de Mayo." This year marks the 100th anniversary of that day when a tiny band of dedicated Mexicans, under the generalship of young Ignacio Zaragoza, repulsed a vast, better armed and arrogant French army which thought it could speedily wipe out this little peasant garrison. From their forts of Loreto and Guadalupe on the rolling hills of Puebla, the little garrison fought with a splendor that sent into disordered retreat those French soldiers it didn't kill. What was it that stopped this superior French force?

Spirit, heart, love of freedom, and a determination to keep out the foreign invader. In these days of enslavement, it is well for all of us to heed the lesson of the Mexican martyrs. Freedom in the Western Hemisphere is under constant threat. The memory of El Cinco de Mayo can help to keep this continent free from foreign invaders and hostile ideologies.

#### FRANK FLICK, CITIZEN OF THE YEAR OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of Illinois at their meeting in Springfield honored Mr. Frank Flick, president of the Flick-Reedy Corp., of Bensenville, Ill., as the Citizen of the Year.

Mr. Flick was introduced by Department Commander Muller and I submit for the RECORD the introduction of Mr. Flick by the department commander and also the address by Mr. Flick. In addition there is submitted a pledge to freedom which was contrived by the VFW. I am sure these will be matters of interest to everyone.

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

##### PLEDGE TO FREEDOM

I recognize my individual moral responsibility to provide for my own welfare and the welfare of my family, of my business, my clubs and associations. I pledge that I will not ask my Government to provide such welfare and if offered I will refuse to accept such welfare. I further pledge that I will serve the interests of my country above my own selfish interests. I believe that if I faithfully adhere to these principles and encourage others to do likewise, we will win the fight against the forces of regimentation, socialism, and communism, and re-establish the principles of individual moral responsibility and freedom for all under God.

Department Commander MULLER. Comrade Sergeant at Arms, would you escort the Man of the Year to my station?

##### PRESENTATION TO MAN OF THE YEAR

(Mr. and Mrs. Frank Flick escorted to the rostrum.)

Department Commander MULLER. First I would like to present Mr. and Mrs. Flick with

the distinguished guest badge of our convention. I want to extend all the courtesies of our convention to both of you.

Ladies and gentlemen of the 43d annual convention of the department of Illinois. Mr. Frank Flick, our 1962 Citizen of the Year of Illinois, is the president of the Flick-Reedy Corp., Bensenville, Ill. Flick-Reedy are manufacturers of tool-grade air and hydraulic equipment, owners of one of the Nation's 10 most modern industrial plants. He is the father of six children. He is a great civic leader, prominent in many State, local, and national organizations. Recently Flick-Reedy was recognized with the National Award of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, at the same time that this foundation recognized our own VFW fifth district for its Americanism program. Many of these programs were carried out with the cooperation of the Flick-Reedy Corp. in which Mr. Flick, as president, plays a leading role. Frank Flick has been chosen for the highest award by the department of Illinois, as its Citizen of the Year, in recognition of the sterling leadership he has given the Chicagoland area in a reassessment of their American heritage, their blessed possession as a free people. This award is given in recognition of his insistent effort, along with the efforts of his associates at Flick-Reedy whom he leads, through lectures, newspaper articles, radio, TV, and his editorials in the company newspaper Hydair, and other public information media, to bring all of our citizens to an awareness of the Communist threat against our liberties as Americans and to fortify them against this threat by constant aggressive reminders to become alert and active Americans.

I speak of this activity because I have seen this Flick-Reedy program in action. I have attended meetings and lectures at his plant, and members of our staff have seen the tremendous program put forth by this man. We all know that no program is one man's doing, but I am here to tell you that this man puts forth the greatest and most energetic leadership and drive that I have ever witnessed. This is the kind of business leadership America needs. This is the kind of leadership that will keep America free.

At this time it is a great honor and privilege—and I would like to have Mrs. Flick come up with Mr. Flick to receive our annual Citizen of the Year Award by the Department of Illinois, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and its almost 90,000 members of this State—Mr. Flick and Mrs. Flick.

[A rising ovation by the audience.]

Mr. FLICK. Thank you. I accept the Citizen of the Year Award with a deep sense of humility.

In giving me this recognition you have also charged me with additional responsibility. I sincerely hope that I can live up to your expectations in carrying out that which will follow from this distinguished award.

The first observation I would like to make is that no one person can ever be totally responsible for receiving an award of this type. It required the cooperation of many, many people, and I had that cooperation. I want to particularly refer to the men and women of my company, the Flick-Reedy Corp. They gave me all the support that one could ever expect. They worked tirelessly on the Americanism programs. It didn't make any difference what they were asked to do, they did it willingly. To the employees of Flick-Reedy, then, goes a great deal of credit for this award.

The community of Bensenville deserves credit too. You can arrange for all of the programs you want but if the community does not have the spirit to come out and attend the programs, you are talking to empty chairs. So at this time I want to thank the community, the community of Bensenville, Du Page County, and Metro-

politan Chicago, for their share in this award.

I want to especially thank one of your area groups who shares in this award, VFW Tloga Post 2149, Bensenville. They did much toward helping us achieve the goals we set for ourselves, and I take a great deal of pleasure in introducing three men, delegates to your convention, who I think should have special recognition. They work for Flick-Reedy and they are members of Tloga Post. They are members of the color guard of Tloga Post and no matter when they were needed, they were always there, as part of the color guard at any program we ever had. I would ask the following men to stand as I call their names: Fred Wender, Leland Scott, and Bob Mulligan. [Applause.]

Before I mention the next individual, who was a great help to us, I want you to know I have given this a great deal of thought before I decided to mention his name. The reason I did so was because I do not want to hurt this individual. He is running for a high office in your organization and, as a consequence, I feared that perhaps some might misunderstand that my talking about him would be interpreted as propaganda. Those who know me well would know that I would never do this. So I am going to chance it. I hope you will all understand me as well as my close friends do, when I say that Ray Soden, your department inspector, contributed more to the success of our program and our contacts with the community than any other man. We are grateful to you, Ray Soden. [Applause.]

A few words about some unsung heroes that are usually bypassed at a time like this. I was so pleased that my wife could share this honor with me by being here on the rostrum. She contributed so much; she was willing to wait at home with the children while I was gone all evening on some share of this work; or just came late for dinner. She was most patient and encouraging. My wife contributed much to the earning of this award and I share it with her. [Applause.]

There is one other person who should be remembered, and this perhaps should be classed in the category of the inspiration that many of us grown men live by, the inspiration of our dads. If I have anyone to thank for what I do today, in the area of Americanism, it is my dad. He would be known today as a "superpatriot." I want to tell you just one quick story about him.

In Lincoln Park in Chicago they used to have parades on Sunday mornings and dad used to take the children to see them. I was about 8 or 9 years old, but I never forgot this incident. The American flag was passing by, the hats were off and arms across the chest, when dad looked over to the man next to him, who hadn't taken off his hat. My dad nearly knocked the man to the ground with a blow across the chest with his forearm as he demanded, "Take off your hat. That is the flag of our country." The man didn't have to take his hat off. Dad had knocked it off. You can imagine what an inspiration in Americanism this was to a kid 8 or 9 years old. I have never forgotten it. I'm sure all of you have had experiences with your own dads that are the inspiration of why you are here today, why you are doing a job in your great organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

My dad is no longer with us. My mother, 88 years "young," couldn't be with us today, but she was the inspiration to my dad, as my wife is my inspiration, and a great deal of credit also goes to her.

Now, I have a little message for the VFW if you will bear with me. I feel if I didn't have some message to leave with you today that I would not be doing what you expect of me.

I want you to know that this distinction has particular significance to me. I wonder



if many of you will understand fully what it was to be too young for World War I and too old for World War II. I could not be a veteran. I never can be. This is a privilege that will never come to me. But you have given me something which is perhaps the closest thing that I can ever receive in lieu of being one of you—your Citizen of the Year Award.

I want to speak about the veterans. Your participation in a foreign war earned you the right and distinction to be a veteran. This, no one can take away from you. This designation did not automatically earn you the right to be a member of your great organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This may sound strange to you who have become used to this distinction but to me it is very meaningful. In order to be a true member of your great organization of VFW, must you not earn and reearn the privilege every single day of your lives by your actions, by your continuity of patriotism, as demonstrated by coming away from your jobs as you have today by coming here to this great convention and a hundred other ways in your daily lives? Is this not why the organization of Veterans of Foreign Wars means more than just the simple words "veterans of foreign wars"? Are you not a select group who discriminate selects its members? Everyone can't belong.

I ask myself, what is the purpose of the VFW? I didn't read your constitution or bylaws to see what it was. Through the years I believe I have gotten an impression of what the VFW stands for. I think it can be expressed quite simply in that you, as former military men, will continue to fight for the freedom and constitutional government that you fought for with guns as soldiers on the battlefield. When you smelled gun smoke on the battlefield, your objectives were pinpointed for you. There was no question, there was unity, there was strength, there was courage and, believe me, I know from the stories it wasn't always the guns you had—it was your courage that won the wars for us so that these United States could remain free.

Now what is your job as members of the VFW? How can we pinpoint our problem?

It can be pinpointed in the main by recognizing that we now are in a new type of war. Recognizing this can we go one step further and see if we can pinpoint what our action should be in this new war, this strange war, this war that gives us as many problems as, no doubt, our forefathers had when they were fighting to start a new idea, the birth of a nation, a new concept of government, a new concept of freedom? I think we have to somehow or other pinpoint our objectives as they did. These were men who also gave their last full measure of devotion.

Who is this war with? First, I don't think anybody questions it is with both communism and socialism, for they are certainly bedfellows in objective though they may vary in method to achieve their objective. If you end up being controlled by and your property owned by the state, it makes little difference as to whether you got that way by revolution or by neglect. There are forces rampant in the world that deny you your freedom and your rights as individuals. With these rights go obligations and individual responsibilities. How can these evil forces of regimentation which deny us so much freedom have made so much progress? Let us take a close, hard look at the words "individual responsibilities." All of us by nature are lazy; we want the maximum benefits for the minimum effort. This is instilled in us by human nature. When somebody comes along and says, "Gee, I'll take over that job of individual responsibility so you won't have so much work to do," believe me, this is appealing. This attitude

gives us an insight and some idea as to why there has been so much progress made in regimenting us in causing our loss of freedom and progress and leading us on the road to socialism and communism. The Kremlin has said, "First socialism—then communism."

Let us look at individual responsibility another way. Let us look at it from the moral point of view.

Everyone has the individual moral responsibility to provide for his own and his family's welfare and well-being. Under ordinary circumstances, does the individual have the right to shift this responsibility to the state? Does the individual have the right to force a third party to provide for his welfare and well-being or that of his family? If the individual is unable to provide for his and his family's welfare, can it not be provided by voluntary contributions of a third party or parties? Does this not give people an opportunity to earn their salvation through real charity? "He who gives charity is thrice blessed," wrote Pope Leo XIII, in *Rerum Novarum*, the papal encyclical. If a family finds itself in great difficulty, utterly friendless, and without prospect of help, it is right that extreme necessity be met by public aid—but the rulers of the state must go no further; nature bids them stop here. Paternal authority can neither be abolished by the state nor absorbed. The Socialists, therefore, in setting aside the parent and introducing the providence of the state, act against natural justice, and threaten the very existence of family life \* \* \* and such interference is not only unjust, but is quite certain to harass and disturb all classes of citizens, and to subject them to odious and intolerable slavery \* \* \* the sources of wealth would themselves run dry, for no one would have any interest in exerting his talents or his industry.

The next thing I think we should ask ourselves is, Are we winning this war with socialism and communism or are we losing it?

Have we drifted into more socialism here at home since the gun smoke died out in 1945 and 1952? Are you not more regimented today under socialistic concepts and schemes than a few decades ago? I think the obvious answer is "Yes," we are losing this war to socialism here at home. Let us take a look as to how we are doing elsewhere. Have we not lost millions of souls throughout the entire world, near and far, who have been lost to communism since you men and women last fought in a foreign war to free all men from oppression—from regimentation? Our score at home and abroad does not seem to ring true to the tradition of winning wars so well established in years past by you veterans. The word "victory" has been abolished. Patriotism is corny. The flag is not respected.

Now I would like to ask the question, since we appear to be losing in this war, what can we do about it? Who can we look to, to turn the tide? Who can we look to for leadership to win this war? For it must be won. As we cast about, we find that there are many organizations in this country, great organizations, our churches, our schools, our teachers, our Kiwanis, our Lions, our chambers of commerce, to name but a few who might be looked to for leadership. As we look at this imposing list, we find that each and every one of these organizations have a specific purpose \* \* \* but that purpose eminently good, is not specifically to lead us in this cold war against the forces of regimentation. But there is one organization that, it seems to me, should be the natural leader in the cold war. This natural leader is the great VFW of the United States, 90,000 strong in the State of Illinois alone. Do you think among your members you have enough force, enough power, enough courage

to win not only this war but any challenge requiring courage that is put to you? I am sure that if you put your shoulder to the wheel, if you put your mind to it and your will, that there will be no question as to the outcome.

So the next obvious question is, Are you doing as much today as you can do? As an individual? As an organization? As much as you have to do? If we are still losing ground in this cold war day after day, then doesn't some special efforts have to be carried forth in order to reverse the tide and carry us back to victory?

Can your great VFW, your "superpatriots"—and I am not using that word derogatorily, because you have demonstrated time and again that you are great superpatriots—lead us to victory in this cold war as you did when you faced the guns of the enemy? I say there is a challenge here; it is not to criticize the tremendous job and work that you are doing but when we see that this is not enough, then I urge you to see what can be done about doing a little more that will carry you and America to victory.

Let us pinpoint our objective if we can. We have all kinds of good freedom programs in America today. The programs have the support of the good, civic organizations as well as the VFW. We can step these programs up and I think that is being done today, but is this the total answer? I do not think so.

The action that I am going to suggest is one that requires individual action. It is an act that will be quite simple, yet at times will take more courage than was ever required of you on the battlefield. Yet I know and am confident that when you realize, as I am sure you will, that this action might well save your country, you will not fall in the courage needed to carry it out.

The action that I am going to ask of you is that your great organization of VFW consider the adoption of the following pledge to freedom whenever you pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States.

"I recognize my individual moral responsibility to provide for my own welfare and the welfare of my family, of my business, my clubs and associations. I pledge that I will not ask my government to provide such welfare and if offered I will refuse to accept such welfare. I further pledge that I will serve the interests of my country above my own selfish interests. I believe that if I faithfully adhere to these principles and encourage others to do likewise, we will win the fight against the forces of regimentation, socialism, and communism, and reestablish the principles of individual moral responsibility and freedom for all under God."

If this pledge were carried out in your every day decisions it could help reverse the trend towards regimentation, socialism and communism. Would it not promote individual responsibility and freedom? Is there any question but that it would do just this?

We agreed earlier that we are losing this battle because we are slipping into more regimentation and losing freedom. Whose fault is it? Let us not blame the men in public office. When you are a citizen of these United States, do you not swear to uphold the same laws, the same Constitution and freedoms, the same defense of the individual's rights, as the President, the Senate, and Congress of the United States?

Is your moral responsibility less than his or any other public official? If you waver and make your decision on a selfish basis; if you are afraid to stand up and be counted, what can you expect your public officials who feel they must "give" you what you want? You courageous men who faced the guns of the enemy, who rushed in when the shots were falling all around you to save a buddy, to save your country, did not hesitate then. You had courage then. Will you have the same courage now to serve your

country or will you excuse yourself for fear of the nasty names that might be leveled at you if you speak out against regimentation? Will you hesitate because you might lose some business? Will you rationalize that if you do not take this business order which is intended for delivery to the Communists, somebody else will take it anyway, so you might as well take it. "Some one is going to make a buck—it might as well be me." These are everyday decisions and this battle in my estimation will be won when each and every patriotic individual in these United States makes their decisions on the basis of the suggested VFW pledge to freedom. Your great organization here in Illinois could start right here today, right here this minute, with leadership, first in our State—90,000 strong—and then on a national level to spearhead a national campaign to encourage everyone to ask themselves this question, "Will this action of mine today promote regimentation or will this action promote freedom?"

In every decision involving these factors, I'm sure you have the courage to ask yourself this question and follow with right action now that you realize and understand what this will do for you and your family and country in winning the cold war against communism.

God bless you, and with the grace and help of God, I am sure that this fine, great, wonderful, patriotic organization that has bestowed on me this distinguished honor today, will lead this country back to freedom and away from regimentation at home and in all parts of the world. You can. You must lead the way to victory.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Department, Commander MULLER. Ladies and gentlemen of the convention. I would just like to say if we follow the words of Mr. Flick, and I am sure we will, we will be greatly inspired and motivated to do more than we have ever done before.

Frank, I want to say it has been a great honor to be associated with you. I am going to retire "to the pastures" next Sunday, but if there is anything I can do to help, I'll be around.

Mr. FLICK. We will work together. [Applause.]

#### VISIT BY ROBERT FROST TO SOVIET UNION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on September 11 the New York Post published a column written by Max Lerner under the caption "Frost Flavor." It relates to the visit of Robert Frost, the poet, to the Soviet Union, and what has intrigued me about this column is one paragraph setting forth what Khrushchev said in the course of his interview. He said, according to the column:

The American capitalist democracy has bred the corrupt flower of modern liberalism which Communists scorn far more than they do reactionary militarism and racist fascism. This is what he is counting on during the years ahead. It is the same paralysis of will which Josef Schumpeter noted as part of the disease of democratic intellectualism. It is a gap which separates a leadership and people who have a conscience and a sense of guilt from those who have neither.

What an interesting comment from Nikita Khrushchev.

I ask unanimous consent that the column from the New York Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### FROST FLAVOR

(By Max Lerner)

Robert Frost has come back from his journey to Gagra, on the Black Sea, where Nikita Khrushchev came to his bedside and they talked of America and Russia. Frost is one of our authentic representative men, and gives a characteristic flavor to every sentence. His report of the exchange between the two men is worth more pondering than the whole raft of Khrushchev interviews that have floated over the Atlantic.

Frost called himself a tramp poet, but on his principle that poetry and power are related he is recognizably making some forays into the realm of power, where he is far less at home than with poetry. He called Khrushchev variously a mighty monarch and a ruffian. But not let the anti-Khrushchev society rejoice prematurely at the latter epithet, for Frost saw after sleeping on it that it was scarcely diplomatic language about a man who had sat by his bedside, and modified it into rough and ready. But I like his first term, "ruffian," especially since he meant it genially and said it almost with affection.

If poets must join diplomats in censoring their language, which comes to them by a magic route out of their unconscious, then what's the use of having a poet talk politics?

The spectacle of an 88-year-old man taking a jaunt to the Soviet Union is one to cherish. Old men have been advisers of heads of state in the past, they have been court jesters and storytellers, they have been ambassadors, they have been singers of songs. But it is rarely in history that an old man has combined something of each of these roles, as Frost has.

Khrushchev said of Frost that he has the soul of a poet, but unfortunately they talked only politics, with little about poetry. Frost's crucial ideas were roughly four. First, that Russia and America are the two great realities in the world, and that little else counts. Second, that rivalry between them is good for both and for the world, and that progress-out-of-conflict is the law of God. Third, that the two nations express two different kinds of democracy; that the Russians are humanizing down to democracy, and easing down to socialism while we are straining up to it. Fourth, that the rivalry between the two powers must be carried on with magnanimity, by which Frost meant with chivalry and in a noble manner.

These are all ideas with a Frost flavor, as I can testify from having known him somewhat over a number of years. He means them as a poet should mean his political ideas—in a large generous way, vaulting over the generations ahead, without too much precision of concept, and with a concern for the long future rather than the day to day.

But we who are not poets nor power men must live in the here and now, and we have learned truthfully how the Communists have been able to use the generously meant notions of some of our best spirits. For example, Frost's idea that only Russia and America count, and his insistence on dismissing other countries, does not help free world survival much at this particular time. The Russians like the idea of a Russian-American modus vivendi, with the other nations counted out. For the other nations are chiefly the European ones, like Britain, Germany and France, which are today shaping an economic and political unity in Europe that is the great phenomenon of the 1960's. The Russians cannot hope to have them on their side, but they hope to split them from an Atlantic partnership.

Or take the notion that there is not really much of a gap in freedom and democracy

between the free world and the Communist world—that the Russians are leveling down while we are leveling up to democracy and socialism. If I were Khrushchev I would rejoice at such an opinion, and I should even forgive its holder for calling me a ruffian. For in the war of ideas between the two systems the most radical weapon the free world has on its side is the idea of freedom and of the shaping of individual life by the individual personality. When that is leveled out of existence, a sharp weapon is lost in the very rivalry which Frost regards as a law of God.

But the saddest fact is that while Frost was talking of magnanimity, chivalry and the noble manner, Khrushchev was talking out of a Communist ethos which scorns all three, and regards them as survivals from a precapitalist age of feudalism. The payoff came in a remark of his which Frost failed to quote in his Moscow interview but did quote on his return to Idlewild. "Khrushchev said he feared for us modern liberals. He said we were too liberal to fight."

This was what the interview really came down to. Khrushchev told this devotee of poetry and power that American capitalist democracy had bred the corrupt flower of modern liberalism, which Communists scorn far more than they do reactionary militarism and racist fascism. This is what he is counting on during the years ahead. It is the same paralysis of will which Josef Schumpeter noted as part of the disease of democratic intellectualism. It is the gap which separates a leadership and people who have a conscience and a sense of guilt from those who have neither.

Robert Frost, I am certain, does not go with this tender mindedness of "us modern liberals." If he did he would be far less of the poet than he is. And the iron in the Frosts of our time, as well as the poetry in them, may be what will save the free world.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we are honored by the visit of a distinguished delegation representing 11 NATO countries.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be included the names and the countries from which these delegates come.

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

#### VISITING NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS

Belgium: Mr. Hubert de Groote, Mr. Henri Moreau de Melen, and Mr. Jacques Van Buggenhout.

Canada: Miss Julia Verlyn LaMarch and Mr. Robert Muir.

Denmark: Mr. Victor Gram and Mr. Viggo Hauch.

France: Mr. Jacques Baumel, Mr. Raymond Mondon, and Mr. Jean Chamant.

Germany: The Reverend Hans Merten and Prof. Dr. Hans Susterhenn.

Italy: Mr. Girolamo Messeri; Senator Pietro Micra, President of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

Netherlands: Gen. J. H. Couzy and Col. W. Wierda.

Norway: Mr. Otto Dahl and Mr. Bernt Ingvaldsen.

Portugal: Mr. Jose Soares da Fonseca and Mr. Manuel Antonio Fernandes.

Turkey: Dr. Fethi Tevetoglu, Mr. Haydar Tunckanat, and Mr. Nuvit Yetkin.

United Kingdom: Rt. Hon. Earl of Listowel, Mr. John Hall, Mr. William John Pell, and Mr. Anthony Kershaw.



Staff, NATO Parliamentarians' Conference: Mr. O. van H. Labberton, Executive Secretary; Miss Claude Goffart, Deputy Executive Secretary.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This delegation of approximately 40 parliamentarians, representing 11 NATO countries, has been in the United States since September 4. On September 5 they were flown to Wheeling, W. Va. From there they went into Ohio and spent a day visiting industrial facilities in that State. Then they made a tour of various military installations. On September 6 they visited the Strike Command at McGill Air Force Field. On September 7 they visited the Air Force Missile Test Center at Cape Canaveral. On September 8 and September 9 they spent the weekend at Miami. On September 10 they visited the Supreme Allied Command Atlantic, and had briefings, tours, and demonstrations there. During the last 2 days, September 11 and 12, the group has been attending meetings held at the State Department—meetings of the Standing Committee, the Economic Committee, and the Military Committee. It will no doubt be interesting to many Senators to learn that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is chairman of the Military Committee of the NATO Parliamentarian Conference, and that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is the chairman of the Economic Committee of the Conference.

We have been working with the parliamentarians and, together with the Committee on Foreign Relations, were joint hosts to them today. It is a great pleasure and an honor to have the parliamentarians visit us. I am delighted to present them to the Senate. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I express deep gratification at the presence of our colleagues, who are led by the President of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, Senator Pietro Micara, of Italy, who is among our guests in the Chamber.

I am happy to report to the Senate that I feel our sessions have been very fruitful, especially with respect to an understanding of the problems of our country as they are developing, and our clear understanding of the problems of our European allies.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I join in welcoming our visitors and in commending them for their excellent cooperation with us. I feel certain that our NATO alliance will be much stronger by reason of the understanding and the diligence which these people have indicated in their meetings with the military committee. We are all interested in a common problem, namely, the strength of our NATO alliance, in order that we can combat the Communist threat.

These fine people have traveled a great distance and have worked diligently in order that we might strengthen the alliance. I am sure that their efforts and understanding will do much to strengthen the NATO alliance in combating threats from the other side of the Iron Curtain.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may stand in recess for a few minutes, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The Presiding Officer of the Senate at this moment extends, on behalf of the Senate, a welcome to our distinguished guests upon their visit to the Chamber. I am sure the Chair voices the judgment of his fellow Members that we recognize our mutual interdependence in trying to solve the problems of the world. We know that that which is a threat to your security is ultimately a threat to our security. We feel certain that your views correspond with ours, in that the security of your countries is in a substantial respect dependent upon the continued security of our Nation. We have a common interest. All dangers are common to us all.

The Chair feels that he expresses the thinking of the people of the United States in these troublesome hours that our main base of confidence in the quest for security depends upon the cooperation which the NATO nations and our country will pursue in the years to come.

The Chair welcomes you to the Chamber. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, perhaps it might be of interest to Senators to know the countries which are represented by our guests:

Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a mark of respect and friendship for our friends from the NATO countries, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to reconvening at the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Accordingly, at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair).

#### URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1962

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3615) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for

the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

#### CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the order which I ask to have stated for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That in the engrossment of the bill (S. 3019) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland, passed by the Senate on yesterday, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make the following correction in the reported print of the bill, namely: On page 2, line 16, strike out the words "University land" and in lieu thereof insert "University Lane".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tonight it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

#### THE TRANSPORTATION CENTER CONFERENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, transportation has played a major role in the growth of this great country of ours from its earliest days. Today, the movement of goods and people is a \$100 billion a year industry and a very large portion of our gross national product. Transportation affects the lives of all of our people; whether it be by air, land, pipeline, truck, or water.

On October 29 of this year, for 2 days, the transportation center at Northwestern University at Evanston, Ill., will have a national conference on private and unregulated transportation. There will be new information on a topic of concern to all transportation modes and to shippers. That topic is private carriage, or the shipment by companies of their own goods in their own trucks. The transportation center conference is the first industry-university discussion of private carriage ever held. It is expected to attract several hundred representatives of shippers, carriers, and Government agencies to hear research personnel present the facts and a new theory of private carriage.

One of the controversies in which this conference proposes to stress attention

is the question of regulation versus non-regulation. That is, when a company ships via common carrier, such as a commercial truck line or railroad, it is using forhire transportation whose rates and services are closely regulated by various public agencies; but when a company uses its own trucks to haul its goods, it is using private carriage, which is not subject to regulation. These and other tangents of this issue will be discussed at the conference at the transportation center at the Northwestern University.

The transportation center is to be commended for its efforts and this undertaking, which I believe will be of immediate value to the carriers, shippers, and American public.

I ask unanimous consent that a part of a brochure on this conference be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

The advantages of nonregulation have been held by many to be one of the main reasons why more and more shippers seem to be turning to private carriage. And this apparent growth of private carriage has been blamed by the common carriers for much of their loss of business.

While opinions on the subject of private versus common carriage are hotly held and have been the subject of intense industry debate for many years, facts are few, largely because private carriage is unregulated and not reported to Government agencies.

However, available statistics from the Interstate Commerce Commission show that private carriage has been increasing in use and importance, bringing benefits to some areas and problems to others.

While the number of intercity ton-miles hauled by common carriers increased three times between 1943 and 1958, the proportion of ton-miles fell from 50.66 percent in 1943 to 35.14 percent in 1959. In other words, while common carrier ton-miles have increased, private carrier ton-miles have increased faster.

At least 18,000 companies now have fleets of 10 vehicles or more, and some 85 percent of the country's 12 million motor vehicles are operated in private carriage.

In addition, it seems likely from available evidence that private carriers account for an increasingly important share of the high value freight as well as high bulk freight, such as television sets, glassware, scientific instruments, and the like.

This leaves the common carriers with the low bulk and low value freight which they are apt to be called upon to haul on an infrequent or standby basis.

There are many reasons cited for the growth of private carriage. President Kennedy's recent transportation message lists two:

1. The development of modern highways, which has reduced the dependence of manufacturers on central locations near port facilities or railroad terminals.

2. The development of improved production techniques that require spacious one-story plant layouts which in turn have made many industries move out to the edge of cities where space is available and where common carrier facilities are scarce.

But these are not the only reasons. A company that is using private carriage will often cite two more reasons that are more important to the firm:

1. Cost: These companies believe, for one thing, that they can haul their goods for less than the common carrier rates filed with Government bodies. Rates can be revised, but the procedure takes too long.

The cost factor is especially pertinent where a company is in position to use its own trucks both going and coming. In fact, the 1960 Doyle report to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce observed that "In a reasonably balanced, two-way traffic pattern, private carriage will usually be cheaper for the user than for-hire carriage, so long as the volume and frequency of traffic provides good equipment utilization."

2. Better service: The company using its own trucks sets its own schedules, delivers goods to its own and its customers' specification, can offer a more personalized service, and generally has less trouble with breakage and claims settlement.

For example, an electrical goods manufacturer saves the trouble of specially crating its transformers now that it uses its own trucks. An auto parts supplier says it now can deliver goods in its own trucks within 2 working days to its retail outlets, compared to a maximum of 8 to 10 days via common carriage.

A TV set manufacturer can make arrangements with his retailers to have sets delivered in night hours by giving his truck-drivers the keys to stores and instructions to bring the sets inside. This is something that a common carrier trucker could not do.

But there are disadvantages, too. By operating its own trucks, a company puts itself into the transportation business and must allot managerial time to it.

This is where the common carriers produce their severest counterargument, for they claim that companies do not really know their costs and are fooling themselves if they think they are saving money through private carriage.

The common carriers point to examples of private carriers using gasoline trucks for long hauls when diesel power would be better. Or they point to cases where inadequate insurance coverage, resulting from inept management, has brought losses to a company transporting its own goods.

Nor, say the common carriers, do companies properly evaluate the rate of return on their private carriage equipment investment; the same money invested elsewhere would probably earn more.

They recognize that some companies have made a thorough study of costs and have installed top managerial talent to operate private carriage. They doubt, however, that any ultimate savings were accomplished or that the rate of return has been equal to or greater than the rate of return in other aspects of the business.

The common carriers also say that much of private carriage attractiveness is based on illegal backhauls. For example, if a private truck carrying a company's goods from one city to another is scheduled to return empty, the company might contract to carry another company's goods on the return trip. This is an illegal practice unless confined to agricultural goods or a wide class of exempt products in intrastate movement.

For the common carriers, whose profitable business is seemingly being eroded by private carriage, the answer appears to be a matter of loosening the regulatory bonds on common carriage, imposing regulations on private carriage, or both.

The common carriers note that the ICC often puts "floors" on rates that are too high, and that these high rates prevent the common carriers from attracting the volume business that is necessary to sustain large-scale operations.

But, as the transportation center conference will point out, even these large scale economies of common carriers have very narrow limits.

Thus, as the common carrier loses more and more business to the private carrier, its average costs increase and its profitability decreases. These trends are partially respon-

sible for mergers, and might eventually force some carriers out of business altogether.

If this comes to pass, the large shipper would lose his common carrier standby facility and he may find that he is unable to operate private carriage profitably for the larger proportion of his shipments.

The smaller shipper in these instances would then be without adequate resource for shipments via common carrier.

What the common carriers would have is registration and regulation of private carriers (a bill requiring this has been introduced by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS), plus a general loosening of the restrictions on common carriers.

There is therefore at least a possibility that the rights of companies to furnish transportation to themselves (and thus their ability to badger common carriers with that right) could be to some degree curtailed by Government.

Whether or not statutory changes regarding common and private carriage will be forthcoming will depend largely on a more accurate knowledge of private carriage. The transportation center conference will mark the first time that all segments of the transportation industry have banded together to obtain this knowledge.

The conference will present empirical data to transportation management in both the shipper and carrier categories, and for the use of regulatory agencies and the courts. At the same time, the conference expects to give management the working knowledge needed to make intelligent shipping decisions.

One of the highlights of the conference will be the presentation of results of a survey on the scope of private carriage conducted by transportation center researchers. The survey required 2 years and \$125,000 to complete. Funds for the survey were provided by widely divergent transportation interests including shippers, carriers, and labor, all seeking to obtain new information for industrywide use.

As part of the research project, the largest of its kind ever undertaken, questionnaires on transportation practices have been sent to 10,000 manufacturing companies with headquarters in the United States. Other fresh data is being obtained from special runs of data collected in shippers' surveys by the Bureau of the Census.

The conference will project the most accurate picture of private carriage to date, and advance indications are that private carriage will be shown to be not quite the rapid-growing phenomenon that many people think it to be.

The funds for the transportation center shippers' survey to be presented at the conference were contributed by the following:

Associated Truck Lines, Inc.; Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.; Chesbrough-Pond's Inc.; Chicago & North Western Railway Co.; Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co.; Denver-Chicago Trucking Co., Inc.; Gateway Transportation Co.; Great Northern Railway Co.

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America; Interstate System; McLean Trucking Co.; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co.; Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.; New York Central System; the Procter & Gamble Co.; the Quaker Oats Co.

Red Ball Motor Freight, Inc.; Ruan Transport Corp.; Ryder System, Inc.; Southern Pacific Co.; the Western Pacific Railroad Co.; and Yellow Transit Freight Lines, Inc.

For the carriers, the conference will present a more definitive picture of the shipper and the factors which influence him in his choice of carriage.

For the shipper, the conference will present a theory of private carriage and its empirical testing based on the research. The theory will be designed to give management



a better understanding of the factors to be considered in determining whether private or common carriage, or what combination, is best for a company.

For Government, including regulatory agencies and the courts, the conference will shed new light on the relationships of private and common carriage providing a better basis for ratemaking decisions and other actions affecting transportation services.

#### MAINTAINING A SOUND ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all trustees of a great trust—the American system. I have spoken on the subject of the two great issues: First, can we maintain the peace? Second, can we contain communism?

And now, today, we are going to talk about the third great issue or challenge: Can we maintain this country economically healthy? Or, in other words, can we maintain a sound economic system? Of course, we cannot do that if war should come, nor would we be able to do it if we were taken over by the Communists. So we have got to make sure that we win the two previous issues.

Now the third one is most important, and calls for the best thinking of all Americans.

The cold war still continues. The demands on us to make our contribution to contain war from erupting in other places, plus the tremendous cost of being adequately prepared, required upward of \$50 billion or more. Now, as someone has said, "that's not peanuts." Then, beside that item we have the interest on our national debt, our veterans pensions, the overseas cost of Government, and so forth, and so we get up to a total close to a yearly need of \$100 billion.

Of course, we are a nation of 186 million people. We have within our borders half of the market of the world, but we also are faced with tremendous challenges that we did not have a few years ago. I mean foreign competition. With our Marshall plan, and other aids, we have built up the manufacturing plants of other nations where labor is cheaper. We have now got to see that the markets of America are not flooded with these foreign goods. At the same time, we have got to maintain our export-import trade, which provides quite a problem.

Then, of course, the farm program is with us. During the war we said to the farmers, "Produce, so we can feed the world." And they did. Now, we have surpluses in practically everything that the farmer produces. How to handle that problem has not yet been solved.

We cannot ignore the fact, either, in considering our economic welfare, the turbulence in the new nations, where the people are just coming out of their sleep. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that just off our shore is Cuba, which is a Communist satellite, and China, with its more than half a billion searching, seeking human beings which Mao Tse-tung may cause to erupt at any time.

Now, let us discuss the meaning of a sound economic system—bearing in mind we must keep the free enterprise

system intact, and not let state socialism take over our system.

Besides protecting our economic philosophy, we have our political system to preserve. I mean the great freedoms that we are trustees of. The Communists have no appreciation of these jewels of great price. Yet, in some of the Communist countries the yeast is in ferment.

The goal of maintaining a sound economic system is, as a goal, something none of us will argue about. We know that a sound economic system is absolutely indispensable to the welfare of our own people and the peace of the world. But there are, in my opinion, two aspects of this subject that will merit some discussion:

First. A brief consideration of what constitutes a sound economic system; and

Second. Some guidelines as to what we, as a nation, must do to assure that we will continue to have a sound economy.

We can start by recognizing that the main function of any economic system is to permit the optimum satisfaction of man's physical and, yes, his spiritual needs as well. With this criterion, we must agree that our American economy has over the years performed with remarkable effectiveness. When we consider the fantastically involved complex that our economy has grown into, and how it usually performs its myriad functions with minimal friction, we may rightfully have great pride and faith in it.

We hear a great deal about the growing intervention of the Government into the affairs of businessmen and the decline of individual freedom. I do not deny some element of truth in this charge. But let us also remember that the overwhelming day-to-day economic decisions are those made freely and without governmental coercion by all of us as producers and consumers of the goods and services needed by over 186 million Americans. In no other land does the economic system function with as much freedom of choice as in America. Despite the growing powers of government, of big business, and of organized labor, it is still the consumers of America who in their freedom of basic choices play a pivotal role in the economic process.

I, of course, do not mean to suggest that we should complacently accept our economic system as it is, even though it is basically superior for us to all alternative systems. Each of you will have no difficulty in pointing to areas where change, change for the better, is urgent. And to strive for such improvements, promptly and with vigor, is necessary if we are to preserve that freedom of choice and the freedom of action in our economy as we know it.

When we talk about a sound economic system, we clearly mean to reject any thought that such a system can be static or rigidly fixed. We must focus our attention on an economy that grows as the needs of the Nation and its people grow. I do not intend to get into the idly speculative game of percentages of economic growth and whether we should or should not have a rate of growth greater than

that of Britain or Germany or Russia. There are so many ways of measuring economic growth, and the rate of growth is so dependent on the base period from which the rate of growth is measured, that any single percentage figure, such as a growth rate of 3 percent a year, is rather meaningless.

Furthermore, there is no merit in growth just for the sake of growth, any more than sound reason to keep on inflating a balloon higher and higher. We want not just economic growth, but that particular kind of economic growth that is needed to cope with our growing population, our technological advances, our expanding needs. We want the right kind of economic growth because we know that our Nation will be stunted and stifled if we permit our human resources to lie idle and fail to harness the talents and imagination of our people to the goals we cherish.

Thus, perhaps the paramount economic need of the Nation today is to take steps to solve the nagging problem of excessive unemployment in today's labor force. As Senators know, in the past 8 years, the rate of unemployment, even at the peak of the business cycle, has been creeping up. Today, after a steady improvement in most economic indicators over the past 16 months, unemployment—seasonally adjusted—is still, as of June 1962, 5.5 percent of the civilian labor force. It went down to a low of 4.9 percent in February 1960 and even further to a low of 3.9 percent in March and April of 1957.

There are, of course, many reasons which have been given to explain this disturbing trend. Many believe that the rapid advances in automation and other technological developments have cut so sharply into the employment of major industries as to more than offset increasing employment in other, newer industries. The relative satiation of consumer demand for many durable goods that were in exceedingly short supply at the end of World War II, coupled with a slacking of investment in production facilities for such items, is also considered a major factor. In some industries, such as coal and iron ore, depletion of resources combined with high labor costs, has caused serious unemployment. In certain industries rising imports have been a factor.

Thus, it is obvious that there can be no single, and no simple, solution to the exasperatingly persistent unemployment phenomenon that confronts us today. But there are certain basic approaches that may help us in thinking about the problem. First, we can stand on the basic premise that the primary responsibility for the employment of America's potential workers rests with the businessmen of this country. The American businessman has throughout our history shown great resourcefulness in providing consumers, directly and indirectly, with the goods and services they call for, and, as we know, through the many media of advertising, has done much to stimulate and magnify such demand. They have, as a result, been the motivating force behind the employment of

American workers and will continue to be so.

But it is clear that there must be a reasonable prospect of profitable operations before an enterprising businessman will invest in plant, buy materials, and hire labor for expanding production. And it is precisely in this area that the Government shares responsibility with private enterprise. It has always been the function of Government, now as much as ever, to assure business of a so-called economic climate in which the profit motive has a fair chance of operation. Thus the entire fiscal program of the Government is immediately involved. We think of the tax burden which individuals and corporations have to bear. There is no doubt in my mind that substantial changes in our tax structure are called for. Not only has the tax structure been modified piecemeal again and again over the past decades, resulting in many complications and inequities, but the entire tax burden is now so high, on both corporations and individuals, as to raise serious concern as to its effect on the economy.

It is quite possible that incentives for business investments may have been already affected. I am in accord with the President's pledge of August 13 to reduce tax rates in January, but I am not entirely convinced that an earlier tax cut might not be more desirable to stimulate both consumption and investment before a possible downturn in the economy reaches such proportions that more drastic cuts may prove necessary.

The new depreciation schedules issued last month by the Treasury Department should, in themselves, provide some stimulus to investment, with further impetus to be provided by the investment credit bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee. However, I believe it important to recognize that tax cuts should be geared to the stimulation of both consumption and investment. It is idle to stimulate investment alone, unless such investment will be shortly transformed into higher levels of consumption. And, notably in the lower income brackets, any increases in disposable income resulting from a reduction in personal income taxes can be expected to be transformed almost wholly into spending for immediate consumption.

The amount the Government takes in taxes is, of course, important to businessmen and consumers alike. But no less important are the expenditures of Government, and that includes State and local as well as Federal expenditures. Too often these expenditures are viewed in almost completely negative terms, in terms of what they drain out of the private economy. We too easily forget that they contribute much to the economy as well.

The largest segment of public expenditures goes, as Senators are well aware, for national defense purposes. Although there will always be controversy as to the relative merits of various military weapons and military strategy, we will all agree that unless our Nation is protected from potential aggression, economic freedom and a sound economic system become little more than a hollow shell or

a distant dream. We want our defense dollars spent wisely, but we know that upon this defense rests our hopes for our chosen way of life, for survival itself.

Many, if not most, other public expenditures are intended in one way and another, to help provide particular benefits to our people, benefits which are not, or cannot be as readily provided by private enterprise. Here again, we will find opposition to the farm program, to the highway program, to proposed programs of aid to the aged, but in each case, the people, through their elected representatives, have determined that the Government is in a position to promote or protect essential activities in the national economy with greater effectiveness than other groups. So we have a Federal farm program to help assure farmers of adequate income; a highway program to facilitate movement of people and goods by motorists, public and private truckers, and buses; and Federal assistance to the aged.

Thus far, I have spoken of how the Government can help private business solve the unemployment problem by providing, in various ways, a more favorable economic climate that will encourage the expansion of business and therewith the employment of more workers. I have thus dealt with stimulating the demand for labor. We should also take a few minutes to look at the supply of labor, because part of the answer to the unemployment problem, particularly in the long run, lies in the abilities of those in and those coming into the labor market. This phase of the unemployment problem is currently crystallized when we contrast the disturbing unemployment figures I cited with the fact that our major newspapers contain page after page of help wanted advertisements, but advertisements almost entirely for engineers, physicists, designers, sales executives, computer programmers, and other highly skilled personnel. We have unemployed miners, but a crying shortage of engineers. Textile and leather workers are pounding the pavements, but we have far too few doctors, nurses, and teachers.

This points to an educational crisis that is becoming more serious every year. Here, too, the solution is not solely a matter of private or of public concern. Businessmen will undoubtedly accelerate the training programs offered by many concerns in the major industries of the country. Private schools, training centers, colleges, and universities will certainly expand.

But there is little question that the major responsibility for a citizenry trained to meet the vocational needs of tomorrow will be in the hands of our public school systems throughout the Nation.

The problem of adequate schools and colleges is doubly acute due both to the rapid acceleration in the number of school- and college-age boys and girls, and to the more advanced training, some of it requiring expensive laboratory and other equipment, which the needs of today's and tomorrow's technology and economy make essential. It is this need which must receive the highest of priori-

ties among public officials in all levels of government. It deserves the most serious attention of all of us as private citizens.

It is a familiar economic axiom, that while man's resources are limited, his needs and desires are virtually limitless, in any case far outstripping the resources, natural and human, available for filling these needs. We must make choices. We must decide as citizens what we shall insist on and what we will do without. One thing we cannot do without is adequate educational opportunities for our children, and not just for our children, but for all of us, those wishing to learn a new trade and those who want to continue to expand their intellectual and social horizons. This will keep taxes, especially State and local taxes up. But I can think of few dollars that are more important than those that help provide more and better teachers and educational facilities.

I have sketched for Senators a few of my thoughts on what we need to do to assure ourselves of a sound economic system in the years ahead. It is a task that all of us share. It is a responsibility of the Federal Government to see that private enterprise has the opportunity to function freely and fairly. But it is even more important for private enterprise to take advantage of its rights and potential to provide the goods and services we and our country require.

Finally, we should recognize that we should never consider a sound economic system as a final goal in itself. An economic system exists solely to serve the needs of the people. A sound economic system will help us to maintain peace. It will help us in our dealings with other peoples of the world. It will make possible greater understanding and appreciation of the myriad talents and interests of our own people. It is an indispensable tool for progress. But it can never take the place of spirit of liberty, of patriotism, of human sympathy and understanding, which is the essence of worthwhile living here and now.

#### U.S. HUSH-HUSH GIVES REDS TIME TO SET UP BASE IN CUBA

MR. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Reporter, a weekly newspaper which will soon be converted into a daily newspaper, is attracting much attention as a new newspaper. Particularly interesting have been the special reports by Mrs. Edward Hunter, the author of a number of books on Communist brainwashing techniques. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mr. Hunter printed on the front page of the Milwaukee Reporter entitled "U.S. Hush-Hush Gives Reds Time To Set Up Base in Cuba" on September 7, 1962.

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

U.S. HUSH-HUSH GIVES REDS TIME TO SET UP BASE IN CUBA

(By Edward Hunter)

WASHINGTON.—The same hush-hush that provided Fidel Castro with the protection he needed to capture Cuba for the Reds is



now giving Moscow the time to make a base for space war out of Cuba. In both instances, this protection was provided by the State Department.

Whatever the motivation, Red success in this maneuver can make American defense in decisive space war practically impossible.

The recent Communist success in placing two manned satellites close to each other in the heavens was a military measure, closely linked to the mission given the Red technicians sent to Cuba by the Soviet bloc.

Destruction of a rocket in orbital flight does not require contact between it and another rocket. The destroyer does not have to come any closer than the second spaceship sent up by the Communist Russians came to their first one, if Soviet claims are anywhere near accurate on this point. Even if not, they came near enough in the present stage of military preparation.

Both of those rockets were sent up by the Kremlin, which maintained them under its constant control. The problem the Reds face in confronting the American defense program is that the Kremlin would not know the exact details of orbit by our sky vehicle.

That is, if the Reds do not have espionage agents to handle this part of the maneuver for them. We certainly know they make every effort under such circumstances to plant such agents. Our hush-hush on inquiry into communism in the United States, and official discouragement of anti-Communist activity, can only help them repeat their previous successes as in the theft of our A-bomb specifications.

A satellite tracking station in Cuba would give the Moscow-Peiping axis exactly what it needs to counter American retaliation for an attack. Precise data is required on the initial flight path of a satellite.

The Cuban tracking station could obtain this for the Reds, letting Moscow know at once. Exactly as the second spaceship it sent up came close to the first one, a rocket could be dispatched, with or without being manned, to go close enough to one of ours to destroy it, or at least to push it off its track. This would be equivalent to shoving a pistol off target.

Rocket ships are so delicate that only a slight reverberation is required in space to send it onto a different path, off target.

Moscow's whole military strategy for aggression is built around the knowledge it obtains from us, of our developments and actions, and our announced policy of never striking the initial blow, but sitting back and waiting to be hit first, with all the enemy can throw at us.

#### FIRST BLOW IN GAMES

Perhaps in harmless children's games, one permits a first blow to be landed, but not in any fight for keeps, that is, if one seeks survival and victory, and isn't distracted by a fantastic no-win policy. The probable enemy has to be let known without any doubt that he would never be given an opportunity to land an initial blow, certainly not with possibly decisive weapons, but that the moment he tried, he'd be reeling, himself, from attack. This isn't belligerency.

Such a sane approach would require much more realism in our intelligence services. Isn't this what they were set up for? What else can be anywhere nearly as important as data on such matters?

But exactly as we let the Communists know a dozen years ago, that we were depriving South Korea of sufficient weapons to defend itself, thereby inevitably bringing on the Korean war, the Reds have been invited to design their war strategy on the basis of our declaration that we will take the first blow.

All the Communist war machine has to plan, therefore, is to make any American retaliatory blow ineffective. Hence the sig-

nificance of Cuba in the Red military planning by Khrushchev and his coexistence co-conspirators.

If the Kremlin can find out at once about any retaliatory blow that we might attempt, it would have the advantage it needed for victory. A satellite tracking station in Cuba would go far to provide just this strategic military information.

The flow of Communist military technicians into Cuba is directly connected with this program of the Peiping-Moscow axis. While Cuba's Red bosses have frankly declared they intend to help in every possible way to bring about the destruction of the United States, we officially go on the premise that it is a friendly country, and that our relations to it are bound by neutrality provisions.

This is "asking for it" in colloquial language. Will we never learn, until it is too late?

#### TECHNICIANS MILITARY MEN

President Kennedy used doubletalk in his press conference when he was asked about the reports that Communist troops from East Europe had been brought into Cuba. He said, No, there was no evidence that they were troops. Yet he knew, and so do many in Washington, that this reply was misinformative, because the technicians are mostly military men. The modern military officer is primarily a technician. They had been sent into Cuba for military preparations, not to build sugar mills.

Consistently, for several administrations, the American public has been deceived in this semantic manner as to the true world situation. Censorship is now being used against the American people, not as it traditionally was in the past, to keep the enemy from knowing security matters. This was proven by the testimony in the recent Senate hearings on the gagging of Pentagon officers. A subtle change has been imposed, without permission of Congress, or the knowledge of the American people.

This has gone hand in hand with the development of an anti-anti-Communist policy in so-called prestige newspapers, that collaborate in such distortion and suppression of the news. This is the primary danger in a one-ownership press in any important community in our land, irrespective of the political leanings of the proprietorship. This is why we had a traditional check-and-balance, competitive system, now being destroyed simultaneously with the rise of a new political approach, falsely called liberal, that favors centralization of power in a so-called elite in the Nation's Capital.

The American public, understandably worried by such developments as the absorption of Cuba into the Red military network, is being lulled and deceived by the doubletalk by those who have become inflated with power under a government-by-the-elite ideology.

Only Congress, safeguarded by the Constitution, stands against such kidnapping of Government processes. Congress can only fulfill its responsibilities if backed by a determined electorate that will insist on it upholding its constitutional rights. A competitive press is essential for a public to be properly informed to be able to be vigilant and exercise its sovereign powers.

The people are sovereign in the United States, certainly not the appointees in high places in Washington, who act as if they were rulers.

The Monroe Doctrine provides the United States with every right it requires—except the will—to safeguard its existence against the incursion of any foreign ideology into the New World. The threat against us that Maximilian posed in Mexico in 1864 was nothing compared to the peril in which we have been placed by the incursion of international communism into Cuba.

#### MONROE DOCTRINE IGNORED

The Monroe Doctrine was tossed into the scrap heap of history by Washington bigwigs not too long ago. They were so world minded they forgot about America's safety. At President Kennedy's press conference of August 29, when he was asked several times about Cuba, and finally specifically about the Monroe Doctrine, his answer was weak kneed and misleading, one of those interpretations that replace aboveboard speech in the Nation's Capital nowadays.

The traditional American position regarding the Monroe Doctrine, until the State Department's so-called lower echelons perverted it, has been as definite as anything has ever been in our national life. We did not allow foreign ideology to move into the Americas, supported by foreign power, because this constituted a danger to American survival. This was the Monroe Doctrine.

President Kennedy answered, Yes, the Monroe Doctrine still meant what it always did—nobody denies this—and then, as an example, said that we were working in the Organization of American States "to isolate the Communist menace in Cuba." This is not how the Monroe Doctrine is supposed to operate. It is not an alliance, it is U.S. policy.

#### EXTENDING RESPONSIBILITY

This is extending the responsibility, which has always been our own, to others. We wonder, with such displays of weakness, why these others then refuse to accept the responsibility we no longer accept.

Data in the offices of a number of Congressmen and Senators in Washington has provided firsthand information on the abrogation in Cuba of the Monroe Doctrine, and the establishment of a foreign-armed, foreign-run military force in that island neighbor. The same suppressions are now imposed on the Cuban people as are inflicted against the East Germans, where they are made visible for all the world by the wall of shame. The shame is ours in letting it rise, for on the side of the Reds, the wall constitutes a defiance, demonstrating power and the will to employ it, with utter disregard of human rights.

If anything will bring war and destruction to the American people, it will be a continuation of hush-hush and distortion in information allowed to reach them on such fundamental matters as the creation of a Red military base out of Cuba.

The American people can be trusted to maintain a rational balance in what they expect of our leaders, and to be willing to accept whatever sacrifice the occasion requires, if provided the truth, without it being clouded over, or distorted, or made into a lie by semantics and doubletalk. This way of trust and frankness in our people, and this way only, can the American public provide their Government with the support and the strength that alone can save us from war and destruction.

Before this can come about, the government-of-the-elite mentality must be erased from our political minds in Washington.

#### THE CARACAS RESOLUTION OF 1954 AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, earlier today the well-read and well-informed columnist, Arthur Krock, published an article which I think is extremely pertinent to the discussion about the Monroe Doctrine and the Caracas resolution of 1954. Mr. Krock points out clearly and conclusively that it is still the right of the United States to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, unilaterally if necessary.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CARACAS RESOLUTION OF 1954 AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—For some time now, beginning with the indispensable U.S. support of the U.N. military offensive against Katanga as required to preserve international peace, a certain phrase has been reiterated by officials of the Kennedy administration with an air of confidence that the words justify every foreign policy which has been under strong critical fire. In addition to the U.S.-U.N. Congo policy of waging peace with the implements of war, these critical targets include two others in particular. They are the failure of the administration to lay before the U.N. Assembly India's violation of the charter by seizure of Goa; and the administration's role in Indonesia's blackmailing operation in Netherlands West New Guinea.

The phrase in constant public use by officials here against critics of these policies is, "Do you want a full-scale nuclear world war?"—the import being that this single alternative is not a matter of judgment but a fact established beyond any shred of doubt. But the Cuban situation has spawned another, and very privately uttered, phrase aimed at those who contend that Soviet Russia has clearly challenged the Monroe Doctrine there. The expression is, "The Monroe Doctrine is dead." To make this statement in public would raise a tornado of public protest, would echo a similar appraisal by Premier Khrushchev and controvert President Kennedy's recent reaffirmation of the doctrine. So it is not surprising that the few who say that, and support it with the following arguments, specify they are talking strictly off the record:

1. When the 10th Inter-American Conference of 21 nations met in March 1954 at Caracas, it adopted a resolution urged by Secretary of State Dulles. The principal declaration was that control of the political institutions of any American state by international communism, or any extension of that system to this hemisphere, would constitute a threat to the Pan-American continents, and would be met by immediate consultation and action under existing treaties.

DELEGATING POWER TO OAS

2. The actual and practical effect of this resolution—approved 17 to 1 (Guatemala alone voting "no," Mexico and Argentina abstaining)—was to turn over enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine to the Organization of American States as a multilateral proposition. Thereby the United States delegated to the OAS its historic position that it could and would enforce the doctrine unilaterally as before, when in its judgment the extension of a foreign power system to this hemisphere became a matter of fact.

3. Hence, unless and until such an extension was evaluated by the United States as a solid threat to its security, this Nation would abdicate enforcement of the doctrine, and the details of enforcement, to the judgment of the OAS.

4. Consequently, the historic Monroe Doctrine died at Caracas in 1954, and the only basis for forceful U.S. measures toward Cuba is an evaluation by the President that the threat posed there endangers national security.

A supplemental argument advanced for this thesis is that unilateral invocation of the doctrine by the United States would be repudiated by world opinion because of the

ring of our military bases and Armed Forces around the U.S.S.R.

In the very private sessions in which these views have been asserted, they have thus been rebutted:

1. The right of the United States to enforce the Monroe Doctrine unilaterally, if necessary, was not abandoned at Caracas either by implication or by anything said or encouraged as an inference by our representatives there. Secretary Dulles' comment was merely that the resolution adopted "relates to the extension to this hemisphere of the political system of despotic European powers" and made "as international policy" of the Americas "a portion of the Monroe Doctrine which has largely been forgotten." This gives no foundation to the analysis that, when the OAS declines to implement this policy, the United States has committed itself to do the same.

2. Unlike the infiltration and subversion of Soviet Russia in Cuba, the purpose of this Nation's bases and troops around the periphery of Russia is to prevent the spread of these activities of international communism, not to expand the American governing system.

Any high officials or Members of Congress who may dispute this rebuttal are not likely to do so publicly.

HEALTH CARE TASK FORCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the problem of health care for the aging will continue to come before the Congress until a practical solution is provided. With the percentage of the aging in our population continuing to grow and costs for medical care continuing to rise while their retirement and other incomes remain relatively static, it is obvious that assistance must be forthcoming if these millions of Americans are to get the health care they need.

Many questions were raised in the Senate debate on the Anderson-Javits bill last July, and I have therefore invited a health care task force composed of some of the best minds in our country on this problem to go into the question of the best way to provide health care for our senior citizens. This task force will, it is expected, bring in a report and recommendations seasonably so that we may have the benefit of their thinking early in the next Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the text of my announcement made in New York, September 12; the statement by former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming; and the news stories which appeared in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, September 13.

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

SENATOR JAVITS ANNOUNCES FORMATION OF MEDICARE TASK FORCE

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS today announced the formation of a task force on health care for the aging to conduct a full-scale study of the Anderson-Javits health care bill in preparation for the 1963 drive for enactment.

The task force is comprised of a group of outstanding health care experts, including two former Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom and Dr. Arthur Flemming.

Senator JAVITS said the task force will analyze the major objections raised by op-

ponents of the Anderson-Javits bill this year when it was defeated in the Senate by only four votes. He said the task force will seek to determine if the plan is practical and workable, and will recommend any changes it may deem necessary to improve it.

"This task force is nonpolitical and representative of all interested and qualified groups," Senator JAVITS said. "These distinguished leaders have taken on an important job, and I believe their findings will be of enormous benefit to the next Congress. Their investigation will get underway now so that their report can be made known to the public and Congress early in 1963, before Congress is asked again to act on a health care for the aging bill."

Research staffs will be made available for the study by the University of Oregon development fund and New York University Law School. The study will be financed by individual benefactors.

Mr. Folsom is now director of Eastman Kodak Co.; Dr. Flemming is president of University of Oregon. Other members of the task force are: Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, emeritus professor of medicine, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; Winslow Carlton, New York health consultant; Thomas Tierney, executive vice president, Colorado Hospital Service (Blue Cross), Denver, Colo.; Dr. Vernon W. Lipard, dean of Yale Medical School; Dr. Arthur Larson, Duke University, former Director of USA; Russell A. Nelson, director, Johns Hopkins Hospital; John C. Leslie, vice president, Pan American Airways, and chairman, Committee on Aging, Community Service Society of New York; Dr. James Dixon, president, Antioch College, Ohio; Dr. Russell Lee, Palo Alto Clinic, California; and Hubert Yount, vice president, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.

Senator JAVITS said the task force will investigate and report on such matters as:

1. Financing the program: Is the social security system the best way?

2. The private sector option: How practical is it? Are its terms workable? Are provisions for eligibility of vendors of health care, and of insurance carriers, sound?

3. Benefits: Are services provided by the bill deliverable?

4. Cost estimates: How valid?

Senator JAVITS said the task force will also study the growth capabilities of the present Kerr-Mills Act as related to health care requirements of the aging.

STATEMENT BY DR. ARTHUR FLEMMING

I am delighted to respond to the request of Senator JAVITS to participate in the work of the health care task force which he has taken the initiative in bringing together. As a result of my experiences as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare I am convinced there is a genuine need for the development of a positive program to assist the aged in protecting themselves in advance against the economic hazards of illness.

I feel that the establishment of this task force by Senator JAVITS reflects his continuing determination to provide the leadership in this area that will substitute action for talk. I look forward to working with the distinguished group of experts that have responded affirmatively to his invitation. I sincerely hope that we may be able to come up with findings and recommendations which will be of real help to the next Congress when it once again faces this very important issue.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 1962]  
AGED-CARE STUDY SET UP BY JAVITS—12 EXPERTS ON HEALTH TO MAKE INDEPENDENT SURVEY

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS announced yesterday that 12 prominent health authori-



ties would make an independent study of the best way to provide medical care for the aged.

He said the study would start with an analysis of objections that killed the Anderson-Javits bill in the Senate, 52 to 48, in July.

Senator JAVITS, who is standing for reelection this year, stressed that the study, to be privately financed through contributions, would be nonpolitical and that members of the task force would have no strings on them in their work.

The New York Republican said, however, that he hopes the study, after assessing the practicability of the Anderson-Javits approach, might be able to recommend changes that would improve it and make it more understandable and acceptable to the public.

#### SPONSORS NOT BOUND

He said he had advised Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, that he was taking the lead in setting up the health care task force, but he stressed that none of the sponsors would necessarily be bound by its recommendations.

Two former Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare are on the task force. They are Marion B. Folsom, now a director of the Eastman Kodak Co., and Arthur S. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon. Both served in the Eisenhower administration.

Other members, all of whom serve without pay, are:

Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, professor of medicine emeritus at Columbia's College of Physicians and Surgeons; Winslow Carlton, New York health consultant; Thomas Tierney, executive vice president of the Colorado Hospital Service (Blue Cross); Dr. Vernon W. Lippard, dean of the Yale Medical School.

Also, Dr. Arthur Larson of Duke University, former consultant to President Eisenhower; Russell A. Nelson, director of the Johns Hopkins Hospital; John C. Leslie, vice president of Pan American Airways and chairman of the Committee on Aging of the Community Service Society in New York.

Also, Dr. James Dixon, president of Antioch College; Dr. Russell Lee of the Palo Alto Clinic in California, and Hubert Yount, vice president of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. of Boston.

While disclaiming politics, Senator JAVITS stands to benefit from his role in setting up the health care task force. The move serves to again identify him at the outset of his campaign with an issue upon which the Democrats hope to win votes nationally in the congressional election.

Amendments to the administration's medical care bill, proposed by Mr. JAVITS and a small band of other Republicans, helped make the losing Senate vote closer, but 31 of the 52 negative votes were Republican.

Mr. JAVITS announced plans for the study at a news conference at the Hotel Pierre.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 13, 1961]

#### MEDICARE: WHAT'S BEST?

(By John Molleson)

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS announced yesterday the formation of a 12-member committee of prominent citizens to make recommendations on health care for the aged.

The Senator said he was convinced the public had not been fully informed on the issue of medical care for the aging, and that this could have contributed to the defeat a few weeks ago of the Anderson-Javits medicare bill. The bill lost in the Senate by only four votes.

Mr. JAVITS described the committee as nonpolitical and representative of all interested and qualified groups. He said it would report to the public and Congress early next year on whether the Anderson-Javits pro-

posals were sound, or if some other approach should be tried.

Included among the 12 are 2 former Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare—Marion B. Folsom, now director of the Eastman Kodak Co., and Dr. Arthur Flemming, president of the University of Oregon.

The Senator said the group will report on such matters as:

Is the social security system the best way to finance the program?

How practical is the private sector option, for private insurance companies and non-profit health organizations to be included in the Government plan?

Are the services provided by the bill "deliverable"?

Are its cost estimates valid?

The study will be privately financed and is expected to cost less than \$100,000, Mr. JAVITS said. Research staffs will be made available by the University of Oregon Development Fund and the New York University Law School. The members of the force will serve without compensation.

In addition to the former Secretaries, the committee includes:

Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, emeritus professor of medicine, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University.

Winslow Carlton, New York health consultant.

Thomas Tierney, executive vice president of the Colorado Blue Cross.

Dr. Vernon W. Lippard, dean of the Yale Medical School.

Dr. Arthur Larson, of Duke University, former Director of the USIA.

Russell A. Nelson, director of Johns Hopkins Hospital.

John C. Leslie, vice president of Pan American Airways and chairman of the Committee on Aging of the Community Service Society of New York.

Dr. James Dixon, president of Antioch College, Ohio.

Dr. Russell Lee, Palo Alto Clinic, Calif.

Hubert Yount, vice president of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., Boston.

#### ARMS OF FRIENDSHIP

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared dealing with the work of Arms of Friendship, Inc., a unique and imaginative effort to foster better understanding between the veterans of the world's two greatest armed powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, whose president is Maj. Gen. Bryan Lee Milburn, U.S. Army, retired, and whose chairman of the board is Gen. Charles L. Bolte, U.S. Army, retired.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS: "ARMS OF FRIENDSHIP, INC.—A POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR PEACE"

Last year I had the privilege of being asked by the Joint Economic Committee to undertake a factfinding trip through the Soviet Union, in order to explore the political and economic problems relating to East-West trade. In the course of my stay in the Soviet Union, I had the opportunity to observe a profound desire for peace and friendship with the United States among the civilian population of that country—an amazingly persistent desire which is surviving the massive campaign of hate propaganda spewed out by the Kremlin.

In this light, I looked into means for promoting more widespread, people-to-peo-

ple exchanges between the citizens of the Soviet Union and the United States, including the possible exchange of members of the legislatures of the two nations. In this way the frail plant of good will can be nurtured and kept alive in the tense climate of the cold war. One of the means which came to my attention is an organization called Arms of Friendship, Inc.

Arms of Friendship was founded 4 years ago after careful research into the whole area of Soviet-American relations. Some of the soundest and ablest businessmen in the country, among them Henry Ford II, Gen. David Sarnoff, William L. Clayton, Colby M. Chester, and George D. Widener, gave their personal and financial support to the study project at Temple University, then headed by Dr. Robert L. Johnson, on which its programs are based. The board of directors and sponsors, whose chairman is Gen. Charles L. Bolte, former Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, includes past national commanders of five of the leading veterans' organizations and a number of prominent citizens from my State, such as Adm. John J. Bergen, Mr. James A. Farley, and Mr. Winston Guest. These military, civic, and veterans' leaders established Arms of Friendship in Philadelphia as a private, nonpolitical, nonprofit organization, devoted to creating better understanding between individual Americans and Russians, particularly those who have had military experience, and their families, through letter writing, exchange hospitality visits, and increased personal contact.

This is a unique sort of people-to-people approach, aimed at dispelling misunderstandings which arise from illusions and misinformation. It is working to establish, within the Soviet Union, the realization that the aspirations of peace-loving, patriotic Americans and Russians are not incompatible; that a better knowledge of each others' ideas and way of life, through closer ties, may reduce tensions and encourage a just peace.

A distinctive feature of Arms of Friendship is the emphasis on military experience. Ex-servicemen and their families in both countries represent all interests and occupations and their previous common experiences and knowledge of war make possible now a mutual understanding of the imperatives of peace. This aspect of Arms of Friendship appeals to me particularly, since I feel that American veterans are qualified to play a most important role in making meaningful contacts with people behind the Iron Curtain.

Arms of Friendship increases personal contacts through a number of programs: encouraging Americans to tour the U.S.S.R., meet Russians and visit in their places of work and their homes; offering the hospitality of American homes to visiting Russian tourists on a personal basis; promoting personal correspondence between American and Russian veterans and their families; fostering publicity in the press and radio of the United States and of the Soviet Union to recognize the accomplishments of such person-to-person contacts and to encourage participation by individuals.

From a report submitted to me by the organization, I learned the following facts and figures about their first 4 years of activities, which have been undertaken on a pilot type of basis, with a very modest annual budget contributed by a few far-seeing private individuals, foundations, and corporations:

Under their program for U.S. tourists Arms of Friendship printed 20,000 copies of a leaflet and distributed them, through American travel agencies, to the 35,000 to 40,000 Americans who have made trips to the Soviet Union since 1958. Arms of Friendship contacted by letter or in person about 5,000 of these American visitors to the U.S.S.R. To

each of them it furnished this leaflet which emphasizes the important role each of these tourists could play in improving relations between the two countries. The leaflet also includes specific suggestions on how to meet Russians and how to prepare oneself for the trip. Hundreds of these American tourists were given more detailed information, including specific addresses to write to and follow up in person.

Arms of Friendship has sponsored two group tours of prominent American war veterans, including national commanders of the American Legion, AMVETS, Catholic War Veterans, Disabled American Veterans, and Jewish War Veterans. They were able to visit areas where American tourists have not been allowed during recent years and, through their own interpreters, reportedly had very frank conversations with Soviet veterans from all walks of life. Last year the first group of Soviet veterans came to the United States under this program, staying in homes and sharing in the lives of their American hosts.

Arms of Friendship has a home hospitality program for Soviet visitors to the United States. This was started on an experimental basis in late 1960, shortly after Soviet tourists began coming to the United States. Since that time Arms of Friendship's hosts in about a dozen cities have made hospitality arrangements for over 20 groups, totaling about 500 Soviet visitors. Well over 1,500 Americans, including hosts and interpreters, have been included in these hospitality arrangements, which vary anywhere from a few hours of shopping in an afternoon to an entire day or, on several occasions, a couple of nights and days. These personal contacts on an individual or small group basis have given the Soviet visitors opportunities to satisfy their curiosity about America and get a true picture of our life and thinking.

Great credit is due to these volunteer American hosts who opened their homes, sometimes on very short notice, and proved that we Americans do want peace and are willing to do everything within our power to bring it about. The Soviet visitors, who are generally very influential persons in the Soviet Union, seemed particularly impressed by this program, which indicates to them that Americans are truly interested in improving relationships with the Russian people as individuals. Some of them have noted that it is only in the United States, of all countries in the West, that such a home hospitality program exists.

A letterwriting program, to facilitate exchanges between American and Soviet veterans and their families was started in 1959. Americans who desired were referred to Arms of Friendship, at 4150 Henry Avenue, Philadelphia 44, Pa., telling them about themselves, their military experience, professions, current interests, and background. Arms of Friendship then sends them the address of a Russian who may have something in common. They also send suggestions on writing letters to the U.S.S.R. and offer the services of their translators, so that language is not a barrier. There are currently well over a thousand Americans and Russians who are directly involved in this letterwriting program. A recent article on this program in the Saturday Review brought Arms of Friendship a lively response from hundreds of Americans who want to take part in the letterwriting and other programs.

A most interesting aspect of Arms of Friendship is the amount of favorable publicity it has had within the Soviet Union. Messages sent by Arms of Friendship to Soviet veterans on V-E Day and Veterans' Day have been widely publicized by Pravda and other local and national Soviet newspapers. Soviet tourists returning to the U.S.S.R. have written accounts of their travels and the opportunities given them by Arms of Friendship to visit with Americans on a personal basis.

Arms of Friendship has been carrying out these programs over the past several years on an experimental basis. The programs have apparently established a record of practicability and usefulness. For example: Arms of Friendship is seeking to be able to send several groups of veterans to the U.S.S.R. every year. These would include ex-servicemen from all walks of life who may be chosen on the basis of competitive essays and interviews. In addition, Arms of Friendship would like to increase its program for getting in touch with other Americans visiting the Soviet Union, in order that they may make an effort to meet Russians in their fields.

This organization is planning to increase the letterwriting program, although this may run into some expense, as it is rather costly to obtain the names of Soviet veterans and to process the American requests, including translations. The hospitality program can be increased but this, of course, will depend on the number of Soviet visitors coming to the United States. The organization says it is possible that "ham" radio operators could be encouraged to make more contacts with Soviet counterparts and that students of the Russian language could be brought in and encouraged in the practical use of the Russian language they are learning.

All of these programs are to be broadened as more and more Americans learn of Arms of Friendship's useful activities. While concentrating on ex-servicemen and their families, Arms of Friendship also gives suggestions to nonveterans on ways in which they might exert their efforts and initiative toward increasing human understanding and reducing the chances of war between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.

Arms of Friendship seems to be a carefully programmed organization which is working in a practical manner in a most important field. Americans taking part in these activities are supplementing on a personal level what we in the Government are striving to do—bring meaning to our aims and operations in the interests of peace to the world for ourselves and our children.

#### SCHOLARLY INTERCHANGE IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the Transpacific Conference on Scholarly Publishing was held in Honolulu June 25-29 this year under the joint sponsorship of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West and the University of Hawaii Press. It was attended by 30 representatives of 10 countries in the Pacific Basin—Australia, Canada, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaya, Mexico, Pakistan, and the United States.

The purpose of the conference was to strengthen scholarly publishing and interchange in the area. Dr. Alexander Spoehr, chancellor of the East-West Center, has reported that the effort is "a promising avenue to international understanding and world peace." These, of course, are the objectives which Congress has had in mind when it authorized and financed Federal support of the East-West Center. Dr. Spoehr reports that "the conference was an important step toward the two-way exchange of the results of scholarship, a field of human activity that knows no national frontiers."

Because of the importance of continuing such efforts on behalf of international understanding, I ask unanimous consent that several resolutions passed by the Transpacific Conference on

Scholarly Publishing be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### GENERAL RESOLUTIONS

Realizing the great importance of more effective communication among the scholars of the transpacific area, the participants in the first Transpacific Conference on Scholarly Publishing resolve—

That this conference be continued as the nucleus of a permanent group to provide for the systematic interchange of information pertinent to the transpacific area.

That consideration be given to the expansion of this conference to include nations and groups of publishers within the area which are not now represented but which are vitally concerned with the interchange of knowledge among scholars.

That the University of Hawaii through its press and the East-West Center be asked to continue the coordination of these efforts until such time as a permanent organization can be established.

That the conference endorse the proposed informational mission to Asia by the Association of American University Presses which has already been made the subject of an application to a foundation, and that it commend to the mission the study of the various avenues of approach to the problems of scholarly publishing, by whatever agencies accomplished, which have been discussed by this conference—always within the context of the situation which obtains in each nation.

That the conference urge all participants to keep in constant touch with the coordinating agency and with each other concerning the problems which we have discussed and to communicate to the AAUP investigating team through the central office any suggestions which they care to make concerning the course which they feel the investigation should take in their countries.

That the conference commend to the publishers of the transpacific regions the desirability of keeping in close contact with each other and suggest to them that, whenever desirable, they consider the organization of cohesive subregional structures to facilitate the achievement of the aims set forth by this conference.

#### RESOLUTION ON THE FLORENCE AGREEMENT

Whereas there should be no barriers to the flow of scholarly materials among nations; and

Whereas the UNESCO Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials (which is better known as the Florence Agreement) seeks to remove such barriers.

The participants in the first Transpacific Conference on Scholarly Publishing ask that all nations that are not yet signatories should become so; and, most especially, the participants from the United States urge that its Congress take early action on implementing legislation that will give practical effect to the Senate ratification which occurred 2 years ago.

#### RESOLUTION ON BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TRANSPACIFIC AREA

It is the sense of this conference that it is important to make a beginning by tackling a problem that contains within it those aspects that are likely to obtain in connection with any specific endeavor of a transpacific cooperating group.

The problem recommended for attack is one of preparing and publishing—by employing, insofar as possible, the good offices of the University of Hawaii and the East-West Center—a selective bibliography of scholarly work (including translations) published throughout the transpacific area.



It is clear that this simple statement has within it elements of immense complexity that at the same time provide a point of concentration for working out the three parts of any problem we are likely to face: (1) The precise definition of the bibliography; (2) The coordinating techniques and active participation necessary to carry it out successfully; and (3) the dimensions of the necessary financial commitment.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT HONOLULU,  
JUNE 29, 1962

Realizing that the participants in the Transpacific Conference on Scholarly Publishing have had an opportunity to observe at firsthand the form and content of the program of scholarly publication at present in force at the University of Hawaii; that they have learned at the same time of the plans for research and publication now drawn up for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West; and that they have also come to a fuller appreciation of the existing publication needs and programs of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum and the Honolulu Academy of Arts; and

Believing that it is clear that the powerful forces of research and learning must make their way through the world principally by means of scholarly publication; that by their strategic location at the crossroads of learning and international understanding, the University of Hawaii and its associates in scholarly endeavor are on the threshold of a remarkable opportunity; and that it becomes the responsibility of the citizens of this new State to provide its growing university with the means to realize this opportunity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the participants in the Transpacific Conference on Scholarly Publishing do respectfully urge the University of Hawaii to review its instrument of publication and to take what steps may be necessary to reconstitute a university press equipped to accept—by a greatly enlarged dimension of imagination, dedication, and financial resources—the major role in scholarly publishing which so plainly lies before it.

THE NARCOTICS DILEMMA: CRIME  
OR DISEASE?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last week the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], chairman of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, delivered on the floor of the Senate a fascinating and revealing report on a new method for treating narcotic addicts. It is found in Synanon, a new social experiment operating on a small scale in Santa Monica, Calif. It is a program operated on a voluntary basis to rehabilitate on a group therapy basis some of the victims of drug addiction.

The powers of observation, summary, and perception of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] functioned well to give a graphic, effective account of what is happening in Synanon. He has rendered another important service by reason of his activities in that investigation in the narcotics field.

Similarly, the White House Conference on Narcotics later this month will undoubtedly generate many constructive suggestions to promote much needed progress in the field. I commend the Attorney General and his staff for their leadership in organizing this important conference.

It is heartening to know that there is much concern and activity in the field of this vast and devastating menace in our national life. Efforts are made from time to time to grapple with it. It still defies solution although progress is being made. Sometimes these efforts are not as successful as they were planned to be. An example is the Narcotics Control Act of 1957, which among other things, requires imposition of mandatory sentences for violation thereof. The act was well intentioned and sincerely directed, but the realization is increasing every day that while it has done some good, it has also created many new problems of serious proportions.

A greater public awareness and understanding of this entire problem is certainly needed to combat it effectively. The thoughtful article by Mr. John Kobler in the September 8 issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Narcotics Dilemma: Crime or Disease?" is a very effective one toward this goal of awareness and understanding. Among other things it comments on the efforts to modify the 1957 act referred to. It does so, however, after laying a splendid factual foundation to show the reason and the necessity for amendment of that act.

It was with gratification that I read Mr. Kobler's article. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NARCOTICS DILEMMA: CRIME OR DISEASE?  
(By John Kobler)

Among the 203 Federal prisoners serving life sentences, Gilbert Mora (Givie) Zaragoza, a 27-year-old inmate of the U.S. penitentiary on McNeil Island, Wash., has a dreadful distinction. All the other lifers—who include killers, kidnapers, and rapists—stand a chance, with good behavior, of parole. But no matter how Zaragoza behaves, he can never qualify. Barring Presidential clemency, he will die in prison.

The crime Zaragoza committed, in 1957, fell under section 107 of the Narcotics Control Act, which Congress passed the year before. The toughest section of one of the toughest Federal statutes ever enacted, it imposes imprisonment for not less than 10 years up to life on anybody over 18 who sells heroin to anybody under 18, and it forever precludes parole or probation. Zaragoza is the first and so far the only violator to incur the maximum prison term. But he might have fared still worse; section 107 also empowers the jury to decree death.

Under another section of the enactment, mere possession of a narcotic without prescription entails 2 to 10 years in prison for the first offense, 5 to 20 for the second, 10 to 40 for the third. A single illegal transaction in narcotics, moreover, may involve several different felonies, each carrying a stiff penalty, such as using any form of communication to obtain the contraband, or possessing it with the knowledge it was unlawfully imported. Some judges fix the maximum penalties on all counts and sentence the culprit to serve them consecutively. Thus, for selling heroin, her first crime of any description, a hatcheck girl is now serving 40 years; for selling marihuana, a diskjockey, who also had no previous criminal record, is currently serving 50 years.

UNIFORM NARCOTICS DRUG ACT

Forty-six States have adopted the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act, which incorporates most

of the Federal provisions. The penalties and certain amendments vary, and in some States surpass the Federal limits. Connecticut makes life imprisonment mandatory for a third infringement of any provision. Massachusetts prescribes death for a sale to a person under 21. In California addiction by itself was a crime until last June, when the U.S. Supreme Court struck down that statute as "cruel and unusual punishment."

A civilized penal code reflects two primary aims: to protect society and to rehabilitate the criminal. Throughout the United States today increasing numbers of jurists, penologists, legislators, and doctors are protesting that the narcotics laws, the harshest in the world, accomplish neither aim. The net effect, these dissenters contend, has been to perpetuate the gigantic drug traffic, to abrogate human rights and to engender a climate of moral corruption which sometimes affects the law-enforcement agents themselves.

"The Narcotics Control Act," says James V. Bennett, director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, "has made a travesty of our concepts of justice. With interminable prison sentences and no possibility of parole, these offenders now compose the second largest group of prisoners, exceeded only by the car thieves. They have no incentive to improve themselves, and their very presence, bulking ever larger, is creating a formidable handicap for the prison staffs who are doing their best to rehabilitate them."

REPORT BY JOINT COMMITTEE

Last year a joint committee of the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association issued a report entitled "Drug Addiction: Crime or Disease?" Calling for a revision of policy, it pointed out that, despite 40 years of increasingly stringent measures, the United States has more addicts than all European countries combined. Yet by comparison European laws are mild.

No responsible critics minimize the evil of the drug traffic or propose leniency for the jackals who fatten on it. What they deplore is the failure of the laws to distinguish between kinds of offenders. Juveniles in the early stages of addiction, who may still be salvageable, face the same sentence as hardened adult junkies. The addict who peddles a few caps of heroin to pay for his own supply can expect no more mercy than the nonaddicted professional pusher. The law's critics agree that the latter, the cruellest predator the underworld ever spawned, merits life imprisonment, if not death; but the former, they insist, needs medical care. The addicts, however, wind up behind bars far oftener than the mass distributors who belong to well organized mobs.

The most influential figure to oppose reform is 70-year-old Harry Jacob Anslinger, who recently retired as Commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, a post that he held since its inception. A passionate believer in punishment as a deterrent, Anslinger has consistently demanded tougher sentences. "I'd like to pull the switch myself on drug peddlers who sell their poison to minors," he once said, and he has variously characterized those who assail the status quo as gangland press agents, fuzzy thinkers, and leftwingers.

LEGAL SANCTIONS VERSUS THERAPY

"Crime or Disease?" The title epitomizes the basic issue. Is drug addiction to be solved chiefly by legal sanctions, as Anslinger maintains? Or is therapy the solution, as the American Bar Association-American Medical Association report concludes? The very Senate subcommittee whose investigations led to the 1956 act called addiction "a symptom of a mental or psychiatric disorder." Anslinger himself denies that he considers addiction as such a crime. "But," observes Rufus King, the Washington lawyer who headed the American Bar Association committee, "if addicts are sick people, it's barbaric to throw them into jail for

possessing a narcotic. Obviously they have to possess the stuff to use it."

The controversy will reach a climax on September 27 at a White House Conference on Narcotics under the chairmanship of Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Because the case of Gilbert Zaragoza embodies so many aspects of the controversy, let us examine it more closely.

Zaragoza is an epileptic. He grew up in a Los Angeles slum, the third of eight children born to a Mexican meatcutter. He completed his first year of high school in his 16th year before his frequent seizures forced him to drop out. His IQ is a borderline 71.

After he left school Zaragoza fell in with a gang of neighborhood delinquents, was arrested on suspicion of car theft and placed on probation. He was soon arrested again for car theft. In view of his affliction the court committed him to the Camarillo State Hospital, which discharged him as improved 18 months later.

During the next 3 years Zaragoza's police record grew to include two arrests on suspicion of robbery (charges dismissed both times for lack of evidence), driving without a license (fined \$48), loitering (1-year probation), drunkenness (a day in jail), suspicion of assault to commit murder, which was reduced to resisting arrest (fined \$35). For cohabiting with a 15-year-old girl, who became pregnant, he was convicted of statutory rape, fined the sum of \$150 and given 2 years' probation.

Zaragoza's epileptic fits made him a poor employment risk. He nevertheless managed to hold three manual jobs between the ages of 18 and 21. He had been working 8 months as a maintenance helper in an air-products plant at \$65 a month when the rape charge caused him to be fired.

California has the second-highest incidence of drug addiction (7,592 cases reported to the Bureau of Narcotics last year) of any State after New York (26,813). Of the total addicts reported for the entire country, 46,798, the vast majority came from minority groups. Fifty-six percent were Negroes, 10.2 percent Puerto Ricans, 7.1 percent Mexicans. Roughly half belonged to the 21 to 30 age group; 3.8 percent were minors. More than 90 percent had switched from marihuana or other drugs to "horse" (heroin), because heroin, a derivative of morphine, delivers the biggest kick.

A number of the delinquents Givie Zaragoza consorted with were no strangers to heroin, and he soon got the habit. According to his family, his epilepsy drove him to it. Within a few months he was a "mainliner," injecting into his veins as much as 12 grains a day. His source was a neighborhood pusher, Martin Dominguez, alias "Sheppard." What Givie's habit cost him he never disclosed. Black-market prices of a narcotic vary according to its availability and how desperately the addict craves it. "Hogs" (addicts who require maximum dosages) may have to pay \$25 to \$50 a day. Often the only way to obtain such sums, or their equivalent in drugs, is to become a "mule"—that is, to work for a pusher.

#### GIVIE'S FINAL MISTAKE

On the evening of February 12, 1957, Givie ran into a fellow hophead, Eddie Munguio, whom he had known since boyhood. Eddie was 17 and he had a probation record dating from his 12th year. He asked Givie where he could find Sheppard; he wanted some "horse." Givie explained he was working for Sheppard and promised to furnish it himself.

The following day Givie slipped Eddie two caps of heroin—or about 3 grains—charging him \$5. On the 15th he sold him 2 more caps and on the 26th 10 caps for \$27. All three transactions were filmed from observation posts by Federal agents working with the municipal police. They arrested Givie after the third sale. The bills

Eddie paid him had been dusted with a fluorescent powder, and under fluorescent light traces of it showed on Givie's hands and trousers. It finally dawned on Givie that his old friend Eddie was, in the Narcotics Bureau euphemism, a "special employee"—meaning stool pigeon.

#### RELIANCE ON STOOL PIGEONS

Like most police agencies, the Bureau leans heavily on stool pigeons, and it finds no dearth of them among the addicts themselves, who will do anything to avoid the torments of abstinence. As long as the addict-informer remains useful he can expect payment in cash, immunity from prosecution for his own narcotic violations and leniency, if under indictment for other offenses. State narcotics cops often pay off in narcotics.

The exploitation of addicts as informers is one of the standard practices most strongly condemned by the Bureau critics. Wrote Richard C. Donnelly, professor of law at Yale in the Yale Law Journal: "The spectacle of Government secretly mated with the underworld and using underworld characters to gain its end is not an ennobling one." In a recent opinion Circuit Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia declared: "The present informer practice amounts to condoning felonies on condition that the confessed or suspected felon brings about the conviction of others. Under such stimulation it is to be expected that the informer will not infrequently reach for shadowy leads or even seek to incriminate the innocent. . . . The law recognizes that the only way to protect the innocent is by imposing safeguards which protect the guilty as well."

Before he went to McNeil Island, Zaragoza got permission to marry the girl he had made pregnant. She later wrote to Mathes: "What he did he did out of desperation, for he couldn't keep a job on account of his attacks. Please modify his sentence."

The plea fell on deaf ears. So, for all practical purposes, did a request from the U.S. Pardon Attorney, Reed Cozart, for Mathes' comments and recommendations on Zaragoza's petition for clemency. "It would appear," wrote Cozart, "that the only reason a minor was used as an informer was to make it possible for Zaragoza to receive a life or a death sentence."

Mathes replied: "Apparently the severity of his sentence may have been some deterrent to others. I have no other comment or recommendation to offer."

The municipal police arrested Sheppard in connection with another narcotics offense and from a municipal court he drew a sentence of 5 years to life. Four years later he was paroled, then returned to jail for violating his parole.

It is conceivable that the heroin Zaragoza peddled was smuggled into the country through Mafia channels directed by Vito Genovese, one of the most powerful international vice lords since Al Capone. In 1959 a Federal jury convicted Genovese of narcotics conspiracy. His sentence: 15 years plus \$20,000 fine. With time off for good behavior, he will be released in 8 years.

As a police force the Narcotics Bureau is acknowledged even by its bitterest critics to be struggling against enormous odds. Although its personnel totals only 424 and its annual budget less than \$5 million, it manages at least to limit a traffic which, as Anslinger once told a Senate subcommittee, the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard combined could not eliminate. With rare exceptions its agents have been honest, dedicated men. Anslinger himself has been acclaimed throughout the world as the foremost expert in his field, and he has fought hard to persuade other nations to tighten their narcotics controls. What aroused the current hostility to the Bureau was not only its punitive attitude toward drug addicts but

also, in the view of many authorities, a certain impatience with judicial safeguards which it feels hamper its efforts—an over-eagerness to "make" cases.

#### GUILE VERSUS ENTRAPMENT

The courts uphold the right of police to use guile against criminals. They draw a line, however, between legitimate guile and entrapment, which consists of tricking a person into committing an offense he might not have otherwise committed. Through its informer system the Narcotics Bureau has sometimes been led to cross that line. An extreme instance occurred not long ago in New York City.

For 14 months, beginning in March 1956, the Bureau had been paying William Pabon, an ex-convict and mainliner, \$40 to \$60 a case. He spent most of it on heroin.

#### NARCOTICS

In July 1957, Pabon scraped up a bar-room acquaintance with another Puerto Rican, Angel Silva. One evening he took Silva to his room, injected himself with heroin and offered his guest a shot. Silva, who had never touched the stuff, declined. During subsequent visits the informer persistently tempted Silva. He finally succumbed to the extent of sniffing a little heroin. Pabon soon taught him how to mainline it. At first he supplied the drug free. Then he began charging \$5 a shot. In November he demanded a different kind of exchange. Silva must deliver half an ounce of heroin to a certain customer, who would pay \$100. Crazy by his need, Silva obeyed. He repeated the errand 2 weeks later. The customer was narcotics agent Gabriel Dukas. Pabon's reward for corrupting and betraying Silva was \$100.

Anslinger demurs, "My attitude," he proclaims, "has been to use any means available to cut narcotic violations to a minimum, and where criminal or addicts will cooperate with us to that end I will deal with them."

Givie Zaragoza could scarcely have picked a worse time to sell heroin to a 17-year-old informer. The Federal agency, which can step into any narcotics case, was eager to see an example made under the new section 107.

The presiding Federal judge was William C. Mathes, whom defense lawyers sometimes refer to as "Maximum Mathes." No evidence was produced that Zaragoza had ever sold drugs to anybody except Munguio. According to Zaragoza's probation report: "A combination of low intelligence and his epileptic condition are believed to be contributing factors to defendant's antisocial behavior."

Upon passing life sentence, Judge Mathes commented: "This jury gave you back your life. Now society should use your life to set an example for others."

#### IMAGE OF THE "DOPE FIEND"

Waiving jury trial, Silva appeared before Federal Judge Edward Weinfeld. The judge acquitted him. "I find," he stated, "that the criminal conduct participated in by this defendant was the product of creative activity by Pabon, the Government informer."

"The nature and size of the narcotics problem does not explain the peculiar severity of the laws," objects Judge Henry W. Edgerton of the District of Columbia circuit. Alcoholism, he reasons, poses a far greater problem both numerically—there are some 5 million alcoholics in the country—and a menace to the community. Yet prohibition produced no comparably severe statute. What, then, does explain it? Largely, say the voices of reform, the horrendous image of the "dope fiend" which has been stamped upon the public mind by the law enforcers and the sensational press.

To people inculcated with that image it is an astonishing fact that around the turn



of the century American morality attached less stigma to drug addicts than to women who smoked cigarettes. No legal sanctions hindered the sale of narcotics. Cheaply priced opiates crowded the shelves of pharmacies and general stores. The physician was free to treat addicts as his conscience dictated, by gradual withdrawal if they seemed curable; if not, by maintaining them on drugs indefinitely. In 1902 the American Pharmaceutical Association estimated the number of addicts at about 1 person out of every 380. Thoughtful citizens decried the vice as an appalling health problem. But they spoke of the addict pityingly as a "sufferer" who needed medical help. Nobody advocated criminal action.

Neither did Congress when it enacted the Harrison Act of 1914. A regulatory measure cast in the guise of a revenue statute, the act was designed primarily to correct loose dispensing practices. By taxing narcotics, by requiring importers, druggists, and doctors handling them to keep records and register with the Treasury and by requiring users to obtain prescriptions, Congress hoped to force supplies into controllable channels. Smugglers and pushers were the targets, not addicts. Congress had no wish to disrupt the bona fide addict-doctor relationship.

The act contained several ambiguous stipulations, however. For example, a physician could issue narcotic prescriptions only "in the course of his professional practice and for legitimate medical purposes." But what delimited professional practice? What constituted legitimacy? Many doctors continued to assume it as their duty to relieve an incurable addict's agony by giving him drugs. After World War I, in the same hysterical atmosphere that bred prohibition, the Treasury published a report—gathered from what statistical sources, it never revealed—which horrified the Nation. The addict population, it claimed, had grown to 1 million, mostly miners.

The Department merged its Narcotics Division (later a separate bureau under Anslinger) with its Prohibition Unit and the antiaddict crusade began. A series of Supreme Court interpretations of the Harrison Act provided powerful weapons. The Federal agents set stool pigeons to collecting evidence against defiant doctors, raided their offices, jailed them. The conviction of a few real malpractitioners, no better than pushers, strengthened the Treasury's hand; and reputable doctors, thoroughly intimidated, turned their backs on addicts.

The Supreme Court later reversed itself in the case of a Dr. Linder whom a stool pigeon tricked into prescribing four tablets of cocaine and morphine. Vindicating Linder in 1925, the Court repudiated the Government's contention that doctors "may never give an addict moderate amounts of drugs for self-administration to relieve conditions incident to addiction." But it was too late. The doctors' retreat was complete, and to this day, despite the Linder opinion—which the narcotics regulations ignore—few doctors care to have anything to do with addicts.

#### DETERRENCE BY TERROR

Thus, in its application the Harrison Act transformed patients into criminals. The Narcotics Division, seeking support for its policy of deterrence by terror, depicted them as monsters. There arose a body of myths which obscured the nature of addiction and impeded a calm, scientific approach to it. For example:

The myth of intrinsic criminality. According to Anslinger, addicts are criminals before they become addicted.

The fact: A statistical analysis of 1,036 addicts committed to the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, Ky., showed that 75.3 percent had no criminal history. Again, of 119 inmates who developed the habit as a result of drugs prescribed for illness, 90 had otherwise unblemished records.

On the other hand, among addicts from city slum areas delinquency was shown to have frequently preceded addiction. In short, the incidence of prior offenses depends on the particular group studied.

That most addicts commit crimes to support their costly vice every study agrees. The crimes mainly take nonviolent forms, such as drug peddling, petty larceny, shoplifting. Dr. Lawrence Kolb, dean of authorities on the medical aspects of addiction, dismisses as "an absurd fallacy" the notion that violent criminals commonly use drugs to acquire Dutch courage. "Opiates," he explains, "inhibit aggressive impulses. Under their influence the addict becomes passive, free of tensions, contented. One way to render a man with homicidal urges harmless would be to put him on morphine."

The sexual myth. Dope incites to rape, orgies, and assorted perversions.

The fact: Heroin, the drug of choice, depresses the libido and replaces sex, and other normal emotional satisfactions. Drs. David Maurer and Victor Vogel note in their monumental study: "The reduction of sexual desire tends to remove the opiate addict from the category of psychopathic sex offenders, even though he might have a tendency to commit sex crimes when not addicted."

#### ADDICTION'S PHYSICAL DANGERS

The myth of fatal effects. Drugs eventually wreck the addict's body and brain.

The fact: Various dangers incidental to addiction may indeed prove fatal. Dosages beyond the tolerance the addict has built up, for one. Tainted drugs, as they often are in the black market. Anemia and malnutrition, since the impoverished addict has little money to spare for food. But opiates of themselves need not wreak physical and mental havoc. "The addict under his normal tolerance of morphine," reported the late Walter G. Karr, assistant professor of biochemistry at the University of Pennsylvania, "is medically a well man."

Dr. Kolb cites the case of a woman who reached 81, healthy and alert, although she had taken 3 grains of morphine a day for 65 years. "I know brilliant doctors," he adds, "who would be drunk in the gutter instead of successfully practicing medicine, but for opiates." No sane scientist, of course, holds a brief for addiction. The addict is a psychological cripple. But his vice is the symptom, not the cause.

Nevertheless, since World War I the specter of the slaving, maniacal "dope fiend" has haunted the halls of government and together with the booming dope traffic inspired ever-harsher laws, culminating in the Narcotics Control Act. To prove the efficacy of those laws, the Bureau frequently issues dramatic charts indicating a sharp decrease of the addict population. Carefully analyzed, however, the charts appear less impressive. The latest number of addicts reported, 46,798, is actually about 3,000 higher than in 1959. The Bureau's estimates, moreover, rest on the dubious assumption that no addict can long escape its vigilance.

Both police officials and legislators concede the need for scientific inquiry into the root causes of addiction, about which we know next to nothing. But while addicts in Federal prisons or hospitals cost the taxpayer close to \$14 million a year, the Government allocates barely half a million to research. The two Federal narcotics hospitals—at Lexington and at Fort Worth, Tex.—which together admit about 3,500 voluntary patients a year and about 500 committed by the courts, can accomplish little beyond temporary repairs.

It is relatively simple to rid an addict of his physical dependence on drugs. Methadone, a nonaddicting narcotic, greatly reduces the tortures of withdrawal. The process normally requires less than 2 weeks. Diet, fresh air, exercise complete the standard treatment usually in a few more weeks.

But psychological dependence remains, which the doctors, in their present state of knowledge, can seldom eliminate. Returned to his old environment, faced with the same frustrations which originally drove him to drugs, the patient is likely to backslide. A followup study of 1,192 patients discharged from Lexington showed that about 90 percent relapsed, the majority within 6 months.

The reform factions, however, do not consider poor prognosis any justification for jailing addicts. Several bills now before Congress reflect a more compassionate spirit. One of them, sponsored by Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, of Nebraska, would allow the courts discretion in applying mandatory no-parole laws and so enable them to distinguish between major criminals and simple addicts. Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, are sponsors of bills which would provide Federal aid to State-hospital programs and permit civil commitment of addicts guilty of no other offense.

The most radical scheme, which no legislator supports and the mere mention of which outrages the Bureau, is the nationwide establishment of clinics to dispense free narcotics. Its endorers, who include the New York Academy of Medicine, advance two main arguments: By removing profits, clinics would end the illicit traffic; by taking the addict out of the criminal class they would make it easier to cure and rehabilitate him. Under British law, the scheme's proponents point out, doctors may administer narcotics to addicts who they feel cannot exist free of suffering without them, and Great Britain has only about 430 known addicts. The narcotics laws of the Scandinavian countries, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and Italy are also mild compared to America's. No vast drug traffic plagues those countries; in none does the number of addicts exceed 1,000.

#### ARGUMENT AGAINST FREE DRUGS

But the arguments against free clinics are compelling. Addicts require continually increasing dosages up to a formidable degree of tolerance and, unless they get it, would revert to underworld sources. To gratify their craving, even if practically feasible, would be to evade the basic problem of what created it. England provides no valid model for the United States. With their homogeneity and traditional respect for the law, the British do not have the same susceptibility to addiction as the mixed American population. Their system also prevails in Hong Kong, where addicts number more than 100,000. Regarding the other European countries, it is a question whether their laws are comparatively lenient because they have no serious narcotics problem, as the United States did before the Harrison Act, or whether they have no serious narcotics problem because their laws are comparatively lenient.

The overriding objection to the free-clinic plan is a moral one: Society must strive to eliminate degrading practices, not subsidize them. Although the American Medical Association-American Bar Association report favored the plan, the AMA has since repudiated it.

Among the experimental projects now underway, the most promising was initiated 6 years ago by the New York State Division of Parole. It extends to paroled addicts continuing help—psychiatric, familial, educational, vocational. Under the direction of Meyer H. Diskind, a highly skilled parole officer approaches each parolee as a friend first of all and only incidentally a law-enforcement agent. He visits his home several times a month to discuss the personal frictions that may have contributed to his addiction.

#### A PLAN FOR REHABILITATION

Most addicts lack trade skills. The parole officers refer them to trade schools and later

to employment services. Out of a special fund the project lends money to needy parolees to tide them over until they receive their first paycheck. The parole division expects the addict to relapse at least once, but unless he commits a crime he is not returned to jail; rehabilitation continues.

The project, for which the State legislature had appropriated \$40,000 a year, covered 346 parolees up to the end of 1959 (the last period for which complete statistics are available). Almost half had never relapsed, an unheard-of percentage. Sixty-four have since finished their paroles with clean slates. Pennsylvania and California have instituted similar projects.

"We have stopped treating our insane population as felons," writes Rufus King, summarizing the aims of his fellow reformers, "we have raised the stigma from leprosy and epilepsy and transformed our penal philosophy from one of vengeance to one of rehabilitation. But we have not shown comparable understanding of the addict."

"All the billions our society has spent enforcing criminal measures against the addict have had the sole practical result of protecting the peddler's market. No other nation hounds its addicts as we do, and no other nation faces anything remotely resembling our problem."

For the moment, King adds, no ideal solution is in view. To reach one, various roads must be explored. They lead to relief from persecution for the addict, to therapy programs and followups, and to provisions for incurable addicts.

How far along those roads the United States may travel depends largely on the outcome of the approaching White House Conference. To succeed Anslinger, President Kennedy nominated—and the Senate has confirmed—Deputy Commissioner Henry L. Giordano, a soft-spoken, vigorous, dead-end efficient man of 48, who joined the Bureau in 1941. "I plan," says Giordano "to continue the general policies of Mr. Anslinger."

#### URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3615) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am much concerned about the consequences and disputes growing out of the quest for a utopian "balanced" transportation system in urban areas.

It is my belief that instead of striving for so-called balance, our transportation planners should be endeavoring to develop an all-modes and all-facilities system based on progress, adequacy, and ability to meet needs.

And, Mr. President, when I speak of "ability to meet needs," I refer not only to the requirements of rail and bus citizen-commuters in the urban areas; my concept of "ability to meet need" embraces also the consideration of ways and means to accommodate the massive and increasing requirements of both passenger automobiles and commercial trucks which will continue to virtually clog the highways of urban areas, no matter what is done in the field of mass transit by bus or rail.

In the Washington Post this morning I noted a reference in a news article to

the Nation's Capital "where highway and transit partisans have been locked in a bitter dispute that has brought the city's freeway program to a near standstill."

Unfortunately, that appraisal is essentially correct. There is such a dispute and the highway—especially interstate—program of the Metropolitan Washington area is in virtually a stalemated condition.

As a member of the Public Works Committee's Subcommittee on Roads, I am not a so-called highway partisan. I certainly do not propose that all attention be focused on highways and all available funds be spent on freeways to the exclusion of consideration and financing for other facets of the total transportation problem.

But, Mr. President, I make my position clear in stating emphatically that I strongly oppose bringing highway planning and construction to a halt in urban areas—especially in the Metropolitan Washington area—while there is a search for a transportation system with a magical term.

In spite of recent attacks on the language written into the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, as passed by the House and as recommended by the Senate Public Works Committee, I believe it is thoroughly realistic in the section having to do with "Transportation Planning in Certain Urban Areas." So-called highway interests, as alleged, did not rewrite that section. Members of Congress who studied the problem carefully and considered in a realistic manner conditions of the present, and those most likely to prevail in the immediate future, are responsible for the few deviations from the provisions included in the legislation as originally introduced.

We should not be searching in this country for a will-o'-the-wisp "balanced" transportation system embracing all appropriate modes of transport. Ours should be a striving for something practical—"the development of transportation systems, embracing various modes of transport in a manner that will serve the States and local communities efficiently and effectively."

I believe criticism of the changes recommended by the House Public Works Committee and accepted by the House and as recommended by the Senate Public Works Committee, in the section of "Transportation Planning in Certain Urban Areas," is unwarranted and unrealistic.

Perhaps there is no urban area in the United States more plagued than is the Nation's Capital with the vexing problem growing out of exercises in semantics and of highway stagnation as a consequence of the efforts of mass transit advocates of delay.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works and as a Member of the Congress earnestly concerned with this problem in the Nation's Capital, I have written a letter on the subject to the Subcommittee on District of Columbia of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, through its diligent chairman, my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of my letter in which I urge that provision be made for keeping the District of Columbia highway program on schedule, insofar as possible, through appropriations legislation.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON LABOR  
AND PUBLIC WELFARE,  
September 13, 1962.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Attacks on the proposed capital outlay budget for highways contained in the District of Columbia budget proposal for the fiscal year 1963 have created much confusion concerning the transportation problem in the District of Columbia metropolitan area.

The National Capital Transportation Agency has requested delayed action on four specific projects contained in the budget, pending the reports on certain studies scheduled for delivery to Congress by November 1, 1962. These are the east leg of the inner loop freeway, the Northeast Freeway, interchange "O," and the Three Sisters Bridge. Those who would delay the District of Columbia freeway program apparently are obscuring a number of facts which should be brought into focus.

The capital outlay budget for highways for the fiscal year 1963 represents, I am informed, the minimum highway needs that should be provided if the District of Columbia is to keep pace with regional and national highway development. That program was based on the balanced transportation system called for by the Mass Transportation Survey Report, 1959, and approved by the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

The proposed freeway network for the District of Columbia has been designed as part of a transportation system that is expected to include rapid transit by rail and nonrail. Actually, if there should not be brought into being a rapid transit program, the proposed freeway planning will of necessity have to be much enlarged.

Those who have sought delays in the highway development apparently have done so on the premise that there is a question of highway versus nonhighway facilities for serving the transportation needs of the National Capital metropolitan area. This is an unfortunate mistake as it now threatens the highway expansion and, if continued, could threaten the rapid transit program. Advanced highway planning, as you know, was made feasible by enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. Following the 1959 survey it was possible, because of 1961 Highway Act amendments, to proceed on a broader basis than was formerly true. Thus, the highway program proposed in the current budget is not an "accelerated" one, except in the sense that the availability of Federal matching funds has made it possible to proceed with the original program at a more rapid pace.

Following approval of the transportation plan for the metropolitan region, Congress established the National Capital Transportation Agency to study the rapid transit phase of the overall transportation plan, with specific direction to evaluate the feasibility of subways in the Nation's Capital. This meant that the second part of the overall transport plan was underway; the highway phase already had begun.

There is additional misunderstanding as to the actual roles of the enlarged highway



network as compared with the proposed rapid transit system. The latter, be it subways or some other form of rail transit, is being designed around the home-to-work movement while the highway program is being designed to handle the every day demands of modern motor vehicle traffic. This traffic is only partly involved in the home-to-work movement.

Independent of the need for citizens to move between home and place of employment or business, there is an ever-growing volume of motor vehicle traffic of all types that must be served. The increased travel and commercial needs of the metropolitan area are placing tremendous demands on our road and street facilities that have nothing to do with commuter traffic. Unless these demands are met, this area will be faced with a staggering problem of traffic congestion. Any delay in the current program will only multiply the many serious problems that ultimately must be solved.

If the present highway program is suspended until there is a determination of what can be done with a subway system, no provisions will have been made for ever-mounting motor vehicle traffic that is not and never will be susceptible to subway travel.

Annually, millions of people visit the Nation's Capital. Tourism is the District's second largest industry. More than 90 percent of visitors travel in their own automobiles. It would be tragic if Washington's highway condition became such that the city would be classed as a place to avoid.

The report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, to be filed in November, must of necessity undergo a series of intensive hearings in order to determine whether its recommendations are (1) physically possible, and (2) financially reasonable. This may well take a year or more. In the meantime, highway traffic volume increases almost daily, endangering the commerce of the city and posing a serious problem of public safety.

If the highway program is financed to continue as planned, it is doubtful if loss would be sustained even though the transit program might demonstrate a need for some adjustment in future highway planning. However, if the highway program is stopped until the subway plan is fully evaluated, the time lost can never be regained.

This table shows that the District has been making some progress in the "work under way" category, but lags behind the national average:

	Miles of Interstate System		Percent of total	
	District of Columbia	United States	District of Columbia	United States
Miles open to traffic.....	2.6	12,549.9	9.3	30.7
Work in progress:				
Under construction.....	4.5	4,801.3	16.0	11.8
Engineering or right-of-way.....	4.9	10,926.8	17.4	26.8
Total underway.....	9.4	15,728.1	33.5	38.6
Miles remaining.....	16.1	12,519.8	57.2	30.7
Total.....	28.1	40,797.8	100.0	100.0

Another matter of grave concern to the District of Columbia metropolitan area is the possibility that any substantial alteration in the comprehensive highway plan for the District of Columbia might result in altering the roads of interstate character. The projects involved in the current dispute are all links in the National Interstate System and as such must be coordinated with roads in other States to form an integrated system. Changes in the vital parts of the plan could result in these roads being considered ineligible for inclusion in the interstate program.

I believe it is imperative that the proposed District of Columbia highway program be kept on schedule and I urge that this be made possible in appropriations legislation. Delays doubtless will lead to ultimate added costs rather than savings. Another probable byproduct of delays doubtless will be further deterioration of the downtown section and a resultant loss in revenues. And there should be avoidance of the possible loss of Interstate Highway System funds.

These observations and recommendations are set forth in my capacity as a member of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works and as a Member of the Congress earnestly concerned with this problem in our Nation's Capital.

With recognition and appreciation for your diligent efforts in providing for the needs of the District of Columbia, I am,

Very truly yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO MEET DURING THE SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, September 14, 1962, at 10 o'clock a.m.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 13, 1962.

#### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Corwin S. Snyder, of North Dakota, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 34, with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1962

The House met at 11 o'clock, a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*I Samuel 12: 23: God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you.*

Almighty God, in our prayer of intercession, we are now bringing to Thy throne of grace, all whose lives are haunted by fears, harassed by doubt, heavy with sorrow and stained by sin.

Inspire us to grasp the eternal truth that we must accept life with all of its blessings and bereavements, its satisfactions and struggles; its opportunities and obligations, as an adventure and a discipline meant to make us strong and steadfast.

May our hearts be aglow with the enthusiasm of high ideals and may we never become cynical and embittered when we fail to attain those goals upon which we have centered our aspirations and ambitions.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress may courageously face without reservation or retreat our difficult and dangerous international problems, confident that Thou wilt sustain us in our high endeavor for freedom, which can only be the sure possession of those who have the faith and fortitude to defend it.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 298. An act to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the cost of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States;

H.R. 5393. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H.R. 9728. An act to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act;

H.R. 10160. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Lendian; and

H.R. 12459. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Coast Guard.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3064. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12180) entitled "An act to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United

States under Government orders," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE, TEX.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill S. 4, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 257, nays 87, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

YEAS—257

Abbutt	Dawson	Ichord, Mo.
Abernethy	Delaney	Inouye
Addabbo	Dent	Jarman
Albert	Denton	Jennings
Alford	Diggs	Johnson, Calif.
Andrews	Dingell	Johnson, Md.
Arends	Donohue	Johnson, Wis.
Ashley	Dorn	Judd
Ashmore	Dowdy	Karsten
Aspinall	Downing	Kee
Avery	Doyle	Keith
Ayres	Dulski	Kelly
Bailey	Edmondson	Keogh
Baldwin	Elliot	Kilgore
Baring	Ellsworth	King, Calif.
Barrett	Everett	King, Utah
Barry	Evins	Kitchin
Bass, Tenn.	Fallon	Kluczynski
Battin	Farberstein	Kornegay
Beckworth	Fascell	Kowalski
Bennett, Fla.	Feighan	Kunkel
Bennett, Mich.	Finnegan	Kyl
Berry	Fisher	Lane
Blatnik	Flood	Lankford
Blitch	Fogarty	Lennon
Boggs	Forrester	Lesinski
Boland	Fountain	Libonati
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Lindsay
Brademas	Friedel	McDowell
Breeding	Fulton	McFall
Brooks, Tex.	Gallagher	McIntire
Broomfield	Garmatz	McMillan
Broyhill	Gavin	Mahon
Bruce	Glaimo	Mailhard
Burke, Ky.	Gilbert	Marshall
Burke, Mass.	Granahan	Martin, Nebr.
Burleson	Green, Oreg.	Mathias
Byrne, Pa.	Green, Pa.	Matthews
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffiths	May
Cahill	Gubser	Miller, Clem
Cannon	Hagen, Calif.	Miller,
Carey	Haley	George P.
Casey	Halpern	Milliken
Chenoweth	Hansen	Moeller
Church	Hardy	Moorhead, Pa.
Clark	Harrison, Wyo.	Morgan
Cohelan	Hays	Morse
Conite	Hebert	Moss
Cooley	Hechler	Multer
Corman	Hemphill	Murphy
Cunningham	Henderson	Murray
Curtin	Herlong	Natcher
Daddario	Holifield	Nedzi
Dague	Holland	Nelsen
Daniels	Horan	Nix
Davis, John W.	Huddleston	Nygaard
Davis, Tenn.	Hull	O'Brien, Ill.

O'Brien, N.Y.	Rooney	Teague, Tex.
O'Hara, Ill.	Roosevelt	Thomas
O'Hara, Mich.	Rosenthal	Thompson, N.J.
Olsen	Rostenkowski	Thompson, Tex.
O'Neill	Roush	Thornberry
Osmer	Rutherford	Toll
Patman	Ryan, Mich.	Tuck
Perkins	Ryan, N.Y.	Tupper
Peterson	St. Germain	Udall, Morris K.
Philbin	Santangelo	Ullman
Pike	Saylor	Vanik
Poage	Schneebeli	Van Zandt
Price	Schweiker	Vinson
Pucinski	Schwengel	Waggonner
Purcell	Scott	Wallhauser
Quile	Selden	Walter
Randall	Sheppard	Watts
Reifel	Shipley	Weaver
Reuss	Sibal	Whitener
Rhodes, Ariz.	Sikes	Whitten
Rhodes, Pa.	Sisk	Wickersham
Riley	Slack	Williams
Rivers, Alaska	Smith, Iowa	Willis
Rivers, S.C.	Smith, Miss.	Wilson, Calif.
Roberts, Ala.	Smith, Va.	Winstead
Roberts, Tex.	Steed	Wright
Robison	Stratton	Young
Rodino	Stubblefield	Zablocki
Rogers, Colo.	Sullivan	
Rogers, Fla.	Taylor	

NAYS—87

Adair	Glenn	O'Konski
Alger	Goodell	Ostertag
Anderson, Ill.	Griffin	Pelly
Ashbrook	Gross	Pillion
Auchincloss	Hall	Pirnie
Baker	Harsha	Poff
Bates	Harvey, Mich.	Ray
Becker	Hiestand	Riehlman
Beermann	Hoeven	Rousselot
Belcher	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Bell	Hosmer	Schadeberg
Bolton	Jensen	Schenck
Bow	Joelson	Scherer
Brown	Johansen	Short
Cederberg	Jonas	Shriver
Chamberlain	Jones, Mo.	Siler
Chiperfield	Kastenmeier	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	King, N.Y.	Springer
Collier	Knox	Stafford
Corbett	Langen	Taber
Curtis, Mo.	Latta	Teague, Calif.
Derounian	Lipscomb	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	MacGregor	Tollefson
Dole	Mason	Utt
Dwyer	Meader	Van Pelt
Fenton	Michel	Westland
Findley	Minshall	Wharton
Fino	Monagan	Wildnall
Gathings	Moore	Younger

NOT VOTING—91

Alexander	Goodling	Montoya
Andersen,	Grant	Moorehead,
Minn.	Gray	Ohio
Anfuso	Hagan, Ga.	Morris
Bass, N.H.	Halleck	Morrison
Betts	Harding	Mosher
Bolling	Harris	Moulder
Boykin	Harrison, Va.	Norblad
Bray	Harvey, Ind.	Norrell
Brewster	Healey	Passman
Brownell	Hoffman, Mich.	Pfost
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Pilcher
Celler	Kath	Powell
Chelf	Kearns	Rains
Coad	Kilburn	Reece
Colmer	Kirwan	Rogers, Tex.
Cook	Laird	Roudebush
Cramer	Landrum	Saund
Curtis, Mass.	Loser	Scranton
Davis,	McCulloch	Seely-Brown
James C.	McDonough	Shelley
Devine	McSweeney	Spence
Dominick	McVey	Staggers
Dooley	McDonald	Stephens
Durno	Mack	Thompson, La.
Flynt	Madden	Trimble
Ford	Magnuson	Weis
Frazier	Martin, Mass.	Whalley
Garland	Morrow	Wilson, Ind.
Gary	Miller, N.Y.	Yates
Gonzalez	Mills	Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Scranton.  
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Cramer.  
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Ford.  
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Betts.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Miller of New York.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Healey with Mr. Kilburn.  
Mr. Harding with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.  
Mr. Karth with Mr. Devine.  
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Goodling.  
Mr. Brewster with Mrs. Weis.  
Mr. Loser with Mr. Durno.  
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.  
Mr. Yates with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.  
Mr. Mack with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.  
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Seely-Brown.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Bromwell.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Dooley.  
Mr. Gary with Mr. McDonough.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kearns.  
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Norblad.  
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Laird.  
Mr. Gray with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Rains with Mr. Mosher.  
Mr. Morris with Mrs. Reece.  
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.  
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. McVey.  
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.  
Mr. Madden with Mr. Merrow.  
Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Garland.  
Mr. Cook with Mr. Dominick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, even though Padre Island extends along the coast of Texas and is well known to Texans, I must oppose at this time this bill making Padre Island a national park.

The reasons are quite simple.

First, it is wrong to spend money the Government does not have. At a period of deficit financing, we can easily delay such expenditures. Further, while \$5 million is the amount to be appropriated, this, at best, is a "guesstimate" and the cost would be twice that plus the cost of necessary improvements, such as at least one all-weather highway the length of the island.

Second, the State of Texas has requested "that all action on the proposed national seashore project be withheld during this session of Congress because it is being studied by the State of Texas as a possible State park." Some of the factors being considered are the specific size of the park area of the 113-mile island, which in the bill is specified as 88 miles, the State of Texas believing that 44 miles would be sufficient since much of this area is mudflats and subject to tidal conditions.

Third, the island is not now accessible except by two causeways, and in case of emergency the very safety of vacationers would be in doubt.

Fourth, there is a direct conflict between the wilderness concept of the island and the intended oil and gas mineral developments; one precludes the other.



Fifth, and finally, Padre Island is so close to sea level and so affected by tides and storms that one bad hurricane could destroy all improvements, if not wash it away sufficiently to render it useless as a resort.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I was unable to be here yesterday when the Padre Island bill was before the House for consideration, but there was a primary election in the State of Washington and I was in my district at that time.

I opposed the Padre Island bill in committee—and I oppose it here before the House of Representatives. I do not do this with any great pleasure but because I believe this legislation is basically wrong.

I have visited Padre Island and I have toured a good portion of it—in a specially equipped jeep. Padre Island is 115 miles of deep sand—with practically nothing on 90 miles of it. There are no roads, except for a small portion of the north and south ends—it is impossible to travel this island except in a specially built jeep—one with two-way radio, special tires, extra water, and food—and even then it is rather dangerous to travel. Yet this bill wants the taxpayers of the country to provide \$5 million to buy just the surface and the Secretary of Interior has stated that the price might be "more than twice that." Now the reason you are only getting the surface is because some oil companies own the mineral or oil rights—and you know Texas and oil—do not touch. This bill would permit these oil companies to drill and produce and store oil in a national seashore. As a matter of fact the State of Texas has already received some \$13 million in royalties from oil produced on Padre Island and estimates as much as \$1 billion in royalties have been made. It seems to me that if the great State of Texas wants to preserve this area as a seashore they could and should do it themselves. Certainly they are in better shape financially to do it than is the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the preservation of our seashores, but I believe as the Outdoor Recreation and Resources Commission stated, that the initiative should come from the States.

One final thought, Mr. Speaker. If this bill is passed it will represent action taken by the Federal Government in opposition to the express wishes of the Texas Legislature. Just this year Mr. Grainger W. McIlhaney, chairman of the legislative land study committee, advised this Congress that they were studying the Padre Island situation and further stated "my committee strongly urges that all action on the proposed national seashore project be withheld during this session of Congress." I ask the Members of the House of Representatives if they think they should act against the expressed wishes of a State legislature?

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12711) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, YATES, CANNON, OSTERTAG, and TABER.

#### UNITED NATIONS LOAN

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 764 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (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. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed five hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 764 provides for the consideration of S. 2768, a bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor. This is an open rule, and provides for 5 hours of general debate.

On January 30 of this year the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress asking that the Congress go along with an appropriation of this type because of the fiscal condition of the United Nations. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and one of the minority members, filed legislation similar to the type we have here today. In April the Senate passed such legislation.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, in the time intervening when this matter was passed by the Senate and came to the House, it became more or less a political football and there was great consternation as to whether or not this legislation could pass

this body. I think the polls that have been taken throughout the Nation, the editorial comments and the press and radio show, that the people of America stand behind this legislation and realize the need for it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the appropriation not to exceed \$100 million for a loan to the United Nations. The United Nations is in a financial crisis which if not relieved will make necessary the withdrawal of United Nations forces from the Congo and from the Middle East and the area of the Israel-Egyptian border.

Should such withdrawals occur, it would deteriorate the situation in those areas, and such result would appear to be inevitable, and would threaten world peace and the security of the United States.

The first thing we say to ourselves is, How did the United Nations get into the deficit in which it is in?

The financing of the United Nations and its affiliated agencies falls into four categories. First is the assessed budget for the ordinary expenses of the United Nations of which the United States currently pays 32.02 percent. For 1962 the U.S. assessment for this regular budget was \$23.7 million. Second are the regular assessed budgets of the specialized agencies such as the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Civil Organization of which the United States pays not more than one-third. Third are voluntary contributions to special programs including the Children's Fund and the Palestine refugee program. Fourth are the assessments to finance the United Nations Emergency Force—UNEF—in the Middle East and, more recently, the United Nations Operations in the Congo—UNOC.

The root of the financial difficulties of the United Nations lies in the fourth category. The United Nations Emergency Force has 5,100 troops in the Middle East along the Israel-Egyptian border to maintain peace. This operation costs the United Nations about \$20 million a year. In the Congo 18 nations provide almost 18,000 troops at a cost to the United Nations of \$120 million a year.

There are certain nations in the United Nations that have not paid their cost under category 4. We know that the satellite nations of the Communist Party have not paid their costs. They would like us in this Congress today to defeat this legislation and refuse to go along with it. They realize that if we here in the Congress do not appropriate this \$100 million today that the troops would be withdrawn and taken out of the Congo and the troops would be withdrawn out of these other areas in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this \$100 million loan comes down to this. Unless we are prepared to accept the risks of Communist penetration of central Africa and of active Soviet intervention in a renewal of hostilities in the Middle East, the United States must either take the action necessary to meet the United Nations financial emergency or prepare to assume certain peacekeeping responsibilities in these areas which are being

borne by the United Nations—undoubtedly at greatly increased cost.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 764 and now yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, this may be the only noncontroversial part of this debate today and tomorrow. It is with considerable regret that I rise at this time to announce to the Members of the House the death of a former official reporter for the House, Mr. William L. Fenstermacher. He served as an official reporter for the House for 31 years. He retired on April 1, 1961. He passed away last night at Georgetown Hospital. In the limited time I had to investigate his service, I think he reported for the House of Representatives for as long as any other individual who served in that capacity. He was first appointed by Speaker Longworth in 1929. He served under Speaker Jack Garner from Texas, Speaker Rainey from Illinois, Speaker Byrns from Tennessee, Speaker Bankhead from Alabama, our own beloved colleague Joe Martin from Massachusetts and the late Speaker Sam Rayburn from Texas. He reported debates by such outstanding and illustrious Members as John Rankin, of Mississippi, Ham Fish, LaGuardia, Dewey Short, and ironically enough, if irony is the word, he also was an official reporter during the time that former Vice President Richard Nixon and now Vice President Lyndon Johnson were Members of the House of Representatives.

He has performed a great service to the House of Representatives, to the Nation, and I know that his memory will be revered and long remembered by those of us who served in the House during his long period of service.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to join with my colleague from Kansas in paying reverence to the passing of Bill Fenstermacher. I think he was a courteous and efficient reporter. He was a true friend to all of us with whom he worked.

I have a rather personal interest here too, because one of Bill Fenstermacher's two brothers who survive him lives in my district.

I want to commend the gentleman from Kansas for taking this time.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as has already been said by my colleague from Massachusetts, this resolution, House Resolution 764, makes in order the consideration of the bill, S. 2768, with 5 hours of general debate under an open rule.

This bill comes to us from the Senate. It has been slightly changed, it has been amended and I think improved. In the report under the explanation of the amendment we find that the committee changed the provisions of section 1 of the Senate bill and said:

The proceeds of such loan shall not be used to relieve state members of the United Nations of their obligation to pay arrearages on payments of any United Nations assessments.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important matter. I think also it has been highly controversial. In looking over some of the statements I have received recently I feel that this is one that deserves some consideration.

It seems that the Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, Harlan Cleveland, testifying in favor of the \$100 million bond bill, reluctantly dropped this bombshell after running into some penetrating interrogation by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ROBERT CHIPERFIELD:

The startling facts bared by Cleveland, who has become known as the U.N. bond salesman, shocked committee members when they learned the modus operandi of this extraordinary scheme. The United States, Cleveland admitted, had voluntarily given the U.N. \$215 million out of foreign aid contingency funds. Then the U.N. proceeded to use part of this sum to reduce India's assessed share of special U.N. expenses by \$812,000; Poland's by \$512,000, Yugoslavia's by \$243,200, and Cuba's by \$140,800, if you please.

Mr. Speaker, that is all documented in the minority report. These figures are correct.

There are many others that may be startling to the House of Representatives. There are many people who certainly have defaulted completely in their payments to the United Nations and are not absolutely impoverished.

First—and I have a great deal of sympathy for this country. I am very devoted to France, and always have been. I consider it almost my second country. France, if you please, has a gross assessment of \$4,782,000. And what do you think their defalcation amounts to? \$4,746,601.

We have already noted India. Poland has paid a little but is still in arrears by over a million dollars. Ukraine and the U.S.S.R. both are in complete default. The United States, of course, has paid its full share, and more, and is now trying to do a little bit more with these bonds.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is going to do nothing at all. It will be a stopgap, but they will have to come back here next year for another loan.

Another thing, when you sell bonds, I was always under the impression that people would be allowed to buy them. I have always felt that with these United Nations bonds it might be well to put them on the market. We have heard that the majority of the people in this country are favorable to this bond issue. My distinguished colleague from Massachusetts has just told you that. Then there should be no problem in raising \$100 million. Why cannot the people go

into the market and buy these bonds, put them away in their safety deposit boxes for their children and grandchildren? I think that is an excellent idea.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentlewoman for her excellent statement. Does the gentlewoman not think those who vote affirmatively for this bill ought to have the opportunity and the vigorous encouragement to withdraw some of their own money from banks, building and loan associations, and so forth, on which they are being paid 4 percent interest, and invest in these bonds? I think it would be a demonstration of good faith on the part of Members who vote for this bill, if provision is made in the bill that they join in the purchase of these bonds.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I heartily agree with the gentleman from Iowa. I think that is a fair thing. If we believe in these things we should provide taxpayers' money, and certainly our own. One hundred million dollars, with the way things run today, with a \$308 billion debt is not very much money. I have no doubt that the people of the country who are favorable, and if they are in the majority, they would be delighted to do that very thing.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman spoke of France a moment ago. Is she aware of the statement by President de Gaulle that France would not purchase any of these bonds if they were printed on gold plated paper?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I think President de Gaulle told the truth and made a very forthright statement.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Is it not a fact there is no money in the Treasury to buy this \$100 million of bonds, and that we will have to go out and borrow the money?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Certainly. The gentleman from New York knows very well we are running most of the time on borrowed money. So that is not anything new.

Mr. BECKER. Well, we will have to borrow the money anyway.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That is true. Our people should be given the privilege of buying these bonds.

One more thing I would like to bring out in justification of the attitude of France and the attitude of many other nations. There has been great objection in many quarters in Europe and elsewhere to this war in the Congo.

This is called, I believe, a peace operation. If you have seen any of the pictures—and I am sure that you have—of the atrocities in the Congo, of the torture of little children, of women, of nuns and of clergymen, I do not think you would be very favorably impressed with it as a peace operation.

Mr. Speaker, it was our understanding in the beginning, and we have been told it since, that the U.N. was founded



on a peaceful basis that it was a deliberative body, that there you could get together and talk to each other and talk on both sides, and in that way there would be a meeting of the minds, which is always an excellent thing, even when we differ. But when it comes to raising money to send troops to the Congo to keep the peace, so-called, and have them fighting there for months and have them killing and maiming and have ambulances shot at, I do not think that is a role for the United Nations. I cannot believe that the House of Representatives wants to support that kind of a move.

Mr. Speaker, if these bonds are to be put through on a businesslike basis—and there is no argument against that—I understand that an amendment will be offered by one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. DERWINSKI], to make an appropriate amount available for interest payments. That is a very important thing. These interest payments should be in line with interest as it is paid abroad at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, the two primary purposes of offering this amendment are, first, to provide a return to the Treasury in excess of the recent cost on our own long-term bond issues and in anticipating a continued increase in the cost of financing our national debt. Secondly, this interest rate will make the bonds more attractive to other countries. There is no earthly reason why other countries should not purchase them since interest rate levels throughout the world are consistently greater than in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I think this amendment is a good amendment and should be accepted. I do feel, however, Mr. Speaker, that we are going a little bit too far in doing this kind of thing year after year, and I know it is a very common thing and a very prevalent thought to say "Oh, if we had not had the United Nations." Well, Mr. Speaker, "Oh, if we had had a rainy day today no one knows what would have happened."

The Speaker of the House of Representatives does not know what would have happened, none of the Members know what would have happened, I do not know what would have happened. There are no more futile words than "It might have been." Therefore let us discard this way of thinking and let us try to tighten up a little on the United Nations. Let us try to make the United Nations realize—and I think if they realize it once it will be for all time—that the United States of America is not a milk cow which can be used whenever you need a little more cream.

Mr. Speaker, these people know what they are doing. These people are very smart diplomats, most of them, and certainly the ones behind the Iron Curtain. They are not going to pay the freight if "Uncle" is there to pay it for them. It is as simple as that. You and I have all had occasion to see this same thing in our own home with our own families. If we are going to be a patsy to the world and to an organization over which we have little or no control, we are going to be sought out year after year after

year for this very same thing, and where has it led us so far?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentlewoman think that this bill, as amended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, does precisely what the gentlewoman has said, and with which I thoroughly agree? In the past others have tended to assume that we would always come along and pay 40 or 50 percent of the costs and if they threatened us a bit we would pay 60 percent or still more. We have encouraged them in that attitude because we have done it repeatedly. I think the practice has been a mistake. We are trying to correct it. Here for the first time the U.S. Government will deal with the United Nations the same way it deals with our own States and cities. It will say to the U.N., we will match dollar for dollar what you put up, just as we do in various matching programs with the States. It is the same way a foundation approaches a university, saying, "We will give you \$1 million, if you will raise \$1 million."

Mr. Speaker, this is a realistic and effective approach. It has proved through the years to be a successful way to get others to give, to do the most for themselves.

Using this approach we will also find out, and the world will know, just what other countries really think about the United Nations and its usefulness. If it is valuable to them, then they will come through with their money. If they do not, then we will know that the U.N. simply does not have the significance to others that we have hoped it had. I cherish the belief that what we have done in the bill will achieve what the gentlewoman is calling for.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The gentleman may remember that I did say the bill had been amended and improved. I do not think it has been amended quite enough. I also think that perhaps it is not strong enough as it is written. I think the gentleman and I probably want to attain the same objectives. I still think the United States is doing more than its share. I also would like to know what is going to happen to these other members who refuse to do anything, apparently absolutely nothing. They would still have their vote.

Mr. JUDD. If the gentlewoman will yield further, if this bill goes through and the Senate takes our version, as I am sure it will, or it will be brought back here in disagreement, these countries must come through with their payments or after a period of 2 years they lose their vote in the General Assembly. Any nation can then get up in the U.N. and challenge their vote. Under the charter their vote is lost if they are 2 years in arrears.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. My friend will agree that will have to be done by a majority vote?

Mr. JUDD. The advisory opinion has to be accepted by a majority vote, but if somebody is 2 years in arrears, under the charter itself, article XIX, they will

have lost their vote and any member can challenge their vote, and stop them from voting.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Article XIX has been there a long time. Many people have been in arrears, and no one has challenged their vote.

Mr. JUDD. Not many have been in arrears under the conditions of article XIX. They have to have been in arrears more than 2 full years. As of this summer, only four countries were in arrears, all of them in the free world and good friends of the United States. I understand three of those have since paid up, and only one today is in arrears. The Soviet Union, if it did not pay, would be in arrears by 1964, but my guess is that it will pay up rather than lose its vote.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I should like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if it is not true that this prohibition, or this losing of the vote, may be waived by the General Assembly. It is written into the charter, so that if the General Assembly so acts it may waive that restriction against voting.

Mr. JUDD. I think that is probably true, in the same way we can suspend our rules here, but article XIX authorizes a waiver only if the General Assembly is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the member.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That is what I was pointing out to the gentleman, that that is true. Probably a majority will go the other way. I do not think we can count on them.

Mr. JUDD. I think the United Nations itself knows it is at a crossroads. The members have to come through now or else it is writing its own doom. The little countries more than anybody else know that this is almost its last chance to be helpful to them, if they fail to come through.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. In a copyrighted story in the Herald Tribune of September 9—perhaps I should not mention the name of that paper in the vicinity of the White House—there appeared this article:

#### U.N. WILL NOT DEMAND MEMBERS PAY DEFICITS

(By Darius Jhabvala)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The U.N. General Assembly which will open its session September 18, will not take any firm action to meet the deficits incurred by the Organization's Middle East and Congo operations.

It was learned yesterday from a high authority, that at best the Assembly will be asked by a small group of delegations, strongly backed by the United States to endorse the opinion of the International Court of Justice delivered last July that such payments are obligatory on all members. But that is as far as the General Assembly's action will go.

According to sources here, a draft resolution is being discussed among some delegations in these terms and there is little optimism that it will have either the moral or political force behind it to get very far.

## SAME FINANCIAL MORASS

The net result will be that the organization will be in the same financial morass next year as it is this year, with the added effect that the spirit of the U.N. Charter will be a little shaken.

As of August 31, the U.N. deficit from both the Congo and UNEF operations was well over \$115 million. Assuming that this deficit would increase at the present rate of \$13 million a month, by December the deficit will be well over \$165 million.

From time to time, Secretary General U Thant and other officials of the Assembly have emphatically pointed out that the financial solvency of the organization is imperative for the future of the U.N. But few, if any, delegations are willing to rap the delinquent nations with an ultimatum to pay up or else.

Opposition to payment comes principally from the Soviet bloc nations. While France and numerous smaller African and Asian nations have not anted up as yet, the feeling is that their failure to do so does not stem from opposition as much as inability to meet the costs.

There is already some discussion that a system of installment payments will help the small and new nations to meet this expense. Some sources indicate that France

will pay the costs, although she has not done so as yet.

But the problem created by the Soviet bloc is in a totally different category. The Russians have maintained that the Congo and UNEF operations have been illegal operations. The power to maintain peace and use force rests with the Security Council. These operations were approved by the General Assembly and, the Soviets say, the Assembly did not have the authority to do so.

In last year's Assembly debate, the Soviet delegate warned that it "would not consider itself bound by any decisions the Court might take, because the question was not within the competence of the Court."

The article fortifies the gentlewoman's prediction that the General Assembly is not going to ask for back payments from delinquent members. Members here ought to realize that they may be asked to vote more funds next year. Let us not be lulled into the idea that these delinquents are going to pay up.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I should like to read one more passage from the minority views, which I might

say was written by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], and which is an excellent report.

During the past 2 years, as shown in table I, the United States contributed—over and above paying its regular assessments—nearly \$41 million to U.N. military operations in the Congo. As of June 30, 1962, U.S. voluntary contributions to UNEF amounted to \$23 million. These voluntary contributions made it possible for the U.N. to reduce substantially the assessments of other countries—including Communist and Communist-dominated countries—for the financing of these U.N. activities. The manner in which this was accomplished is reflected in table II, appearing below.

In table II there are far more than three delinquents, I can assure you.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted in the RECORD at this point, showing the delinquent nations, and they are legion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

TABLE II.—Assessments in respect of the Congo ad hoc account for the period Nov. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962

Member states	Per- cent	Gross amount of assess- ments	Reduc- tions <sup>1</sup> under Resolu- tion 1732 (XVI)	Credits from Tax Equal- ization Fund for 1960	Amount received	May 31, 1962, balance due	Member states	Per- cent	Gross amount of assess- ments	Reduc- tions <sup>1</sup> under Resolu- tion 1732 (XVI)	Credits from Tax Equal- ization Fund for 1960	Amount received	May 31, 1962, balance due
Afghanistan.....	0.05	\$40,000	\$32,000	\$51	-----	\$7,949.00	Ivory Coast.....	0.04	\$32,000	\$25,000	\$6	-----	\$6,394.00
Albania.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00	Japan.....	2.27	1,816,000	908,000	1,847	-----	906,153.00
Argentina.....	1.01	808,000	646,400	936	-----	160,664.00	Jordan.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00
Australia.....	1.66	1,328,000	-----	1,510	-----	1,326,490.00	Laos.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00
Austria.....	.45	360,000	-----	363	-----	359,637.00	Lebanon.....	.05	40,000	32,000	42	-----	7,968.00
Belgium.....	1.20	960,000	-----	1,097	-----	958,903.00	Liberia.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00
Bolivia.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00	Libya.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00
Brazil.....	1.03	824,000	659,200	860	-----	163,940.00	Luxembourg.....	.05	40,000	32,000	51	-----	8,366.00
Bulgaria.....	.20	160,000	128,000	135	-----	31,865.00	Madagascar (Malagasy Republic).....	.04	32,000	25,600	6	-----	6,394.00
Burma.....	.07	56,000	44,800	67	\$11,133.00	-----	Mali.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	-----	6,396.00
Byelorussian S.S.R.....	.52	416,000	-----	396	-----	415,604.00	Mexico.....	.74	592,000	473,600	599	-----	117,801.00
Cambodia.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00	Morocco.....	.14	112,000	89,600	118	-----	22,282.00
Cameroon.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	-----	-----	Nepal.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00
Canada.....	3.12	2,496,000	-----	2,624	2,493,376.00	-----	Netherlands.....	1.01	808,000	-----	852	807,148.00	-----
Central African Re- public.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	6,396.00	-----	New Zealand.....	.41	328,000	-----	354	327,646.00	-----
Ceylon.....	.09	72,000	57,600	84	-----	14,316.00	Nicaragua.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00
Chad.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	-----	6,396.00	Niger.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	-----	6,396.00
Chile.....	.26	208,000	166,400	228	-----	41,372.00	Nigeria.....	.21	168,000	134,400	20	-----	33,580.00
China.....	4.57	3,656,000	1,828,000	4,220	-----	1,823,774.00	Norway.....	.45	360,000	-----	413	359,587.00	-----
Colombia.....	.26	208,000	166,400	261	-----	41,339.00	Pakistan.....	.42	336,000	268,800	337	-----	66,863.00
Congo (Brazzaville).....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	-----	6,396.00	Panama.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00
Congo (Leopoldville).....	.07	56,000	44,800	4	-----	11,196.00	Paraguay.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00
Costa Rica.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00	Peru.....	.10	80,000	64,000	93	-----	15,907.00
Cuba.....	.22	176,000	140,800	211	-----	34,989.00	Philippines.....	.40	320,000	256,000	363	-----	63,637.00
Cyprus.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	6,396.00	-----	Poland.....	1.28	1,024,000	512,000	1,155	-----	510,845.00
Czechoslovakia.....	1.17	936,000	-----	734	-----	935,266.00	Portugal.....	.16	128,000	102,400	169	-----	25,431.00
Dahomey.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	149.94	-----	Rumania.....	.32	256,000	-----	287	-----	255,713.00
Denmark.....	.58	464,000	-----	506	463,494.00	-----	Saudi Arabia.....	.07	56,000	44,800	51	-----	11,149.00
Dominican Republic.....	.05	40,000	32,000	42	-----	7,958.00	Senegal.....	.05	40,000	32,000	6	-----	7,994.00
Ecuador.....	.06	48,000	38,400	51	-----	9,549.00	Somalia.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	-----	6,396.00
El Salvador.....	0.04	32,000	25,600	42	-----	6,358.00	South Africa.....	.53	424,000	-----	472	-----	423,528.00
Ethiopia.....	.05	40,000	32,000	51	-----	7,949.00	Spain.....	.86	688,000	550,400	784	-----	136,816.00
Federation of Malaya.....	.13	104,000	83,200	143	20,657.00	-----	Sudan.....	.07	56,000	44,800	51	-----	11,149.00
Finland.....	.37	296,000	-----	303	295,697.00	-----	Sweden.....	1.30	1,040,000	-----	1,173	1,038,827.00	-----
France.....	5.94	4,752,000	-----	5,399	-----	4,746,601.00	Thailand.....	.16	128,000	102,400	135	-----	25,465.00
Gabon.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	-----	6,396.00	Togo.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	-----	6,396.00
Ghana.....	.09	72,000	57,600	59	-----	14,341.00	Tunisia.....	.05	40,000	32,000	42	-----	7,958.00
Greece.....	.23	184,000	147,200	194	-----	36,606.00	Turkey.....	.40	320,000	256,000	498	63,502.00	-----
Guatemala.....	.05	40,000	32,000	42	-----	7,958.00	Ukrainian S.S.R.....	1.98	1,584,000	-----	1,518	-----	1,582,482.00
Guinea.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00	U.S.S.R.....	14.97	11,976,000	-----	11,491	-----	11,964,509.00
Haiti.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00	United Arab Republic.....	.30	240,000	192,000	270	-----	47,730.00
Honduras.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00	United Kingdom.....	7.58	6,064,000	-----	6,563	1,793,822.51	4,263,614.49
Hungary.....	.56	448,000	-----	354	-----	447,646.00	United States.....	32.02	25,616,000	-----	-----	-----	25,616,000.00
Iceland.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	6,366.00	-----	Upper Volta.....	.04	32,000	25,600	4	-----	6,396.00
India.....	2.03	1,624,000	812,000	2,075	-----	809,925.00	Uruguay.....	.11	88,000	70,400	101	-----	17,499.00
Indonesia.....	.45	360,000	288,000	396	-----	71,604.00	Venezuela.....	.52	416,000	332,800	422	-----	82,778.00
Iran.....	.20	160,000	128,000	177	-----	31,823.00	Yemen.....	.04	32,000	25,600	34	-----	6,366.00
Iraq.....	.09	72,000	57,600	76	-----	14,324.00	Yugoslavia.....	.38	304,000	243,200	295	-----	60,505.00
Ireland.....	.14	112,000	89,600	135	-----	22,265.00	Total.....	100.00	80,000,000	11,400,800	57,058	7,714,917.45	60,827,224.55
Israel.....	.15	120,000	96,000	118	-----	23,882.00							
Italy.....	2.24	1,792,000	-----	1,898	-----	1,790,102.00							

<sup>1</sup> Reductions in contributions made possible by voluntary contributions from the United States.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a time for thoughtful, nay, even prayerful consideration of this measure. I think we have to stop deluding ourselves with this everlasting talk that we

would be much worse off without the United Nations. Maybe we would. But no one can answer that question. Therefore, I think it would be wise to let the United Nations know now by our

speeches and by our vote that we think it is high time for them to pull up their socks, to strengthen their organization, and to police themselves, for we are only one member, and any small African



country recently admitted has just as much voting power as the United States of America.

We have a perfect right, it seems to me, as long as we are paying out these vast sums at the expense of our sorely harassed taxpayers, to let it be known that we want more efficiency and that we do not want armies put in the field wherever the Secretariat may deem wise to do so. Further I think we ought to talk about it for the full 5 hours and I think we should amend the bill. It has already been slightly improved and it can be amended to improve it a great deal more.

Mr. Speaker, finally, if it is defeated, it will bring no tears to my eyes.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks previously made and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BROWN. I just want to rise to congratulate the gentlewoman from New York on the very able and remarkable address she has just completed on this subject, and to point out to the House that the Committee on Rules was very generous in granting time to the Committee on Foreign Affairs to debate the philosophy and the beliefs of the individual members of that committee rather fully on the floor for 5 long hours. The opportunity will be given, I hope and believe, to every Member of the House to express himself or herself fully on these particular subjects. So, again, I want to say as ranking member of the Committee on Rules, I am very, very proud of the gentlewoman from New York today because she has made a very remarkable address here and I am sure we are all very appreciative of that fact.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my colleague from Ohio. May I take this opportunity to say that if my address and my presentation has any merit, it is largely due to his tuition and his leadership.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the gentlewoman from New York did an excellent job for her side. She has undoubtedly read the minority report and studied it and believes it. I do hope that she remains on the floor during the 5 hours of debate when those who I would think know more about foreign affairs than we do on the Committee on Rules will be able to answer the questions that she has put forward. Dr. MORGAN, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, will explain the remarks of Mr. Harlan Cleveland in a far different light than the lady from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members of the House will conduct the debate on the pending resolution in accordance with the high traditions of this great body which I love and of which I am so proud. The gentlewoman from New York has expressed her views and, of course, Members may have different viewpoints with respect to the many complex aspects of this legislation, but in expressing our views, let us consider this in the national interest of our country, and respecting each other in disagreement in accordance with the highest traditions of this great body.

This resolution has received 9 months of discussion, debate and searching inquiry. That has all gone into the decision in relation to the resolution now before the House. The vote will take place tomorrow. There may be some who feel this reexamination was protracted and not necessary. I am not one of them. I think we have come a long way toward clarifying the American view of the United Nations and have, thus, made it easier for other members of the United Nations to see their own responsibilities more clearly. I am further convinced that the most important thing to emerge from this debate is that the American people want the United Nations to be a better organization, and the gentlewoman from New York made able reference to that.

In the course of the debate, four American presidents, all during the last 6 months, have said this in one form or another—U.N. responsibility.

President Hoover has eloquently reminded us that the United Nations is not the organization we had hoped for during World War II. He put the blame right where it belongs—not on the organization but on its Communist members. If he saw little value in the U.N.'s immediate future, he nevertheless insisted that other collective security measures should not replace the U.N.

President Truman, in his endorsement of the bill pointed out that the United Nations is only an approach to world peace. He also reminded us that the United Nations has been able to act without the support of the Communists and often against them as it did in Korea and the Congo. I am in thorough agreement with the United Nations assuming responsibility by stable government. We must recognize that our own country in the early days had to go through a long period of experimentation. There were many persons in those days, as history records, who said that under the Constitution the Original Thirteen States then comprising the Union could not long survive. So we have to have patience and forbearance to look ahead at a time when the national interest of our country is directly involved. We have got to consider the national interest of the United States.

President Eisenhower said:

This is a measure helping to hold open the door of hope for all mankind in its yearning for a world of peace and justice among nations.

He sent a cable to both the minority leader, my distinguished friend, the gen-

tleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and me from abroad when he was recently in Europe. It was a ringing telegram of statesmanship.

President Eisenhower also issued a timely warning against letting our dis-appointments with the United Nations blur our vision or our hope.

President Kennedy emphasized the need to temper our hopes with historical perspective when he said:

The United Nations is still in its infancy—and without our full support it will have no chance to grow into the mature institution foreseen by the farsighted men who wrote the charter for an organization. "to secure succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

The views of these four Presidents are perhaps the finest possible summary of our national attitude to the United Nations. It is notable, I believe that they reflect the real concern of the American people with the future of the United Nations rather than with any particular means of meeting the present financial emergency.

The question of whether or not a loan to the United Nations is the best available way to keep the organization going is not a great issue. I believe the United States Delegation to the United Nations handled the matter fairly well, and that the administration presented the Congress with a reasonable proposal which the Congress has studied and improved.

I might say that the committee has improved upon the bill by making certain changes, and I think they are decidedly in the right direction.

The President has recommended and accepted the amendments made by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. If Members wish to support the U.N., this is a good way to do it.

However, there is a great issue involved here. The American people and people throughout the world will judge our vote on this financial measure as a vote for or against the future of the United Nations.

We cannot be sure at this time whether history is watching but all evidence points that way. To reject the loan would be gambling with the future, and I respectfully caution anyone who intends to take this gamble to do so with his eyes open.

I realize all the implications involved. I realize the disappointment we have sometimes felt with the United Nations. I have some myself, but we have got to strive to look into the future as far as we can and to realize that not only this day is involved, but involved also is the future world in which your children and your children's children, the youngsters we see walking through the corridors of the Capitol and elsewhere must live. Their future is being decided. The next 2, 4, or 5 years in all probability will see determined the kind of life and world that the youngsters, your children and your children's children, are going to live in. In connection with that we have got to have strength, we have got to have peace.

I have thought this over from all angles. I think the bill should pass, and I hope it will pass.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (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.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2768, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed \$100 million for a loan to the United Nations. The language of the bill as it passed the other body has been amended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs so as to require that every dollar loaned by the United States must be matched by an equal loan from other countries. The bill also provides that the money loaned by the United States shall not be used to relieve members of the United Nations of their obligation to pay arrearages on United Nations assessments or to reduce regular or special assessments against any such members.

Under the authority of this bill the President can purchase up to \$100 million of United Nations bonds which have been authorized by the United Nations General Assembly, but the lending authority is not limited to the purchase of bonds. A loan or loans on some other basis is authorized as long as the total amount stays within the \$100 million limit and the other limitations contained in the bill are met.

The money loaned to the United Nations will be used to pay its most pressing unpaid bills and to finance the continued operation of the United Nations Forces in the Congo and in the area of the Israeli-Egyptian border for the next few months.

The bill provides that repayments of interest and principal on any loan made by the United States to the United Nations shall be deducted from the annual payment assessed against the United States for the budget of the United Nations. The annual principal and interest which will be due to the United States if the United States purchases \$100 million worth of United Nations bonds will amount to \$5.1 million per year. The U.S. share of the United Nations annual budget is 32.02 percent, and for the year 1962 this amounts to \$23,700,000.

The bill makes clear that the authorization of this loan is not to be considered a precedent and that it is the sense of

the Congress that the United Nations reorganize its financing so as to avoid large-scale deficits in the future.

The bill also expresses the satisfaction of the Congress that the International Court of Justice has indicated that the expenses of the United Nations operations in the Congo and in the Middle East are expenses of the organization within the meaning of the United Nations Charter, which makes members who are delinquent in their payments of such expenses subject to the loss of votes, and that Congress anticipates prompt payment of arrearages.

In considering this bill, every Member of this House should bear in mind three very fundamental facts:

First, unless the United Nations is able to obtain a substantial loan within the next few weeks, the United Nations will have to pull its forces out of the Congo. That is a fact. Every one of us has to form his own judgment as to what the consequences of this fact would be. The big question is: If the United Nations forces leave, who will take their place?

The second fundamental fact is that the United Nations cannot be reorganized so as to correct its basic weaknesses under the charter in the foreseeable future. This is a fact. The Russians through the use of the veto can prevent any amendment of the United Nations Charter.

I am aware that there are many who are dissatisfied with the record of the United Nations to date and who feel that the financial crisis which the United Nations faces at the present time should be used as a lever to insist that changes be made. There is no way that the Soviet Union can be kicked out of the United Nations under the present charter, and there is no way that the equal vote for every member can be modified.

The third fundamental fact to bear in mind is that the United Nations forces cannot be kept in the Congo by forcing all the delinquent United Nations members to pay up their arrearages. The fact is that there is no way in which the arrearages can be collected soon enough to keep the Congo operation going. There are two basic reasons for this.

First, the Soviet bloc is strongly opposed to the Congo operation and is doing everything in its power to bring it to an end. The Soviet bloc, including Cuba, owes over \$45 million. Although there is some reason to believe that the Soviet Union will pay what it owes rather than lose its vote at the United Nations, it can delay payment of its assessments for the Congo operations and maintenance of forces on the border between Israel and Egypt until 1964 before it will lose its vote.

In the case of other delinquent nations, it is expected that most of them will pay up within a reasonable time. Even in these cases, however, such payments ordinarily require parliamentary action which takes a period of months.

In view of the fact that the Soviet bloc will delay its payment as long as possible and that most other nations will require several months to vote the money to meet their arrearages, the United States has to accept the fact that the

United Nations forces cannot be maintained in the Congo through the collection of arrearages.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me make this point: The real issue confronting this House today is whether or not it is important to the security of the United States that central Africa be prevented from going Communist.

The Congo and the region adjacent to it is rich in mineral deposits of great strategic significance. It is an area of great importance to the Soviet bloc, and the forces of infiltration and subversion area ready to move in.

No one can say that if this bill is approved and the United Nations gets the money to continue its Congo operations that everything will be all right. The United Nations operations in the Congo have not been very satisfactory, and there are many serious difficulties and unsolved problems which will have to be faced. Nevertheless, I doubt if there is anyone who believes that pulling out the United Nations forces will lead to anything but chaos.

The question is not what is best for the United Nations; it is what is best for the United States. I am convinced that a careful examination of all the facts will clearly indicate that the passage of this bill is vital to the security of this country.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the consideration of the rule I listened very attentively to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. I heard the gentlewoman make a statement that Mr. Cleveland had stated that \$215 million was used out of the contingency fund in behalf of the United Nations. I think, perhaps, the Record should be clarified early in the debate. No \$215 million was used out of the contingency fund in financing any operation of the U.N. in the Congo.

Mr. Chairman, this figure of \$215 million has been kicked around Capitol Hill here for the last 6 weeks. I am going to read a very brief chronological table of the real Congo operation.

Mr. Chairman, on May 14, 1960, the mutual security authorization bill was approved by this House, Public Law 86-472. This included an authorization of \$150 million for the contingency fund.

On June 17, 1960, the mutual security appropriation bill passed the House, including the full amount authorized by the authorization bill of \$150 million for the contingency fund.

On June 30, the independence of the Congo was proclaimed, followed within a few days by widespread violence.

On July 3, Congress recessed for the Republican and the Democratic Conventions.

On July 12, the Congo requested from the United Nations, military aid, while Congress was in recess. On July 13, the Security Council of the United Nations established a United Nations force in the Congo. A summary of the various U.N. resolutions on the Congo appears in the hearings on page 391.

On August 8, 1960, the Senate reconvened and received a message from President Eisenhower, Senate Document



115, which included a request for an increase in authorization and appropriation for the Mutual Security Contingency Fund in the Congo, from \$150 million to \$250 million, even though the House had already passed the authorization and appropriation bills.

On August 15, the House reconvened and received a message from President Eisenhower, Senate Document 117, transmitting an amendment to the budget asking an additional \$100 million for the contingency fund, raising it from \$150 million to \$250 million. The bill passed the Senate with the full amount of \$250 million. It passed the House, and the final conference report carried \$250 million.

President Eisenhower then used \$36,412,833—\$15,745,211 for our assessed contribution, and \$20,667,622 was a voluntary contribution to the United Nations. That is all of the money that was used out of the contingency fund for 1960 for the military operation in the Congo.

On June 30, 1961, the fourth supplemental appropriation bill was approved, Public Law 87-74. This supplemental appropriation bill, included \$32,204,000 for the State Department as a special assessment for the Congo. It passed this House without much debate. This money did not come out of the contingency fund.

In June and July 1961 the Committee on Foreign Affairs had its hearing on the aid bill for the fiscal year 1962. This bill carried a section on international organizations authorizing \$153.5 million for that purpose. This included the children's fund, money for the Palestine refugees, and for other contributions to international organizations.

Included in the figures for 1962 were two programs, \$35 million for economic aid to the Congo and \$27 million for voluntary contributions for the military account for the Congo for 11 months from November 1, 1961, to September 30, 1962. This sum was carried in the Appropriation Act—Public Law 87-321. No money whatever came out of the contingency fund.

This was the only bill considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs which included funds programed in advance for the Congo military operation. In December 1961, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution setting forth a formula for reduction in assessments for certain of the smaller contributors to the U.N. for the period from November 1, 1961, through June 30, 1962—8 months. The second supplemental appropriation bill, 1962, approved on July 25 of this year—Public Law 87-545—carried \$25,616,000 for the U.S. assessed contributions for the Congo military account for those 8 months.

Let me make clear that every one of these bills was considered by committees of this House and the other body and then voted upon by the entire membership. They proceeded through the regular legislative process.

Let me state fully the reasons for the U.S. voluntary contributions.

The United States did not make a voluntary contribution to the United Nations to aid Albania, Cuba, or any other particular country, but to help pay some

of the expenses of the Middle East and Congo operations. We made a contribution over and above our regular assessment because the United Nations peace-keeping activities are in the U.S. interest. The present annual costs of the Middle East and Congo operations total about twice the United Nations' regular annual budget. Because these costs were so large, opposition quickly developed on the part of many member states to share the costs in the usual manner; that is, on the basis of the regular scale of assessments. The costs were just too large for the smaller members to pay.

To meet this need, the United Nations—not the United States—decided to reduce the assessments of those nations least able to pay. They worked out a formula which did this. A few nations unfriendly to the United States fell within the formula. These nations, like all the others who came under the formula, got part of the so-called benefit—that is, if continuing the Middle East and Congo operations which the Communists violently oppose, can be considered a benefit to them. They certainly do not consider it so. But the formula adopted by the United Nations assured that those nations able to pay the full amounts—nations like the U.S.S.R.—would not receive any reduction in their assessments.

But, Albania and Cuba, along with 78 other countries, did get some reduction.

The United Nations—having assessed the smaller nations the amount it was believed possible to raise at the regular rates—then appealed to the Security Council members and others able to make voluntary contributions to fill the gap and provide the resources needed to continue the Middle East and Congo operations.

The U.S. delegations to the United Nations—which, each year, have included Members of Congress—recommended that since it was in our interest to have the Middle East and Congo operations continued, we would have to pay some of the costs over and above our regular assessments if UNEF and UNOC were to be continued.

The United Nations action in voting to reduce the assessments of members less able to pay for these operations was completely in the open and recorded in their annual debates and resolutions. The United Nations resolution which set up the system was known to the member nations and available to the public. Similarly, the U.S. voluntary contributions, in response to the United Nations appeal for needed additional funds to keep these operations afloat, were presented and justified to the Congress each year, and Congress appropriated these funds for the U.S. contribution.

But more important are these two facts:

First, this system of reduced assessments ended on June 30, 1962 as the result of action taken by the General Assembly last fall. It is a thing of the past. This was long before any Member of Congress expressed opposition to the system.

Second, the \$100 million loan proposal will not provide any credits to any nation. This is the financing device which

eliminated our voluntary contribution entirely and brought our share of contributions for peace keeping down from 47.5 to 32 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In an analysis of the United Nations financial position as of December 31, 1961, there is a category headed "Pay and Allowances." Listed under this heading are 25 countries owing various amounts, adding up to \$25,976,000. My question is: Does that mean the United Nations is paying the salaries or wages, or whatever you want to call it, of the troops in the Middle East or the Congo?

Mr. MORGAN. Some of the money supplements the small salaries that these troops receive in the Congo operations.

Mr. GROSS. Did the United Nations pay for the U.S. troops in the United Nations police action in Korea in 1950 and subsequent thereto?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I think every member that had troops in the United Nations action in Korea paid their own expenses.

Mr. GROSS. Would this not be the way to take care of the troops that the United Nations now has?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman knows that the troops come from the smaller and poorer nations. The United Nations has refused to accept troops from the larger nations. There was a definite and obvious reason for that. That is the reason why they needed some assistance.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I call the attention of the gentleman to page 361 of our hearings, which has an analysis of these costs. The breakdown appears in the chart. The fact of the matter is that the participating countries that pay salaries of their troops. The UNEF fund assumes the extraordinary expenses such as air lifts and taking care of rotating contingents and rations and operational supplies services.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Is it not true, I will ask the chairman, that these troops serving in the Congo, at least in certain instances, are receiving more pay for that service than they do for normal service?

Mr. MORGAN. That is for normal service in their own country?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. I think that might be true, but I do not think it is any great amount because the pay of these troops in the Congo and in the Gaza strip, is a very modest amount.

Mr. ADAIR. But they are greater than they receive for normal service?

Mr. MORGAN. I would not know the salaries, but I do not think it is very much.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The only additional funds paid out of the UNEF fund

are those oversea differentials that the U.N. does assume up over and above the salaries that are paid by participating countries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. With reference to these countries that do make some contribution to the payment of their troops; do not they receive a setoff or credit against their assessments to the United Nations?

Mr. MORGAN. That is a very, very small amount. May I remind my colleague from Iowa that the United States is not the only country that has made a voluntary contribution to the United Nations. There have been 28 other countries that have made voluntary contributions to the United Nations—including cash contributions.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I might add the assessments are paid by various countries and the assessments are set off against extraordinary expenses.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. I have been trying to get some information, Mr. Chairman, on the amount of funds that have been transferred from the military assistance funds, obligated funds, to the U.N. Can you give me that figure during the past year, that is, fiscal year 1962.

Mr. MORGAN. So far as the fiscal year 1962 is concerned, the only transfer from military assistance was \$9.5 million for the Congo economic fund—but not for the Congo military account about which I have been talking.

Mr. YOUNGER. There were no funds transferred so far as you know? Then, can you tell me out of the President's contingent fund; how much was transferred to the U.N.?

Mr. MORGAN. That is for fiscal year 1962?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. No money was used out of the contingency fund for fiscal year 1962 for the U.N.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is the point I have been trying to get. I understand there have been tens of millions of dollars transferred.

Mr. MORGAN. I was just trying to rectify that by reading into the RECORD where the money came from for the Congo operation. I am sure, if the gentleman will read the RECORD tomorrow, and I will have this record complete, he will find that the money that has been paid into the Congo operation by the United States did not all come out of the contingency fund. The only money that came out of the contingency fund for the Congo was used by President Eisenhower in the early months of the Congo operation.

It may be well, if at this point in the discussion, I set forth some remarks I have prepared on the allegations that have been made as to \$215 million we are supposed to have given the U.N. with no public disclosure. The money was used, it is claimed, to reduce the assessments of other member nations. There

are numerous variations of these charges as to amount and purpose.

No U.S. funds—foreign aid or other—have been used to reduce assessments of other nations for the regular U.N. budget or for those of the nine specialized agencies.

There are three possible accounts to which the charges may relate.

First. United Nations Emergency Force—UNEF: This has been an assessed budget plus voluntary contributions—see hearings, page 375. From November 1956 through June 1962 the total budget for this operation was \$122,750,000. The current U.S. assessment is 32.02 percent. Our assessment plus our voluntary contributions total \$57,633,673, or 46.95 percent. Of the U.S. payments \$33,701,242 was our assessed share and \$23,932,431 was our voluntary contribution.

Following is the legislative source of the voluntary contributions of \$23,932,431:

Fiscal year 1957, Mutual Security Act, contingency fund.....	\$3,170,850
Fiscal year 1957, United States waived initial airlift.....	1,191,581
Fiscal year 1958, Mutual Security Act, special assistance.....	9,750,000
Fiscal year 1960, Mutual Security Act, special assistance.....	3,500,000
Fiscal year 1961, Mutual Security Act, special assistance.....	3,200,000
Fiscal year 1962, AID, international organizations.....	1,800,000
Fiscal year 1963, AID, international organizations.....	1,320,000
Total.....	23,932,431

During calendar years 1960, 1961, and 1962, the United Nations reduced the assessments of its members as follows: 1960, 78 states; 1961, 52 states; 1962, 85 states. The following Communist countries had their assessments reduced:

Albania.....	\$7,117
Bulgaria.....	47,576
Byelorussian S.S.R.....	46,965
Cuba.....	42,141
Czechoslovakia.....	86,934
Hungary.....	41,968
Poland.....	199,296
Rumania.....	33,974
Ukrainian S.S.R.....	179,863
Yugoslavia.....	97,533
Total.....	783,367

Second. Congo military account: This is an assessed budget plus voluntary contributions—see hearings, pages 79, 374. For the period July 1960 through June 1962—2 years—the United Nations budget for this operation was \$240 million. The U.S. assessment is 32.02 percent. Our assessments plus our voluntary contributions total \$114,489,290, or 47.70 percent. Of the U.S. payments \$73,565,272 was our assessed share and \$40,924,018 was our voluntary contribution.

Following is the legislative source of the voluntary contributions of \$40,924,018:

Fiscal year 1961:	
Mutual Security Act contingency fund.....	\$10,350,000
Mutual Security Act, contingency fund, waiver of initial airlift.....	10,317,622
Fiscal year 1962, AID, international organizations.....	20,256,396
Total.....	40,924,018

The U.N. reduced the assessments of its members as follows: July–December 1960, 52 states; January–October, 1961, 79 states; November 1961–June 1962, 78 states. These Communist states have had their assessments reduced as a result of our voluntary contributions:

Albania.....	\$57,299
Bulgaria.....	254,795
Hungary.....	332,837
Poland.....	1,190,554
Cuba.....	338,918
Yugoslavia.....	520,565
Total.....	2,694,968

Third. Congo economic program. The United States and other countries have given economic assistance to the Congo in the form of cash and commodities. Unlike the military program which combines assessments and voluntary contributions, all economic aid to the Congo is voluntary. Some of it is given directly to the Congo; some of it is channeled through the U.N. Thus there is no regular assessment scale for the economic program since it is entirely voluntary.

For the period July 1960 through June 1962 our economic aid for the Congo through the U.N. has amounted to \$98,271,953. Of this sum \$70,950,000 has come from our foreign aid funds, of which \$28,512,023 was from the contingency fund; \$27,321,953 has been in the form of surplus agricultural products under the food-for-peace program. We have also had small bilateral development grant programs and provided surplus food for distribution by private voluntary agencies. These two programs have amounted to \$8,996,000.

The pattern of financing both UNEF and the Congo military operation has been the same. The initial costs were met from the contingency fund for a valid reason—these were unforeseen and sudden developments. That is the purpose of the fund. When it was evident that these programs were to be continued, they were financed from two sources—appropriated funds for the Department of State for our assessed share and foreign aid funds for our voluntary contributions. The State Department appropriation bills are carefully scrutinized by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses.

In the case of foreign-aid funds four committees pass on them—the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations followed by the Appropriations Committees. Each of these not only inquires into what it is planned to do with the money for the next fiscal year but also examines what was done with money in the previous fiscal year. Thus there is no basis for the charge that these funds were handled in secrecy or without congressional knowledge.

As to the alleged \$215 million we used to cover the share owed by others, I have given in detail the amounts and the source of funds for each of the programs. I cannot determine by what arithmetical process the sum of \$215 million was reached. Our total contributions, assessed and voluntary, for these two operations have amounted to \$172,122,963 of which \$64,856,449 has been in



the form of voluntary contributions. The balance of \$107,266,514 represents our assessed share of the costs of these two operations. There were no other operations financed through the U.N. for which there were reductions or credits. As for the contingency fund, it has been the source of \$39,583,683 of our total payments. Of this latter amount \$23,838,472 has been used for voluntary payments that have had the effect of reducing the assessments of some countries.

Mr. YOUNGER. If the gentleman will yield for one further question, while the gentleman is furnishing these figures, and I am sincere and I am trying to get some information on this point, there are a lot of funds that have been transferred, but did the U.N. borrow money from the trust funds?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, the U.N. has borrowed from the Special Fund and from the Children's Fund.

Mr. YOUNGER. How much?

Mr. MORGAN. They borrowed some money to operate for short periods to pay some pressing bills. They borrowed \$10 million from the Children's Fund for a few months and have repaid it. The small amounts borrowed from the Special Fund have also been repaid.

Mr. YOUNGER. Can the gentleman get that information so that we can have it during debate?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. YOUNGER. Has that money been paid back to the trust fund?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, I believe it has.

Mr. YOUNGER. Can the gentleman verify that in the report?

Mr. MORGAN. I will.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. In reply to the gentleman's question, there were no funds used out of the contingency fund for the year 1962 for the Congo operation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. But there was money taken from the United Nations Children's Fund which is known as UNICEF?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, a small amount of money was.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that \$10 million is a small amount of money?

Mr. MORGAN. In comparison with other amounts involved and taking the thing in balance—I think it was.

Mr. GROSS. I see. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. When Adlai Stevenson was before your committee he said the bond issue would presumably carry it for a year and a half. A year and a half from when to when?

Mr. MORGAN. June 30, 1962, to December 31, 1963.

Mr. GROSS. I doubt that it is going to last a year and a half.

Mr. MORGAN. It all depends on how rapidly the money is spent.

Mr. GROSS. The crisis has been going on since last December.

Mr. MORGAN. The crisis has been going on longer than that. This financial crisis really started in 1957.

Mr. GROSS. Where has the United Nations been getting the money to operate?

Mr. MORGAN. It has simply delayed paying many of its bills. There was a small deficit starting with the Israeli-Egyptian operation in 1957. It has gradually increased until in 1960 it was about \$87 million. By 1961, it was \$107 million. So this did not occur in the last year or year and a half; it has been building up since 1957.

Mr. GROSS. But the situation was desperate as of last December, and the President said it was desperate in January. A crisis existed in January he said, yet this is September 13.

Mr. MORGAN. A financial resolution was passed by the General Assembly to carry the U.N. through June 30, 1962.

Mr. GROSS. What is the permanent solution, if I may ask the gentleman? This question was asked repeatedly in the committee and there is no answer to it. What is to be the permanent solution of this financial need in the United Nations?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course we are optimistic that the Congo situation will be resolved and that there is not going to be a continuation of this type of operation.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. LATTA. I want to thank the gentleman for clearing up several points

as to whether or not this was paid out of contingent funds or regular appropriations by the Congress, but there is a point that has not been cleared up to my satisfaction. It relates to the statement made by the gentlewoman from New York that we are paying arrearages of other countries, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Cuba, for instances. If this is true will the gentleman insert in the RECORD the amounts involved?

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that the United Nations in 1960 and in 1961 adopted a resolution under which it provided reductions to nations less able to pay.

This method was terminated by action of the General Assembly to be effective July 1, 1962. But there are certain countries that did receive reductions under this. Albania, for instance, during the period November 1961 through June 1962 received \$25,600; Bulgaria \$128,000; the total reductions of Communist countries in that period amounted to \$1,049,000. Now, we made a voluntary contribution.

Mr. LATTA. You say "we," meaning the United States?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. This was on a voluntary basis. These few Communist countries did receive some small amount of reduction in their special assessments to the U.N.

Mr. LATTA. And the gentleman is furnishing the names?

Mr. MORGAN. I will put the names in the RECORD now. They will be mentioned probably time and time again during the debate on this bill. They are as follows:

*Reductions in assessments of Communist countries for Congo military account*

	1960 (July to December)	1961 (January to October)	1962 (November 1961 to June 1962)	Total
Albania.....		\$31,600	\$25,600	\$57,200
Bulgaria.....		128,795	128,000	256,795
Byelorussian S.S.R.....				
Czechoslovakia.....				
Hungary.....		332,887		332,887
Poland.....		678,554	512,000	1,190,554
Rumania.....				
Ukrainian S.S.R.....				
U.S.S.R.....				
Cuba.....		198,118	140,800	338,918
Yugoslavia.....		277,365	243,200	520,565
Total.....		1,645,368	1,049,600	2,694,968
U.S. voluntary contribution.....	\$3,900,000	15,305,596	11,400,800	130,606,396

<sup>1</sup> Waiver of airlift of \$10,317,622 not included. Adding that item increases U.S. voluntary contribution to \$40,924,018.

Mr. LATTA. Another point I wish the gentleman would comment on, if he will yield further, is whether or not these countries debts were forgiven.

Mr. MORGAN. No debts are forgiven for any country.

Mr. LATTA. The payments were made by the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. This was a small amount.

Mr. LATTA. About how much in dollars and cents?

Mr. MORGAN. A very, very small amount. As I read it here for the five countries it was a little over a million dollars for 8 months. No big Communist countries got any relief.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, before I say anything else, I would like to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], for his sincere effort on behalf of a real study of this bill and his great courtesy to those of us who do not sit on the same side of the table as he does.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings which he chaired on this bill are a mine of information. The questions that he put to the witnesses sought to explore all avenues and alternatives. We held all of

our hearings in open session so that the printed volume does not contain the usual security deletions. For the chairman's patience and fairness we on this side are grateful. It is typical of the nonpartisan approach that all of us had toward this difficult issue.

The bill before the committee is a simple one designed for a single purpose. Unlike many measures debated by this committee the bill is in nontechnical language. Its objective is to make available through loans to the United Nations not more than \$100 million. The pace of our loans is geared directly to the loans made available by other nations to the United Nations.

The reasons underlying the financial plight of the United Nations need no lengthy recitation. The Organization has undertaken to engage in two critical peacekeeping operations—one in the Middle East and the other in the Congo. Both of these operations were voted by the United Nations.

But between the authority to vote for a particular course of action and the responsibility to support such action there is a wide gap. The most tangible evidence of this gap is the failure of some 70 nations to pay their assessments for one or more of the several accounts of the United Nations. This failure arises from a variety of reasons ranging from an inability to pay to an outright refusal to pay.

The United Nations has sought a clarification of the financial responsibility of the members by seeking from the World Court an advisory opinion as to the liability of members for the two special assessments for the Middle East and for the Congo. That opinion has now been rendered. It is clear that the assessments for these two special accounts are part of the expenses of the United Nations as much as is the regular budget.

I think you all know by this time that there will be an amendment submitted to make this obligatory before we will do anything.

I cite these few facts briefly to point up the burden that is now placed upon all member states—not just the United States and a few others—to face up to what they must consider at the next meeting of the General Assembly. Two related issues emerge. First, the United Nations must live within its income, the principal source of which is the payment of assessments by its members. In the future they must give thought to the cost of operations before they initiate them. Second, the hearings before our committee show the need for a major overhaul of the budgetary and administrative procedures of the United Nations. From my own observations as a former delegate I am struck by the growing duplication of functions that engage the attention of international organizations. Part of the problem of costs is related to the ease and enthusiasm with which the United Nations and its specialized agencies have embarked upon new programs without careful preliminary planning and competent management.

But the gap between authority and responsibility is more than a financial one. It is in a sense a moral gap that

has been broadened through the evolution of the organs of the United Nations. The two-thirds majority by which important decisions of the General Assembly are made would not be so serious a cause of complaint if those who made such decisions were willing to assume the responsibility for their vigorous execution. The desire of states seeking admission to the United Nations has not been accompanied by a comparable desire or willingness to participate in the carrying out of United Nations decisions.

We had a great many interesting people appear as witnesses, among them Assistant Secretary of State George Ball, who was asked a few questions and answered somewhat in this fashion: "They believe that as soon as this money is made available and the United Nations is able to resume operations, there are plans to go ahead, not to keep the peace, but to resume the war."

That is one of the great criticisms of this bond issue, and it is one of the criticisms of the United Nations. All of us must really know something about this matter before we cast our vote.

I hope those of you who were not present yesterday afternoon will read the address of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce], who gave us an exhaustive picture of the things he has found in his research. I hope you will read at least most of that, if not all of it, and I hope also that you will see to it that everyone you know reads it also.

We have been given by Mr. Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, this statement:

I can give you a categorical assurance as far as U.S. policy is concerned and as far as what I know of the intentions of the U.N. administrators in the matter, that this money will not be used for what you have called making war on Katanga.

I think all of us on the committee have had people come in from Katanga who have given us the horrible details as to what was done by the United Nations troops. I think we have all been deeply troubled about it, and felt that things of that kind should not and could not any longer be permitted. I know my office has been a good channel through which much of this information has come. I am not of the opinion that if this bond issue does not go through it will destroy the United Nations. I think it is too strong a force in the world to have that happen. But I must admit I am deeply troubled over this attitude that there is the possibility of a concerted effort on the part of those who are in control of some of the actions or some of the activities in Katanga that they are determined to take over entirely, and that will mean war.

Mr. Chairman, this morning there was in the New York papers a very disconcerting and disheartening article to the effect that "Tshombe says killing two soldiers destroys faith in Thant's unity plan." He said "I do not believe in U Thant's good faith any longer, nor in the Western nations who guaranteed U Thant's plan," which includes under it "the Acting Secretary General's plan to unify the Congo which provides for

an equal sharing of Katanga's income from rich mineral resources with the Central Government at Léopoldville and integration of the armed forces, among other things."

Mr. Chairman, I think if we will look back in history we will find they never had 50 percent. They had 40 percent at the outside. So, this is a catastrophic moment in his attitude toward what he believes will be done to him and his people. He is going to fight it in some way.

The Security Council has not become a focus for reconciling the fundamental and divisive issues that produce current international tensions. If anything, it has only magnified them. Through the operation of the veto it has lost its capacity to handle the most basic problems of the cold war. Its default has shifted the focus to the General Assembly whose constitutional limitations are conducive to those who seek publicity and who substitute propaganda for accomplishments. It is understandably confusing and frustrating to our citizens when they hear individuals in high office tell us that our position has been supported by heavy majorities on the issues voted by the General Assembly—yet whose statements on specific problems of foreign policy show increased difficulties in our foreign affairs. Clearly there is an air of unreality about the whole process.

These are large and fundamental considerations that should concern every one of us who seeks a world of peace and order. They are proper subjects for discussion not only at the level of governments but among the peoples of the world. But they should not detract us from the subject at hand. For without a solution to the immediate financial dilemma of the United Nations there will be little need for us to seek its improvement.

In his testimony before our committee one of the most dedicated and respected men in public life, Hon. John J. McCloy, put the issue in its proper perspective. He said:

I do not wonder that there is both dissatisfaction and concern over the role of the United Nations, but I do wonder that anyone can seriously think that we would be better off without it, or that it is not deeply in the interests of the United States to support and maintain it. It is far from a perfect instrument, and it has not followed the course that those of us who were at San Francisco when the charter was drawn up thought and hoped it would, but it has performed some deeply significant services in the cause of peace, and any thought of permitting it to collapse at this moment or of failing to do anything within reason to maintain its vigor seems to me to be completely out of the question so far as the interests of the United States are concerned.

Situations incipient with great hazards have been tamped down to much less dangerous, even if painful, balance, due in large part to United Nations action. Not only was a major war averted, but, I believe, in retrospect, we can say with certainty that in the process the interests of the free world were successfully maintained. Largely because of the United Nations action in the Congo the Soviets have not found it as simple as they thought it was going to be to take over



Africa, as the independence movement took effect on that continent.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has voted for our defense programs, for our space efforts, and for foreign assistance. Each of these programs involves billions of dollars. It is no argument for this bill to say that it is at most only \$100 million. None of us has a mandate to waste a single tax dollar. The single issue is whether this bill in some small measure will contribute to international peace and security. There are not many avenues for peace open to this disturbed world. The United Nations with all its imperfections is one. I cannot feel that this is the occasion to throw any roadblocks across one of the few remaining avenues to peace.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS].

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, for some reason which escapes me, the financial crisis at the U.N. has been treated in certain quarters as a deep mystery. There is nothing mysterious or particularly difficult about it. It is inherently no more complex than the financial crisis which strikes individuals, business firms, and governments from time to time.

For a decade and a half the United Nations has been meeting its expenses on a pay-as-you-go basis, paying current bills from current revenues obtained from annual assessments upon its members, levied on the basis of ability to pay. Like all well-managed organizations, it kept a reasonable kitty in a working capital fund. The U.N. began with one debt—the \$65 million it borrowed from the United States to pay for its headquarters building on the East River. Installments have been paid promptly as they fell due.

But in 1956 and in 1960 the U.N. was called upon for emergency operations in the Middle East and the Congo which could not have been foreseen and which therefore were not provided for in the budget. Extra assessments were drawn up and voted to cover these expenses. Some members have been slow to pay up on these accounts. Much more seriously, other members have refused to pay on the alleged ground that such assessments are not mandatory. Meanwhile, the costs continue. What would anyone do under these circumstances.

First, you would try to collect what you are owed. This is being done. In the past 9 months no less than 55 countries have made some payments on their overdue accounts and all delinquents are now being dunned by the Secretariat.

Second, you would take your case to court against those who claim they are not required to pay. This has been done; the International Court of Justice has now ruled that peacekeeping assessments are binding on all members.

Next, you would borrow the money you need to clean up your debts, tide you over, and finance your operations until you can get back on a pay-as-you-go basis. You would borrow the money at the best interest rate you can get and spread out the repayments over a long enough period of time so you are sure to be able to meet the payments.

The U.N. figures—and the estimate has not been seriously challenged—that it needs \$200 million to do this. It offers to pay 2 percent interest, which is not high but which is comparable to the rate on many kinds of international loans made for the purpose of helping nations get on their feet. It offers to repay over 25 years which it can afford to do. The installments will be raised by assessments against all members as part of the regular budget—the mandatory nature of which has never been questioned. And as evidence of the indebtedness the U.N. gives those creditors who want them certificates in the form of bonds.

That is all there is to it. It is a pattern of financing used by individuals, by families, by business firms, by governments every day in the week.

But just because it is the U.N.—and particularly because the evidence of indebtedness is called a bond rather than an I O U or something else—the U.N. refinancing plan seems to have provoked confusion and consternation, even among well-informed people. Curiously enough many other countries do not seem to have such trouble. Almost 50 other nations already have come along and agreed to lend money to the U.N. on these terms.

But because some confusion still persists, let me say again what already has been said about the use of the money. If the U.N. succeeds in collecting most arrearages—with the help of the International Court decision and a vigorous collection drive—then the \$200 million for the bond issue would cover the cost of the Middle East and Congo operations at their present level well into 1963. We will not have to pay any assessments on voluntary contributions until then. If some members remain in default on their payments, some of the bond money may have to be used to pay some of the bills and there will be that much less for future peacekeeping expenses. But if members remain in arrears for a full 2 years, they will face the loss of their right to vote. In the case of the Soviet Union—which is the largest delinquent—it would lose its vote in 1964.

The U.N. financing plan—like any other financing plan—may be subject to confusion by people who want to confuse it. But basically it is a question of a sensible plan for furthering the national interest of the United States.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to pay tribute to our able chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for the way he conducted the hearings on this important piece of legislation, with fairness to both sides and making sure that all the witnesses who wanted to testify had an opportunity to give their viewpoints.

Mr. Chairman, far too many words have been heard on this subject of whether the United States should purchase United Nations bonds and have been spoken on the basis of preconceived notions.

Some of my colleagues take the view that anything connected with the

United Nations is automatically bad, that the U.N. is a destructive force which can only lead to the loss of our freedom, to the end of democracy, to the end of the civilized world as we know it.

Just as vehemently, others of my colleagues seem to take the path which states that anything connected with the United Nations is automatically correct and proper and in the best interests of freedom and peace, and therefore to be supported no matter what the cost nor what the conditions.

If the gentlemen on both sides of this issue will excuse me, frankly I cannot go along with either of these extremes.

Now, I come from a State which is famous for the manufacture of automobiles. We make millions of cars, trucks, and buses.

Every year some 30,000 Americans die in automobile accidents. Hundreds of thousands suffer serious or permanent injury. Millions of dollars worth of property damage are done in these accidents. Literally hundreds die on every holiday weekend in terrible crashes, bloody wreckage in a tangle of tormented bodies and twisted limbs.

Yet, I hear no voices raised in Congress to outlaw the automobile, to abandon it as a means of locomotion.

Why? I think there are two basic reasons. The first is because we realize that despite the horrible death toll the automobile takes on our land each year, the automobile still does a lot of good. It frees us and makes us mobile rather than tying us to where we live or work. It is a vital factor in our freedom.

The second reason is because we realize that while the automobile may kill thousands each year, it really is not the automobile's fault. The blame lies on the man who is in the driver's seat. He is the one who is to blame. It is his carelessness which can lead to death and destruction.

The automobile is neutral. It is a vehicle, a means of getting where we want to go.

In the same way, I would like to point out the United Nations is neither a killer nor a saint. It is simply a vehicle, a means of locomotion, a way to go where we want to go.

Our path, our course of travel through the treacherous and certainly, complicated and frustrating field of international politics is determined by the driver. Whether we reach the end of the road safely and at our destination depends upon his ability, his comprehension, and his judgment.

In our Nation, one of the principal vehicles of our foreign policy is the United Nations. Steering our foreign policy is our President, our State Department, and our U.N. delegation.

To a greater extent than many of us realize, the way in which the administration turns the wheel is the direction in which the United Nations moves.

On vote after vote, on issue after issue, the United Nations has voted the same way as the United States.

Now, on a number of issues, such as the Congo, I have disagreed vehemently with the direction in which the driver was pointing this vehicle.

But I did not make the mistake of blaming the vehicle for these shortcomings. I placed the blame where it belonged—and that is squarely on the backs of this administration.

Now, there is much talk along the lines of getting the United States out of the United Nations. This, to me, would be somewhat comparable to the early days of the automobile when the cry went out to "get a horse" whenever an auto suffered temporary mishap.

We are going to have mishaps in the U.N. We are going to have crises. We are going to see mistakes made.

But I am convinced that the United Nations we have so far seen on the horizon in this imperfect world, can help us reach our ultimate goals of peace, justice, and freedom for mankind.

The U.N. is not perfect, but then what is?

The U.N. makes mistakes, but then who does not?

The U.N. is sometimes slow and hesitant in its actions, but it is moving in the direction of freedom—and for that we can be thankful.

One of the major objectives has been accomplished by the United Nations, and that objective is relative peace.

We are living next door to a powder-keg, we all realize, but it has not gone off yet, thanks largely to this vehicle, the United Nations, which has managed to keep relative order in a world undergoing a tremendous revolution.

I think we owe it to ourselves, our Nation, and our future generations to support this vehicle, to keep it rolling toward peace, to keep its members talking, debating, instead of shooting at each other.

We have come close to war many times in these past few years, right to the very edge. But we have not wandered over.

Today, we are being asked to advance some payments to the U.N., and I think we should do so.

I think the confidence we express in the U.N., in our own ideals and goals which are a part of the U.N., will have a great bearing on whether the United Nations is to continue as a meaningful organization or whether it is to stall and die, and our hopes with it. We know that one of the grand designs of Lenin was to build a Union of Russia and the Asiatic nations against the free world. We know without a doubt that one of the main reasons for failure of Lenin's objectives was because of the United Nations.

So far, 50 nations have pledged or purchased a total of \$73,500,000 in United Nations bonds. To those who think that the United Nations is a tool of the Communists, I think it wise to read the list of those who have already contributed more than \$27 million for these bonds. They are: Australia, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, and Vietnam.

I think all of you will agree this certainly does not read like the list of the 19 most popular on the Communist hit parade.

I would like to conclude by saying I think this is one of the most important pieces of legislation we have had before the Congress in the past 2 years and I certainly would urge a favorable vote.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill before the House to authorize a \$100 million loan to the United Nations Organization.

Because there is very little I can add to the eloquent remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and to the very comprehensive report submitted on this legislation by the committee, I shall be very brief. Both the report and the chairman's presentation have dealt at length with the reasons for the enactment of this bill.

We all know what is involved in this bill. The loan it proposes to authorize is needed to finance the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations in the Middle East and in the Congo for the period which began on July 1 of this year.

No other funds are available to the United Nations for this purpose. Without this loan the United Nations will be compelled to resort to one of two alternatives: Terminate its efforts to preserve peace; or seek an alternative method, some new way of financing its peacekeeping operations.

Both of these alternatives are certainly undesirable. The first alternative will undoubtedly lead to chaos, bloodshed, and very probably the establishment of a Communist power center in the heart of Africa. The other will result in loss of precious time, time desperately needed for the consideration of the long-term problems confronting the United Nations, and can lead to a state of indecision which may permanently cripple the usefulness of that Organization.

Mr. Chairman, I must confess that even during the hearings, I did have reservations about this legislation, particularly when we learned that our voluntary contributions, which were intended to give help to small countries, also accrued to the benefit of certain Communist countries. But after a careful study and continued hearings I came to the conclusion that this legislation was absolutely necessary in our national interest and necessary in order that the United Nations might carry out its obligation, and carry out its decisions, for the maintenance of peace.

It seems to me, therefore, that the choice before us is clear: If we believe that the United Nations Organization serves a useful purpose, if we believe that the Communist conspiracy must be defeated, then we should and must vote for this bill.

I do not like some of the things about the United Nations. In the report issued to the Congress and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, after serving as U.S. delegates to the 14th General Assembly, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and I offered a number of criti-

cisms of the United Nations. We criticized the method it has used to finance its peacekeeping operations in the past. But in spite of these criticisms, I sincerely believe that the enactment of the legislation before us today is in the interest of the American taxpayer and of the cause of peace and freedom in the world.

Let us not forget that with all its weaknesses, the United Nations Organization has contributed more to the cause of freedom and peace in the world than any other international organization in the history of man. In some instances it has assumed the peacekeeping responsibilities which have traditionally rested on the shoulders of the big powers. Through the United Nations these responsibilities have been shared with the smaller, weaker countries of the free world, bringing those smaller countries into a meaningful partnership for the maintenance of peace in the world.

In the Middle East and in the Congo and in the other areas, the soldiers of those smaller countries, members of the United Nations, have worked to preserve peace at the peril, and even at the cost, of their lives.

This is an innovation and an advance toward the maintenance of peace which has no parallel in modern history.

But we cannot shift the entire burden of the peacekeeping operations upon the smaller nations. We must contribute our share, and sometimes more than our share, to this important task. Through the enactment of the bill before us we will be doing just that. We will be contributing our money instead of our soldiers to the United Nations peacekeeping operations in the Congo and in the Middle East.

I believe that this is the crux of the issue before us; and that the American people, having considered the facts brought out here today, would have but one mandate for this: enact this legislation and make it possible for the United Nations to continue to serve the cause of peace in the world.

To sum up, Mr. Chairman:

As reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill before us guarantees the repayment of the loan and distributes the burden of financing the United Nations peacekeeping operations among all United Nations members and on the basis of the regular scale of assessments of the U.N.

It further specifies that the enactment of this legislation shall not constitute a precedent, and it prohibits the use of loan proceeds to reduce the assessment, or the payment of the arrears, of any member nation of the United Nations.

I proposed the latter amendment in the committee, and I believe it improves the bill.

Finally, the bill before the House urges the United Nations to work out a better, permanent method for financing its special operations. There was some question as to whether the bill before us was intended to provide a permanent solution to the U.N.'s financial problems. It is not and it was never intended as a permanent solution. It is simply a stopgap measure, and we of the committee have urged the executive branch



to bear down upon the United Nations membership to seek a permanent solution. I am hopeful that this will be accomplished during the forthcoming 17th Assembly.

In the meantime, it is very necessary that we pass this stopgap legislation which will improve the financial situation of the United Nations. Considering these facts, I believe the legislation before us constitutes a necessary, sound investment for the maintenance of peace in the world. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge its enactment.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. In paragraph 3 of the report the statement is made that our share of U.N. costs will be reduced from 47 percent to 32.2 percent by this bill if adopted. I do not understand that, and I would appreciate it if the gentleman would explain it to me.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will be very happy to.

The United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East and the Congo operation were financed by special assessments on the membership of the United Nations, and by voluntary contributions.

The United States met its assessment and then made voluntary contributions to the financing of these special operations. This brought the U.S. share to 47½ percent of the cost of these operations. If we pass this legislation UNEF and the Congo operations will be financed out of the proceeds of the U.N. bond issue. This will bring the contribution of the United States in line with our regular U.N. assessment of 32.2 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman the same question that I addressed to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. The question was asked repeatedly in your hearings, I would say again, and may I ask the gentleman this: Is this a permanent solution to the financial problems of the United Nations and, if not, what is the permanent solution to it?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I must advise the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] that in my remarks I already stated this was never intended to be a permanent solution. This is a stopgap measure. We hope a permanent solution will be found. I believe that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice will certainly contribute to the arrival at a permanent solution. The real solution, I might say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, is world peace. If we did not have trouble in the Congo, if we did not have trouble in the Middle East, the U.N. would not be facing financial crisis. Peace in my opinion is the principal solution.

But since the world is not at peace, and in order to meet current and prospective financial obligations of the United Nations, we have insisted that the executive branch pressure the mem-

bership of the United Nations to find a permanent solution to the financing of special peacekeeping operations. As I said earlier, I am confident that the U.N. will come up with a permanent solution.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman spoke about the International Court of Justice. I assume the gentleman would have no objection to an amendment to this bill to make mandatory the verdict of the International Court of Justice?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In my humble opinion the Congress of the United States cannot impose mandatory obligations upon the United Nations. I do not believe that this is the proper place to legislate on that subject.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman agree we could make conditional our further financing of the United Nations in this respect, contingent upon a mandatory application of the verdict of the International Court of Justice?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In my humble opinion, this will hurt the possibility of getting the two-thirds vote necessary for the acceptance of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. Some of the smaller nations would feel that we were dictating to them and they would resent it, just as much as some of us would resent it if some other legislative body told us what to do.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, they are dictating to us now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, my remarks today may not seem to be entirely pertinent to this bill, but they are relevant indeed to a discussion of the United Nations. I had the good fortune, with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], to serve last year as a delegate representing the membership of this House in the 16th General Assembly of the United Nations. We went to New York as delegates on September 19, and served there until the end of December 1961, when we returned to our legislative duties.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to report briefly on that service, because today in conversation in the cloakrooms and in the Halls of Congress and particularly on the floor, I have had Member after Member come to me and say "I assume that you and the gentleman from Texas agreed to this bond proposal to finance the United Nations." Let there be any misunderstanding, I think that the House is entitled to know that we were told then of this plan, but did not give approval. I would prefer that the gentleman from Texas give his own testimony, if he so desires; but I do not think that he would object to my saying that we were told of the plan, that it was described to us in detail, and that we showed from the beginning not only reluctance to leap at the suggestion for so financing the United Nations, but skepticism not as regards whether financing was necessary, but as to whether

this was the best method, a good method, or for that matter a method that would be acceptable to the Congress. I am referring, of course, to the proposal that the United States purchase \$100 million worth of the \$200 million bond issue.

Despite our expressed hesitation, or in fact, our serious objection to the proposal, the executive branch thought it wise to bring the matter to the Congress as, of course, it had the unquestioned right to do.

Mr. Chairman, I would speak for myself; but again I am sure that my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], who prepared the report on our service to the United Nations with me, would agree to what I am saying.

Our objections, I repeat, were based first of all on the fact that we did not think that any declaration that the Congress did not mean to establish a precedent in voting to take up a share of such bond issue would prevent the establishment of such a precedent. We are old enough hands at the legislative process to know that when an act is first taken it is ipso facto the first step toward establishing a precedent.

We felt, moreover, that there were other objections. I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, whether either the executive branch or the delegation to the United Nations has the constitutional right to make even a conditional pledge that the United States will give or loan any amount of moneys in advance of congressional sanction. Also, I personally felt that one of the reasons that we have lost influence at the United Nations is that we have repeatedly, consistently, and willingly taken so much more than our share, that we have gained from those to whom we show such generosity, not necessarily gratitude, but a certain amount of skepticism on their part, first as to our good judgment in managing our own finances and, secondly, as to our motives. Foreign delegates expressed to me more than once the fear that our overgenerosity might be due to our desire to make the United Nations "the creature of the U.S. will."

I think that we owe a duty to this Congress to put before you, in addition, the background of our reactions and conclusions regarding the United Nations, on which our disapproval of this proposal was further based. I shall, therefore, ask permission when we go back into the House to insert at this point certain relevant portions of our report so that you may see how we came to the realization that whereas a financial crisis certainly existed, the suggested infusion was not an answer to the basic need of the United Nations and was certainly not even the right financial answer.

#### VIEWS ON U.S. MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS

(Report by Hon. OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, and Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, of Illinois, members of the U.S. delegation to the 16th session of the General Assembly, September 19 to December 22, 1961)

(87th Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 1942, appendixes omitted)

#### I. GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

The 16th session of the General Assembly has perhaps been as turbulent as any in its history. More imponderables surround the

operations of the United Nations than have ever before been encountered. One may say that this is a natural result of the increase in membership to more than twice its original size and of the additional fact that many emerging nations recently admitted have had no previous experience in association with other nations. These new nations have brought with them certain historical prejudices and points of bias which at times appear to be obsessions.

This is particularly true regarding the attitude of the new African states toward "colonialism." Their animosity toward colonialism is always their first consideration and is understandable by reason of their experience with it. It remains, however, a psychological barrier to them in making decisions on other issues of wide and fundamental importance. To a lesser degree the same is true of many of the Asian nations.

"Colonialism" and "imperialism," terms used interchangeably and indiscriminately, were injected into almost every issue. The historic colonial powers of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Portugal were the targets of condemnation. By a liberal application of the concept of "guilt by association," other nations, including the United States, were similarly condemned.

The situation existing between the Arab nations and Israel, and all the prejudices involved, cannot be ignored.

An additional readily recognized misconception must be noted. The terms "neutral" or "uncommitted" nations are, in many respects, misnomers. We observed that some have a strange conception of the meaning. They believe that neutrality is a position exactly halfway between two sides in disagreement, regardless of where the two sides actually stand. The position of the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations is determined by the position on any matter taken by the Western nations and the Soviet bloc.

The preponderance of logic leads us to the conclusion that neutrality means independent judgment and freedom of choice. We often observed in the General Assembly that neutrality amounted to indifference as between right and wrong.

U.S. foreign policy in the United Nations, as well as outside, should make a greater differentiation between those nations friendly to our viewpoint as opposed to those that are not. There is implied no suggestion that we hold out a threat, attempt to dominate, to dictate, or to impose any degree of will upon any nation in return for any commitment. Rather it is well for us to distinguish our friends from those who contribute nothing to us in the cold war, yet to whose reaction we show too much sensitivity. These latter have no inhibitions about attacking the United States and impugning its motives.

It is trite to say that with authority and power should go commensurate responsibility. It is our opinion, based on observation, that by reason of bias and prejudice a considerable number of the member nations of the United Nations do not exercise the degree of responsibility called for in the world organization. As a further speculation on the future of the United Nations, we can only hope that, after the newer nations have had more experience in the international arena, their sense of responsibility will increase. If they are able to "talk out" the subjects which possess them, they may be more aware of, and responsive to, issues vital to their survival. A number of the delegations from these nations should be reminded that their countries need the United Nations more than does the United States.

The question is often asked, "Has the United States lost prestige in the United Nations?" Our reply is in the negative. At the same time, it is our conclusion that we have lost influence. Why? We have lost influence because of a lack of determina-

tion to furnish needed leadership. This is not to condemn or specifically to criticize the present administration or its direction through the State Department or our officials of the U.S. mission to the United Nations. The situation stems from complexes which set in immediately after World War II, at which time it was determined that our general policy should be one of attempting to rehabilitate large areas of the world, if not to remake it in our own image. Our policy over these years has seemingly been one of placation, possibly built on complexes of a "have" nation as opposed to the "have nots." This policy has been mistaken by many as an indication of weakness rather than of a sincere desire to assist other peoples.

There are several reasons why the Soviet Union is looked to through admiring eyes by many of the weaker nations of the world. Probably the foremost reason is that the Soviet Union is not considered a colonial power in the classic sense. The fact that the Soviets have imposed their will upon contiguous territories is not a consideration in the eyes of the Afro-Asian group. Neither do the Afro-Asians call practices colonial if the imposition is by white people upon other whites but only when it is the imposition upon nonwhites. To this group colonialism is the imposition of authority by one government on peoples overseas, or the imposition of the white race on the colored race.

The second factor is that the emerging nations look toward the Soviet Union with a feeling of affinity. Looking at the Soviet Union they observe, "As we are now, so was Russia a few short years ago." The view of many of these nations has been influenced by the fact that Russia has been able to explode a large bomb, has sent a man around the earth in orbit, and has advanced militarily to the point of being a contending power in the world. The inability of these new nations to make an intelligent assessment of the realities of Russia's economy makes it impossible for them to judge that country's pretension to economic advancement. The Soviet Union generates a measure of respect among these nations because it is willing to "stand up" to the other great powers. They take this as proof of leadership, and accordingly view it with respect.

Cold fear is an additional element in their consideration. The Soviet Union applies pressures and makes full use of propaganda in attempting to win smaller and weaker nations to the Communist side. These nations know that the Soviet Union discriminates in its selection of recipients of its friendship and aid and assists those countries that favor it. Contrarily, they feel that the help of the United States will be forthcoming regardless of their policies and attitudes. In other words, they operate on the theory that they cannot lose regardless of the attitudes they assume and the policies they pursue toward the United States.

In our view, United States policy in the United Nations should not proceed from a position of pressure and fear. Neither should it be from a position of constant defensiveness, apologies, and excuses.

We became more and more convinced, during the sessions, that the policy of the United States in the United Nations and elsewhere must be to give full cooperation and assistance to those countries that in general share our common interest and that have the ability to contribute to the peace and security of the world, that is, to the interests of the United States itself.

## II. FINANCING

It was our observation, during our assignment as delegates to the United Nations, that the policy on many issues has crystallized. Commitments and obligations that have been made in previous years make easier a continuation of existing policies.

Their reappraisal in the light of new developments is not encouraged. The present operation in the Congo is an outstanding example.

We also noted a continuous expansion of activities by the United Nations through interpretations given to the broad language of its charter. In our opinion it would have been more beneficial for the organization to have proceeded at a slower pace in developing its many agencies and programs. There has been a persistent tendency for the United Nations to assume more tasks than its resources of men and money can properly support. The result has been a proliferation of the ranks of an international bureaucracy that finds endless problems to engage its attention and to assure its perpetuation. The present financial plight of the United Nations points up its most serious limitation. This in itself should impress upon our policymakers that further expansion of activities should not be supported by our Government. The organization has already undertaken too many programs that involve heavy financial commitments, the greater portion of which is expected to be, and probably will be, paid by the United States. More important, this trend, if unchecked, may result in the gradual erosion of large measures of our national sovereignty. To this we are unalterably opposed.

In this connection, we think that the United States has hurt its own position, and similarly has hurt, rather than helped, the United Nations by assuming a totally disproportionate share of the expenses. The vitality and effectiveness of the organization could be increased if it were forced to "cut the pattern to fit the cloth." It certainly would increase the degree of responsibility of other member nations if they were paying their proportionate share. It would lessen suspicion of and resentment toward the United States. A benefactor who overassumes and overpays his legitimate share invariably produces such a reaction.

Certainly we do not believe that a further unfair financial burden should be placed on our taxpayers. Nor can we fail to consider the effect on our mounting national debt.

During the period 1958, 1959, and 1960, the U.S. assessment for the regular budget of the United Nations was 32.51 percent. By resolution of the United Nations in prior years, it was decided that, in a reasonable length of time, no nation should contribute more than 30 percent to the regular budget. This year the assessment of the United States was reduced from 32.51 to 32.02 percent. This is in the direction of a constant reduction.

Programs financed by voluntary contributions have expanded rapidly, due primarily to the large measure of support by the United States. For calendar years 1958, 1959, and 1960 such programs amounted to \$102,225,000, \$103,364,000, and \$106,896,000, to which the United States contributed \$56,560,000, \$62,430,000, and \$72,330,000, respectively. In percentage terms, the U.S. share rose in the 3 years from 50 percent to almost 70 percent. Figures for 1959 and 1960 exclude our special contributions for the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) of \$3.5 and \$3.2 million, respectively, and for 1960 also exclude our voluntary contributions of \$24,518,000 to the Congo operation. The inclusion of these amounts would raise our percentages to the support of these programs financed by voluntary contributions.

Assessments are not the greatest problem. It is their collection. At the present time 61 nations have not paid all of their assessments for 1960. Seventy have not paid their assessments for 1961. This is by no means the entire story. The Soviet bloc, the Middle Eastern countries, France, Portugal, and others, have not paid anything for the operation in the Congo, while the United



States is paying a minimum of 47 percent of the military cost. Many have not only failed to pay their assessments to the United Nations budgets but have not made voluntary contributions for the support of other programs of the organization.

By a decision of the Administrative and Budgetary Committee, approved by the General Assembly, there has been submitted to the International Court of Justice the question whether the assessments levied for the United Nations Emergency Force and the Congo operation are expenses of the organization and, therefore, mandatory obligations on member states. Under the charter a member that fails to pay its complete assessment for the 2 preceding years is denied its right to vote in the General Assembly.

Article 19 of the charter reads as follows: "A Member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a Member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member."

The loss of voting rights under article 19 requires an initial determination of how much a member owes. This amount is obtained by adding up its indebtedness for all previous years. The measure of article 19, however, is what the member owes for the 2 preceding years. This latter amount is subtracted from the member's total indebtedness. If the difference equals or exceeds the assessments for the 2 preceding years, the member must pay that difference or lose its vote. The maximum amount that a member can owe before being subject to loss of its vote under the formula in article 19 is the total of assessments for the 2 preceding years. Thus the key factor is the amount of indebtedness—not the year or years in which the indebtedness was incurred. Since all members have been within the 2-year ceiling, although many owe substantial amounts under the ceiling, none has incurred the penalty provided under article 19. Whether such a penalty is automatic or must be invoked on each vote has not been determined. Legal authorities both of the United Nations and of the United States contend that it is automatic. Part of the United Nations difficulties arise from this slow process of payment. Further, the question currently before the International Court is what assessments count under article 19; i.e., only those for the regular operating budget or those for the regular operating budget plus those for UNEF and the Congo operation.

The matter of United Nations financing was extensively debated in the Administrative and Budgetary Committee for a period of more than a week. The statement of Representative BURLISON on the subject is to be found at the conclusion of this report (appendix, p. 14).

### III. CONCLUSIONS

The statesmen who drafted the United Nations Charter had a noble dream. Those who would now rely on the United Nations as a cornerstone of our foreign policy are not awake to reality. It can no longer be considered a union of "peace-loving nations," dedicated to maintaining security and order throughout the world. As a present high official in our State Department observed at a delegation meeting during our recent service as delegates to the 16th General Assembly:

"Those who believe so strongly in the United Nations must cease to look upon it as a Holy Grail, and begin to see it for what it is—the fitful arena of international politics."

The pertinent questions, therefore, are these: (1) Can the United Nations, without change in its present composition and present character, ever meet its original goal? (2) Do the policies and activities of the United Nations at this time further the best interests of the United States? (3) Does U.S. policy in regard to the United Nations strengthen our position in that body and consequently in the world? Reluctantly and regretfully, our answer to all three questions is "No."

In stating this conclusion, we do not suggest, nor do we imply, that we should withdraw from the United Nations. Neither do we mean to imply that the United Nations is altogether a failure or is about to become moribund. We simply believe that too much has been expected of the United Nations. In the very form and substance of its charter were laid the seeds of futility and eventual frustration. It has been prevented from its inception from developing as originally intended. Even though, in several instances, the United Nations has managed to prove helpful in spite of the Soviet Union's efforts to the contrary, the hostile attitude of that country effectively nullifies its potentials for development as a peacekeeping agency.

No one can serve as a delegate to the General Assembly without feeling the full impact of crosscurrents and hostility in its committees and in plenary sessions, and without being aware of the frustrations, limitations, and failures of the organization. The United Nations has achieved some significant accomplishments in spite of the crippling results of the Soviet's overindulgence in the use of its veto power in the Security Council. There is still hope that the United Nations can produce results that will merit continued support and further contributions by the United States. However, to fail to bring into focus the dangers involved in its continuation under its present form and circumstances, without hope or plan for change—and to fail to issue a caveat thereon—would be a failure of our own responsibility as congressional delegates.

It can well be seen how disorganization, failure of accomplishment on specific issues, and increasing disillusionment have gradually grown. The principal purpose of the United Nations is to maintain the peace and to restore it when broken. The founding members emphasized peace through collective security. The General Assembly, consisting of delegates from each member nation, was to be confined principally to making recommendations. The smaller Security Council was to have the real power and primary responsibility for maintaining peace. The world's major powers, the United States, China, France, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, were made permanent members in the hope that they would strive together to prevent breaches of the peace by any of the smaller states. A power of veto was given each permanent member. The founders optimistically hoped for a collectively insured peace. The least that they hoped for was the continuance of a stalemate.

Both the hopes and fears of the draftsmen have proved wrong. The Soviet Union has kept the Security Council stymied, and alternative efforts to overcome this have led to an unforeseen development of the General Assembly and of the Secretariat. The General Assembly has attempted to assume a number of the responsibilities which the Council has been unable to exercise. This has led to a considerable extension of authority to the United Nations Secretary General, who has been given the difficult task of acting as agent for the Assembly in carrying out instructions which have frequently been far from clear and so vague in specifics as to make it easy for the Soviet delegation to charge him with violation of instructions.

Almost since the United Nations Charter was approved by the founding nations, there have been demands for improvement and strengthening. They have all been without fruition. Those who talk about strengthening the United Nations frequently couple their recommendations with an insistence that the veto in the Security Council be eliminated. The United States has never used the veto, but the day may come when we will, in order to protect ourselves from an infringement on our sovereignty. Removal of the veto is not the answer. Nor is it, as a matter of reality, possible to strengthen the peacemaking capability of the United Nations as long as the Communist bloc works to impose its doctrine on the free world. In the face of the Soviet attitude, efforts to strengthen the United Nations may well seem destined to remain sterile and devoid of any chance of accomplishment.

Both Communist obstruction and the understandable passion of the African bloc of new nations to protect their "rights" and their voting power may make it impossible to achieve the necessary change in voting strength through amendment of the charter. It may be that each of the "great powers," several of which have had long experience in popular government and have generally pursued peaceful policies in the postwar period, will, during these vital years of world tension, remain limited to casting one vote, each equal, despite their disparity in influence to the one vote cast by each of the numerically small countries, as the island of Cyprus and some of the new African countries and others recently admitted to the United Nations.

In other words, the United States will remain thus in the General Assembly, despite its nearly 185 million people, entitled to cast, as now, just one vote. It has been said recently that the entire population of seven of the recently admitted countries is actually less than the population of the entire county of Los Angeles, Calif.

The United Nations began with 51 member states. It has had a mushroom-like growth and now has 104 members. Some of the new member nations are completely lacking in the experience of handling the multiple and complex problems that confront present-day governments. This situation calls into question the principle of according equal weight to the vote of each member of the General Assembly. Some of the new nations, in fact, appear to have no concept of or regard for the objectives of the organization. Others have irresponsibly used the United Nations as a sounding board against the West. We can only be conscious of the depth of misunderstanding shown in the suggestion, for instance, recently made by a new member that the United Nations conduct an inquiry into United States jurisdiction over Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

The immediate and undeniable need is for a complete review of the United Nations Charter and revisions that would reflect changes that have occurred in the world since it was originally adopted.

By way of illustration the shift of important decisionmaking from the Security Council to the General Assembly, where each member has an equal vote, points up the need to devise a change in the allocation of voting strength. Such a method should reflect the fact that responsibility for the execution of the General Assembly's decisions does not fall equally upon all members. This change is made even more necessary by the growing tendency of bloc voting on many vital issues. Such voting patterns have developed as a result of the increase in the number of new nations, particularly those enjoying geographical proximity or having an affinity in social and ideological background.

As long as the United States and its allies retain membership in the United Nations, they have a vital interest in seeing the United Nations become a more effective organization. Because of its cold war policies, the Soviet Union has an interest in and has worked toward its destruction as an effective instrument. The Soviet leaders have found the United Nations a useful propaganda forum. They have used it as a place to carry on diplomatic blackmail and intimidation. Nevertheless, even as now crippled, the United Nations presents liabilities for the Soviets which exceed any propaganda benefits that they may gain through their conduct as a member. They show their realization of this in their constant efforts to kill the United Nations in everything but name.

The spontaneous outbursts of nationalism and anticolonialism of the new members, accompanied by their unfamiliarity with parliamentary procedure, serve at times to create confusion and ill-considered action in the plenary sessions. One of the two low points in the 16th General Assembly arose from the sporadic and successful attempt led by a number of delegates from the African nations to censure the remarks of the appointed delegate from the Union of South Africa. Few present—certainly not the U.S. delegates—could approve his words. Nevertheless, the right of free speech is inherent in any gathering of "free men," and should remain a cornerstone of freedom in any parliamentary body. The U.S. delegation should always rise to defend on the floor of the General Assembly any of the basic rights on which the strength and vision of our Republic rests.

Emotional crises tend to develop quickly on the Assembly floor. To deal with them suitably and promptly the U.S. delegation should be given greater latitude for the immediate exercise of judgment within the limits of established policy.

A second instance of resistance of principle and misunderstanding of the underlying purpose of the United Nations occurred in the failure of the Security Council to take action at the time of India's unwarranted seizure of Portuguese Goa. Although the United Nations callously ignored this action by India, it did not hesitate to denounce Portugal for not following United Nations directives in its African possessions. Speaking on the Indian invasion of Goa, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson told the Security Council:

"The failure of the Security Council to call for a cease-fire tonight in these simple circumstances is a failure of the United Nations. The veto of the Soviet Union is consistent with its long role of obstruction. But I find the attitude of some other members of the Council profoundly disturbing and ominous because we have witnessed tonight an effort to rewrite the charter, to sanction the use of force in international relations when it suits one's own purposes. This approach can only lead to chaos and to the disintegration of the United Nations."

Under both Democrat and Republican administrations, it has been U.S. policy to idealize the United Nations as one of the cornerstones of our foreign policy. We have invested more than \$1 billion in the United Nations and its specialized agencies in our desire to keep it alive and nurture it in the hope that eventually its increased potentials would produce real peacemaking dividends. We have even risked the friendship of our principal allies by voting against them in the United Nations, or by failing to support them on questions which they believed to be of supreme importance. In fact—it may be added parenthetically—our policy has at times, throughout the years, appeared to be schizophrenic.

In order to protect the strength of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for in-

stance, some votes have been cast which stood, in the eyes of those countries still smarting from colonialism, in direct contradiction to our proclaimed principles of freedom and equality. On the other hand, votes cast to emphasize our strong anticolonial stand, as in the case of Angola, have angered our allies and may serve, in time, to threaten our military position. Whatever the motive for each vote, in whatever direction, the failure to adopt and express consistent U.S. policy has not strengthened our position with either side. Likewise, it has not increased the respect in which, if true to its principles, our country should be held.

All these facts lead us to reemphasize that those who would still have us rely on the United Nations as a major instrument of our foreign policy or as an agency dedicated to keeping the peace, are not awake to the facts of life as they are today and probably will be for some time to come. We should recognize the basic limitations that have now become evident as a part of the structural weaknesses of the United Nations, and limit our efforts through it accordingly.

At the same time, it is incumbent upon us equally to work for necessary changes. As stated above, revision of its charter is the principal requirement for the ultimate success and perhaps survival of the United Nations.

We would not have these comments appear to deny that most of the members of the United Nations deeply and sincerely desire the attainment of world peace. The smaller nations, especially, regard the United Nations as their best hope for remaining independent. We would reiterate also that there are definite advantages to the continuation of our own membership in that body. Aside from the continued protection of our access to the markets and raw materials of the world, on which our great industrial economy, in large part, depends and the necessity, also, for keeping open the lines of world communication and transportation around an ever-shrinking globe, the United Nations offers one unique opportunity to every member, large or small. Such opportunity offered the U.S. delegates through meetings of the Security Council and the General Assembly, to learn and assess the intentions and actions of each of the 104 members, has value for us that cannot be overemphasized. In like manner, the friendly personal contact and the opportunity to express the U.S. viewpoint is also invaluable.

For this, among other reasons, we hold without question that there is value in adhering to the established custom of having two of the five delegates appointed from the Congress, alternating each year between members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, one from each party. Such members have longstanding knowledge of and experience with the foreign affairs of this country. Their sense of perspective has been gained by membership on their respective committees, dealing with foreign policy throughout various administrations. Furthermore, they come to the United Nations with keen awareness of the feeling of the Congress on world issues and, therefore, are capable of being a link between the United Nations and the American people, whose viewpoint the Members of Congress represent. Lastly, we would suggest that there may be advantage to the country, and, indeed, to the mission itself, to have included two delegates who can make independent assessments based upon a viewpoint that mirrors that of Congress and the American people.

We lay such emphasis on this point of congressional representation because it is our understanding that consideration has been given in the executive branch to discontinue the practice of designating Members of Con-

gress as delegates to the United Nations. It is reportedly the view of some in the executive branch that Members of Congress should not be designated as voting delegates but invited as "observers." It is our view that Members of Congress, going to the United Nations in the latter status, would be well-nigh worthless. We feel strongly that the present arrangement should be continued.

Furthermore, a Member of Congress, acting as a delegate to the United Nations, has opportunity for experience which should be most helpful to the Congress in dealing with policy toward the United Nations and particularly with its financing. In addition, the presence of members of the legislative branch within the delegation of the United Nations has a leavening effect, helpful to the Executive and to the Congress. This arrangement should continue, and we so recommended to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, to the State Department, and to the President.

Two facts we cannot overemphasize: First, good manners, as well as respect for national policy and the need for coherent performance, would and should certainly preclude any outward and visible sign of independent thinking by congressional delegates; and, at the same time, it is their privilege and duty to present their point of view constantly and strongly within the confines of the delegation. Second, no words in this section or elsewhere in this report should seem to indicate, on our part, any lack of respect or gratitude for the caliber, capacity, and dedication of the delegates and staff who now serve the United States at the United Nations with skill, distinction, and well-merited honor.

It would be most helpful if the delegates of other countries to the United Nations, particularly those more recently admitted, could be given a wider knowledge of the United States and of its people. We would recommend that the State Department make definite plans for "sightseeing trips" to historic areas along the eastern coast and more extensive travel throughout various parts of our country. It is our understanding that the Canadian delegation has most successfully carried out, for some of the African countries, such visits to significant places in Canada. Even though the institution of such plans would entail considerable expenditure of time and money, the benefits would far outweigh the cost. We would help, if it were desired, to present the plan to the Congress. It is hoped that the Department of State will give consideration to this suggestion and request the necessary appropriation under terms of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

To conclude our comments on our service as delegates to the 16th session of the General Assembly, we would point out that common prudence indicates that the community of free and friendly nations should be the principal focus of our foreign policy, at the same time that the United States remains in and seeks to strengthen the position of the free world in the United Nations. In adjusting its policies to face reality, the United States should give the United Nations credit for what value it does have; direct its efforts through it when circumstances indicate such to be the best course to follow; but not attempt or expect to secure the impossible through it.

The maintenance of the strength of our allies and those who share our faith in the principles of the free world will prove, in the long run, to be an invaluable asset for the United Nations itself.

One last comment remains to be made. Over and over again we observed that other nations present expressed, as a keystone of their policy, their own self-interest. The United States could well afford, without



timidity or reticence, to lay more emphasis on its own self-interest. Much as we admire our traditional generosity and good will, we wonder whether, in a cold and hostile world atmosphere, the time has not come when in the interest of survival the United States must temper its good intent and nobility of purpose with some hard commonsense. Personally, we think so. The United States must define and defend its own self-interest. To be able to do so, it must remain defensively strong; economically and financially strong; above all, morally strong in purpose and will. In the world, as well as in the United Nations, the United States must dare to speak out with consistency and strength. It must assume leadership, not based on its might or its wealth—or its bounty—but on the endemic strength of the freedom and human dignity for which it stands.

It was significant, during our service at the United Nations, that whenever the United States did take a firm stand, as against the proposition to appoint a committee to study the question of the admission of Red China, quick support came to our side. Indecision—or, what is worse, wavering as regards what we tell the world we stand for—breeds first amazement and then disregard. To declare our stand on issues rather than to remain silent; to vote on issues rather than to "abstain"; to dare to throw "deals" and expediency to the winds and stand on principle—this may seem to be poor international politics. However, to two congressional delegates, privileged for some months to sit in the august halls of the United Nations, this suggestion has compelling challenge. It would certainly increase the respect in which other nations hold us and incidentally increase our self-respect. It would strengthen our position in the United Nations. It would go far towards strengthening our position in the world. It might, in fact, even be a primary step in saving the United Nations—and ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, my own reason for feeling still that the measure proposed in the bill under discussion is not a wise step to take is based on my conviction, now as last December, that the financial emergency should be used to force a financial revision, reappraisal, and readjustment, without which the United Nations can never progress to the full strength which I think it should and must have if it is to become the instrument for service and peace as planned in the original concept and dream.

My opposition to the bond issue or to our assumption of a disproportionate share of a loan, is not one of opposition to the United Nations; it is not one of trying to cripple the United Nations; it is rather one of trying to build needed strength into that body. My deep experience there leads me to feel that a temporary "blood transfusion" like this will only postpone the vital major operation that is demanded, if the body is to be saved.

I am aware that the World Court decision has now set a good standard. I am aware that it may be accepted by the General Assembly, and I hope it will be, although I have serious doubts following the interview of the Acting Secretary General with Mr. Khrushchev in which the latter made the statement, published last week, that the Soviet Union will not accept that court decision.

Whether the decision becomes operative or not, a major objection to the proposition is that once again the United

States is rushing in to take far more than our share, offering only temporary and expedient relief. I am merely asking that we use the emergency to force the membership of the United Nations to look on its support as a joint and equally shared responsibility.

Frankly, as to the two bills, the House bill is an improvement. It may seem a paradox that I offered in committee the only amendment to strengthen the bill. I sought, without avail, to strike out section 3 which, as it now stands, is a denial of the very respect which those who support this measure claim to have for the United Nations.

Section 3, which was obviously put into the bill to sweeten, if I may use the colloquial phrase, the House package, is a paragraph that would require the United States to hold back from its annual appropriation to the United Nations for its regular operations the amount of interest and principal due on the proposed loan.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly foremost in the ranks of those who hope a bond issue or loan will be met in full and that payments will be kept up; but I do not think that as required by the proposed provision in section 3 we have the right to insist on a step that may cripple the annual or "regular" programs of the United Nations that we are pledged to support. If we cannot give enough respect to the United Nations to expect it to meet its obligations, our estimate of that body is already sunk so low that the proposed attempt at resuscitation of its finances is futile in itself.

The advantage of the United Nations in my mind is that it offers not merely a sounding board but a listening post. It is valuable to hear what other peoples think of us. It is valuable for us to try and tell other people what we really are. I spent the major part of my time, outside of my committee, in personal conversations with the delegates. I was astonished as I went from delegation to delegation to find in that body how little they knew of what makes Americans "tick."

I want to close with one story that I have wished to tell to the Congress ever since my return.

I was having lunch one day with the chief delegate from a neutral country—a supposedly friendly neutral country. This Ambassador said, "Mrs. CHURCH, I wonder if you realize that you do not pay enough attention to the advantages under which those in Communist countries do live." This was not, I repeat, a representative of a Communist country. Well, that was a pretty poor day to make that suggestion to me. I had picked up a newspaper that morning—and found that practically the last bit of cement and the last brick had been placed in the Berlin wall. There had been a picture of an old lady who, overcome by love and loneliness, had jumped out of a high story window to try to reach her family on the Western side. I said to this Ambassador, "Well, Mr. Ambassador, it is too late in this luncheon to argue with you in detail the pros and cons of different systems, but I want to say to you, in perhaps a light way, that I am a

grandmother nine times over, and I have never yet had to jump out of a dangerously high window to see my family." What I said to him was not so important, but what he said to me, I will remember long after everything else about my service as a delegate has vanished from memory. He said, "That is the trouble with you Americans, you insist on seeing everything in terms of human values."

Well, Mr. Chairman, I was happy to say to him "I come from a civilization based on human values and we Americans mean to keep it that way."

We need to go to the United Nations and show ourselves in our true nature and not simply as overeager and overgenerous folk willing to pay anything to keep the organization going, assuming always beyond our share. Instead we should go as honest partners saying to the others, "This problem of peace is yours as much as ours. This problem of development of underdeveloped countries and peoples is as much yours as ours; this need to preserve human freedom and emphasize human values is as much yours as ours."

As stated in the report previously included, we must stay in the United Nations. We must make of it not only a listening post but a talking post. But we must change the pattern and scope of our financial participation. We should use the present crisis to force a readjustment and acceptance of their fair share of responsibility by other member nations.

If we think that any number of millions of dollars given disproportionately or that any sudden injection or any sheer stopgap measure is going to solve the true need of the United Nations, we are doing it and ourselves a disservice. I would ask that we approach this matter rationally, thoughtfully, and prayerfully because, certainly, an association as it started out to be, dedicated to the peace of the world, could be an instrument for untold good to all mankind.

It is because I deem this stopgap proposal to be, from a long-range point of view, unsound, unwise, and inadequate to meet the basic need for immediate financial revision and reorganization that I shall vote against this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the previous speaker, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. I know all of us are going to miss her when she retires this year. I want to take this opportunity to say that over the years it has been wonderful to work with her, particularly on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I know she has been sincere. She is a hard worker, and is a very wonderful colleague and I say at this time, while I have not always agreed with her on some matters, we are indeed going to miss her.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wish to apologize to the gentleman for not being able to yield to him.

Mr. COHELAN. I understand. The time was short. I thank the gentleman.

Some of the concerns expressed by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], are shared by many of us; but, we look at it in a little different way and feel that the remedy for the problem must be sought by different methods.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of this committee, but I feel very strongly about this problem and have given it a great deal of attention. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I vigorously support this proposal we are considering today—a proposal which would enable the United States to contribute, and contribute effectively, to the cause of world peace and security.

There can be little question that the United Nations is an imperfect instrument, and that at times it has caused us frustration and disappointment. A thorough charter revision is needed—a revision which will take into account the many changes that have taken place in our world, and in the organization itself since its formation in 1946—a revision which will improve its ability to fulfill its functions. I have and will continue to support such efforts.

At the same time, it must be agreed that the United Nations has achieved some very significant successes; that it has usefully served the national interests of the United States.

In Korea the U.N. enabled this country and other free nations to deal effectively with Communist aggression.

In the Middle East, following Suez, the U.N. brought a halt to war and has ever since safeguarded the armistice lines.

In the Congo the U.N. prevented large-scale civil war and a direct military confrontation of the great powers.

In addition, the United Nations has helped bring freedom to countless millions of people who had lived under colonial rule. Its health programs have stamped out malaria, sleeping sickness, and other virulent diseases from broad areas of the world. Its help-people-help-themselves technical assistance activities have provided sturdy underpinnings for raising the standard of living in underdeveloped nations. Its food and agriculture projects have saved large groups from starvation. And its International Monetary Fund has helped small governments bridge financial emergencies, thus preventing bankruptcy and anarchy.

The Soviet bloc nations have, in effect, been attempting to exercise a financial veto at the United Nations. By their indefensible delinquency in meeting their share of the special assessments they have been attempting to scuttle these and similar activities of the future.

It must be stressed, however, that this bond issue is not an effort to "bail out" nonpaying members. It is, rather, an effort to solve an immediate financial

emergency and create a reserve for future operations.

The goals of the United Nations are clearly set forth. They are the promotion of international peace and security; the prevention of war; collective action against aggression; peaceful settlement of disputes; cooperation for economic and social progress in larger freedom; observance of international law and justice; and the advancement of dependent territories toward self-government and self-determination.

Mr. Chairman, this bond proposal will help the United Nations to achieve these goals—goals which are clearly in accord with the vital interests of this country and of the free world. It is a modest proposal representing one-tenth of 1 percent of our Federal budget. And it is an economic proposal for it would reduce the U.S. contribution for peace and security operations of the U.N. from the present level of 47½ percent to 32 percent.

This U.N. bond proposal is justified on its need. It is warranted on its merits, and I urge that we give it our overwhelming approval as a further symbol to the world of our determination to persist and persevere in the cause of peace.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, there are some things that ought to be pointed out about the bill we are today considering. We refer to it as a bond bill, and I presume we will continue to refer to it in that way. But I would like to invite the attention of Members, who may not have noted it, to the fact that the term "bond" has been removed from the bill.

What this bill as now written does is to give to the President authority to make a loan to the United Nations. We presume that the medium through which this loan will be made will be the purchase of bonds, but I want the Members to know that is not required by this bill, nor are there any terms with respect to this loan specified in the legislation as it is now before the House.

The Executive has absolute freedom with respect to length of time, rate of interest, rate of repayment, and all things of that sort.

So, if you vote for this bill, you are voting to give the President much wider authority than he even asked for.

Let us ask ourselves how much money is actually needed by the United Nations. We were told some months ago that it was imperative that they have \$200 million forthwith, that it was needed at once. Now, observe what we are doing by the legislation before us today. As written, we are to match contributions of all other nations. There have been up to this time about \$25 million paid by other nations. That means if we match this there will be available to the U.N. something more than \$50 million at this time, and we are told that the administration is prepared to accept this arrangement.

Mr. Chairman, which is right? Did they need \$200 million 9 months ago or is \$50 million today sufficient? I would

certainly contend that there is a great inconsistency here. Something is amiss when the \$200 million which they said they had to have has dwindled to \$50 million, which they now say they are willing to take.

In the face of this situation, Mr. Chairman, we were told as of last June 30 the amount of the indebtedness was \$137 million. What \$50 million is going to do against that indebtedness I find myself at something of a loss to understand. Our esteemed friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], indicated that in his opinion if this \$200 million is available there would be not only the money to pay off presently owed obligations but there would be a balance remaining. I submit to the gentleman that the evidence in the hearings is otherwise. The evidence is that by the end of this calendar year, even if the entire \$200 million is available, it would all be used.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] very correctly stated that this is stopgap legislation and, if my memory serves me correctly, Assistant Secretary of State Cleveland used exactly that expression in his testimony.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are not dealing with a long-range solution to a program; we are dealing with a very temporary stopgap remedy.

One of the reasons why I object to this legislation and expect to vote against it is that it does not meet the basic question of proper financing of U.N. operations. It leaves that question for the future. Admittedly, this is a difficult question, and as lawyers say, hard questions sometimes make bad decisions. That may be the situation here.

If we are willing to try to solve this problem merely by glossing it over, it will be but a very short time before the U.N. will find itself in financial difficulties again.

Mr. Chairman, to put the thing in perspective, I think it ought to be borne in mind that the annual operating budget of the U.N. is in the \$75 to \$80 million bracket. The cost of the Congo military operation is running now at about \$10 million a month. In other words, in the approximately 2 years that that operation has been going on it has cost \$240 million. Of that amount the United States has paid almost 48 percent in one way or another. Keep that in mind when you think that our contribution to the regular U.N. budget is slightly in excess of 32 percent.

One of the things which I think has been particularly distasteful to people who have studied this matter is the question of voluntary contributions made by our country. These are contributions made out of foreign aid funds, some from the contingency fund and some from chapter III—that is the chapter that deals with international organizations—which now amount in the case of the Congo military operations to more than \$30 million, or \$41 million if we add waived airlift expenses. This has enabled the U.N. to reduce, by up to 80 percent, the assessments of some 80 countries for the U.N. Congo military operation.



Mr. Chairman, let no Member vote for this bill and be unaware of the fact that in the past, financial relief has been given to Cuba, to Yugoslavia, to Albania, and other Communist countries. To the extent that we have in the past made these voluntary contributions, it makes possible a lessening payment by these communistic countries and some 75 others.

Mr. Chairman, let us now address ourselves to the question of the World Court decision. In order to be effective, it must be adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations. As a very practical matter, since some 80 countries have been beneficiaries of our voluntary contributions because they could not or would not pay their full amount, how many think that those countries are all now going to turn around and adopt a World Court opinion which will require them to pay these things that they have previously failed to pay? That just is not human nature. In my opinion, the U.N. will not adopt this Court opinion.

Mr. Chairman, certainly if there is any such thing as an important question, this would be determined to be one requiring then a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is unlikely that this opinion will be adopted. We are going to see a gesture made in that direction, but it is my opinion that it will not be adopted. As I said earlier this afternoon to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] and although article XIX of the Charter of the U.N. says that a member 2 years in arrears loses its right to vote, there is in that same section authority that that loss of voting privilege may be waived by the General Assembly.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Would this be done under a proceeding wherein the United Nations would be subject to a veto by the Soviet Union?

Mr. ADAIR. No, it is my opinion it would not. It would be in the General Assembly, and if I understand the proceedings correctly, I think it would not be subject to a veto.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. It will be surprising if the Soviet Union will support the decision of the U.N.

Mr. ADAIR. I think that is entirely correct, and I agree with the chairman of the committee. In fact, they have already said that they would not.

The reason that the U.N. is in this trouble is because they are in the Congo. I think they are improperly there.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to read to the Members of the House article I of the Charter of the United Nations:

The purposes of the United Nations are:  
(1) To maintain international peace and security and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the

suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that here is a situation in which by its own definition, because it says Katanga is a part of the Congo, the United Nations is improperly there waging this police or military action. It is an internal, it is a domestic problem, it is not an international one. Hence I say they are improperly there.

Some people say to me, "If you do not vote for this money you are voting to kill the United Nations." I strongly disagree with that point of view. Rather if we refuse to give this money we do two things: First, we force the United Nations to organize and regulate its financial affairs in a more proper manner, and secondly we say to them that we do not think the United Nations has any business interfering with the domestic affairs of an independent state. So I say that by voting against this bill you will not be killing the United Nations, you will be in fact strengthening it, by requiring it to take measures to put its own house in order. I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, today we are debating a bill to authorize a loan to the United Nations to enable that body to continue its peacekeeping operations. I ask that we remember at this time that what we are debating is not just a question of finances. This is a question of the future of the United Nations.

The issue of this loan legislation is on the surface only one of lending to the United Nations a certain amount of money. If we look deeper, we see that it is a question of whether or not the peacekeeping and enforcing capabilities of the United Nations will be retained. Even deeper than this, it is a question of whether or not the United Nations will continue as an effective organization or even if it will continue to exist.

Some 40 years ago an organization of nations quite similar to the United Nations came into existence, also the result of the horrors of a world war. That body, the League of Nations, dissolved in 1946 after having failed at its most important task, that of maintaining peace. It was not that the principles and covenant of that body prevented it from keeping the peace but rather that the member nations of that organization were unwilling to give it the power to enforce its own pleas and resolutions for peace.

In Manchuria, in Ethiopia, the story was the same. The League of Nations could do nothing to stop aggression, to maintain the peace. Its words were admirable, but its actions were nil. The

problem leading to the failure of the League of Nations was perhaps best stated by the Honorable Sean Lester, Secretary General of the League of Nations, who said:

Between nations there must be law, there must be justice; but there must be force, economic and military, behind that law and justice.

Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves in the position today of debating an issue that will affect the future of the world. From Korea to the Middle East to the Congo, the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations have stopped the spread of communism and curtailed the use of force to settle international disputes. The legislation we are debating will allow the United Nations to continue these and similar operations. If it is passed, the U.N. can retain its role as an effective peacekeeping force. Otherwise we will have on our hands another League of Nations, that is, an organization of states that has no power to act but only power to talk about. There must be action to keep it. The United Nations has been taking action to maintain the uneasy peace of today's troubled world. Let us not now turn this active, effective force for peace into an emasculated replica of the ineffective League of Nations. We have the power in our hands today to revitalize this force for peace. Let us then take this opportunity to reaffirm our desire for an effective United Nations, a United Nations that will aid our cause, the cause of peace. Let us guarantee that the United Nations will have the capability of maintaining peace in the Middle East, in the Congo, in any country or area of the world where active peacekeeping is needed.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in complimenting our chairman on the excellent manner in which he has brought this bill to the floor and the way in which he has handled the many difficult tasks that have been imposed upon him this year. I join with all my associates in feeling he is one of the unsung heroes of this session.

I had some remarks that I intended to make but I think perhaps it would be better if we did what my good friend from Indiana suggested and put this matter into its proper perspective.

There is no one here today who is not concerned with Cuba—for the last several days it has been the foremost topic of discussion around this body. The penetration of communism into Cuba is a very serious affair. And yet of even greater peril to the world would be consequences of the United Nations failure to survive.

Perhaps the issue is not as finely drawn on the United Nations and perhaps the peril is not as personal an affront as it is in Cuba. And yet a failure to support the United Nations is inconsistent with the thought that we should do something about communism. For it is through the machinery of the United Nations that communism has

suffered its greatest setbacks. And it is through the United Nations that world opinion is brought to bear on infractions to a society of law and order.

I could not stand here today and defend every action of the U.N. Of some I have been most critical. I have criticized the double standard of U.N. justice—one for the West and the other for the East—one for democracies who had public consciences and public opinion, and the other for Communist and other dictatorships who had neither.

But I have never heard in all the criticism of the U.N. anything that could be substituted in its place in our great quest for peace with honor.

There are many who say they support the U.N. but who object to this financing. There have been several suggestions and there will possibly be several more. But I know of no suggestion that more fully embraces the intent of the majority in the House than does the bill now under consideration. It is truly bipartisan, it has the support of President Eisenhower and President Truman. It is a sincere effort on the part of President Kennedy to merge his thinking with the Members of this body who wish to support the United Nations while encouraging a greater collective responsibility in the financing of the operations of the U.N.

Now what are the facts about this bill?

First. It is a much tighter and restrictive bill than the one passed by the Senate. The Senate bill provided for the purchase of \$25 million worth of bonds plus a matching formula for every dollar's worth purchased or pledged by other nations up to \$100 million.

Second. This bill eliminates the \$25 million provision—it even goes further—it restricts the U.S. participation to the amount of bonds actually purchased, not pledged, on a matching dollar-for-dollar formula up to \$100 million.

For example, presently—

19 nations have purchased.....	\$27,750,000
31 nations have pledged.....	45,818,257
50 nations purchased or pledged.....	73,568,257

Under the Senate bill the United States would be authorized to purchase at this time \$98,568,257 of bonds.

Under this bill the United States can purchase \$27,750,000 at this time plus whatever amounts other nations actually purchase in the future.

Now what are the facts concerning the U.S. voluntary contributions to United Nations peacekeeping operations?

The Department of State has received a number of inquiries about U.S. voluntary contributions to the United Nations and reductions in assessments made by the United Nations to certain of its members. The only accounts on which any reductions in assessments have been made by the United Nations are for the United Nations military operations in the Middle East and in the Congo. This paper therefore deals with the U.S. contributions to these peacekeeping operations.

The facts concerning these U.S. contributions are given below. But first, to correct a few distortions or mistaken im-

pressions concerning these voluntary contributions:

First. The United States did not give United Nations \$215 million—or \$212 million—out of foreign aid contingency funds to reduce the assessments of Communist nations.

Second. The United States did not pay the assessments or past debts of other nations, nor were its contributions used for this purpose.

Third. No foreign aid funds were used for any contributions to the United Nations, except in pursuance of congressional authorizations and appropriations.

Fourth. U.S. contributions were not used to keep any member of the United Nations from losing its vote.

All contributions made by the United States to the United Nations military operations in the Middle East and in the Congo have been made to insure that these peacekeeping operations—which were and are in the U.S. interest—could continue, not to aid any other United Nations member.

The United States has made contributions—both assessed and voluntary—to the United Nations military operations in the Middle East and in the Congo since their inception in 1957 and 1960, respectively. The total U.S. voluntary contributions to these operations since 1957 total about \$65 million.

With the exception of the initial year for each operation, the U.S. voluntary contributions to these operations have been specifically authorized and appropriated for in the annual foreign assistance acts and appropriations. The U.S. voluntary contributions for the initial year of each operation—which totaled about \$23.8 million—also came from foreign assistance appropriations available to the President, but from the funds made available by the Congress to meet contingencies when the President determines such use to be important to the national interest. In each case these first-year costs could not be foreseen because of the emergency nature of the requirement. It is for such emergencies that the Congress has wisely provided the President with a fund for international contingencies which is voted upon each year.

None of this \$23.8 million was used to reduce or pay the assessments of any nation nor to reduce or cancel the debts of any nation. Nor were any of the other contributions made for these peacekeeping operations so used.

The facts are that the annual costs of the Middle East and Congo operations presently total about twice the annual cost of the regular budget of the United Nations. Because these costs were so large, opposition quickly developed on the part of many United Nations member states to share the costs in the usual manner, that is on the basis of the regular scale of assessments. To meet this need the United Nations adopted formulas to reduce assessments for members less able to pay. Several Communist nations as well as many of the nations of the free world fell within these formulas. These reductions were not contingent upon any payments to be made by any member nor were U.S. payments in

fact used to pay the debts of any of these nations.

To secure the total resources needed to keep these operations afloat, the United Nations appealed for voluntary contributions to the members of the Security Council and others financially able to pay. The U.S. Government decided, first, that it was in our interest to have the Middle East and Congo operations continued and, second, that if we wanted them to continue, we would have to respond to the United Nations appeal for additional funds in the form of voluntary contributions. It has been as the result of the United States and other nations' voluntary contributions to the Middle East and the Congo operations—operations which the Communist nations violently oppose—that the gap in funds was filled which provided the United Nations with the resources needed for the successful continuation of these operations.

The funds for the U.S. contributions for these operations were presented and justified to the Congress each year and Congress appropriated the funds for the U.S. contributions.

As explained earlier, the first-year emergency costs were met from the contingency fund provided by Congress for international emergencies.

The U.S. voluntary contributions to the United Nations were not used to keep any member of the United Nations from losing its vote. In fact, the several nations who were subject to loss of their votes under article 19 of the United Nations Charter have escaped this sanction only by paying the required amounts to the United Nations. Assuming that the General Assembly accepts the opinion of the International Court of Justice, which was requested by last fall's General Assembly and rendered on July 20, 1962, the U.S.S.R. will be subject to loss of its vote in 1964 if it continues to refuse to pay its Middle East and Congo assessments. The United States was one of the cosponsors of the resolution requesting the Court opinion.

The system of credits and reductions begun 6 years ago by the United Nations was ended on June 30, 1962, as the result of resolutions adopted at the United Nations 16th General Assembly in the fall of 1961. It is a thing of the past. The \$100 million loan proposal, which has already passed the Senate and has been reported by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, does not provide any credits to any nation. The ongoing costs of the Middle East and Congo operations after July 1, 1962, are to be financed from these loan proceeds. One of the many advantages of this loan proposal of benefit to the United States is that it not only eliminated the need for our voluntary contributions, but also lowers our contributions to these peacekeeping operations from 47.5 percent to approximately 32 percent.

Now what are the facts and the background of UNEF and Congo voluntary contributions and reductions?

The system of voluntary contributions for U.N. peacekeeping operations began with the UNEF operation in 1957 and was later applied to the Congo operation



which began in 1960. The practice was continued through June 30, 1962. When voluntary contributions are made for these operations, their effect is, of course, to reduce the burden on other members. Originally the total budget for UNEF was reduced by the amount of the voluntary contributions and therefore assessments on all members were proportionally lower. However, beginning in 1960, a formula was developed by the United Nations and approved over the objections of the Soviet bloc that limited the reductions to those countries least able to pay.

This formula of the United Nations for reducing the assessments of the poorer countries unavoidably benefited the few unfriendly nations that fell within the formula. But the United States nevertheless sought to change this system in the 16th General Assembly in the fall of 1961.

During this session, the United Nations adopted a financing program that ended the previous system of voluntary contributions entirely as of June 30, 1962. But as a part of a total financial plan with many advantages to the United States, it was found necessary to continue this practice until that time as an interim measure.

The system was continued first, until the member states could consult their respective legislatures and secure agreement to and the appropriation of funds for the purchase of United Nations bonds, the proceeds of which are to be used to finance the UNEF and Congo operations beyond July 1, 1962. No reductions or voluntary contributions for these military operations for the period beyond July 1, 1962, are included in the U.S. budget nor are they contemplated by the United Nations resolution. In fact, the U.S. contribution for the repayment of the bonds is to be made at the rate of 32.02 percent. This eliminates our voluntary contribution for these operations and is a reduction from the roughly 47½ percent that these operations have been costing the United States for both the assessed and voluntary contributions; and second, until an advisory opinion could be secured from the International Court of Justice which would give the Secretary General a sound legal base for an aggressive campaign to collect arrearages from those nations who have thus far failed or refused to pay their arrears for the UNEF and Congo operations.

The favorable decision has now been received from the International Court of Justice. If the U.S. Congress authorizes the loan of \$100 million to the United Nations, which was requested by the President, this will permit the United States to participate in the approved interim United Nations financing plan which, as pointed out above, ends the previous system of reductions and reduces the percentage of the U.S. contribution to our regular percentage.

In each of the above cases, the voluntary contributions intended to be made and the justifications therefore were presented to the Congress which appropriated the funds for the U.S. contributions. For example, the data concern-

ing these requests and justifications for 1962 are listed below:

In connection with the Senate Appropriations Committee hearings on foreign assistance, 1962, Mr. Cleveland, on September 7, 1961, submitted a supporting statement—pages 501–506—which fully discusses the credit formula and financing problems. This statement also shows the sources of U.S. funding. Tables on pages 493 and 494 show net assessments on member states after application of the credit formula, and the discussion preceding these pages covers the credit procedures as well as the question of arrearages.

Similar testimony is to be found in the House appropriations hearings on foreign assistance for 1962, dated August 16, 1961—pages 242–245. In the House Foreign Affairs Committee hearing on the Foreign Assistance Act for 1962, Deputy Assistant Secretary Gardner on June 28, 1961, presents for the record tables showing U.S. funding, the sources of these funds and the credits—page 1295.

In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings of June 8, 1961, tables on page 419 show U.S. assessments and voluntary contributions.

In addition to the formal submissions and justifications to the committees of Congress, the U.S. delegations to the annual meetings of the United Nations General Assembly have included two Members of Congress. One of these has served on the fifth committee, which is the committee which handles budgetary and financial matters and which originates the financing resolutions. This has meant that one or more Members of Congress each year has had the opportunity to learn in detail of the problems which led to the adoption and continuation of the voluntary contributions and reductions system and has in many cases been one of the principal representatives of the United States in the fifth committee during the development and adoption of these financing resolutions.

Now what are the rumors and facts about the bond issue?

Rumor: The United States will be going it alone on the bond issue.

Fact: Several other nations, including Great Britain, Canada, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden have publicly announced their pledges of about \$65.4 million. At least 26 others are in favor of buying but have yet to obtain parliamentary approval.

Rumor: The bond issue relieves the Soviet Union of its financial obligations to the United Nations.

Fact: It will not relieve Russia or any country of any amount owed to any of the U.N. accounts.

Rumor: U.S. taxpayers will be called upon for huge expenditures because of the bond issue.

Fact: The \$100 million the President requests to purchase U.N. bonds represents two-tenths of 1 percent of the entire U.S. budget for national defense. The individual American's loan comes to 54 cents, about the price of two packs of cigarettes.

Rumor: The United States will be stuck with even larger assessments in the future as a result of the bond issue.

Fact: The American share of the U.N.'s peacekeeping costs in the Congo and Middle East will be reduced by use of the bond issue from 47½ to 32 percent.

Rumor: Small nations will continue to be unable to carry their load.

Fact: Spreading the financing of the special U.N. operations over a 25-year period will enable the poorer members to meet their obligations more readily.

Rumor: The Communists will go on letting the West foot the bill for U.N. activities they do not like.

Fact: An anticipated favorable decision which the U.N. is seeking from the World Court this year will confront the Soviet bloc with having to pay their assessments or action to deprive them of their voting rights.

Rumor: The Afro-Asian bloc has taken over the U.N. and the United States has lost its influence there.

Fact: Nations do not vote mechanically in geographic blocs. Each country votes in its own self-interest. Year after year we find that American interests are generally common to the great majority of nations. There is a great power which is regularly outvoted in the U.N.—Russia.

Rumor: The U.N. does not really need the money this year—the whole matter can be put over to 1963.

Fact: On January 1 the U.N. had debts of about \$114 million and monthly operating expenses of almost \$19 million. It is obvious that the U.N. needs funds as quickly as possible.

Rumor: The U.N. audits its own books and does not know how much it owes.

Fact: The audit of U.N. accounts is directed by the auditors-general from three different countries. This year: Netherlands, Colombia, Pakistan.

Rumor: The 2 percent interest on the bonds will lose money for the United States.

Fact: The interest rate was set at 2 percent to give bondholders some return but to avoid the charge that it is a profit making scheme to benefit the richer countries. While the United States will not make money on the interest, a 2-percent return is better than no return at all.

In the opinion of many in the Bureau of the Budget and in which I concur this bond proposal is one of the most clever devices found as regards the interests of the United States. We are presently bearing 50 percent of the cost. This puts us on a 32-percent participation basis. It also sets a pattern for future participation on the same percentage basis.

The bond issue device gave us time to do the following:

First. Obtain the decision of the World Court.

Second. Get it adopted by the General Assembly.

Third. Find a way to allow the participation of the small nations who said they cannot stand high costs.

Fourth. Gives us time to get a collection campaign underway and get them paid up.

Fifth. It eliminates voluntary contributions.

Sixth. It eliminates credit reduction devices.

Seventh. It accomplishes all this while it establishes the principle that whoever loans money will be repaid under a collective financial responsibility.

Eighth. It allows the United Nations to function.

As a financial device the U.N. bond proposal is more favorable to the United States point by point than any other possible arrangement that could be devised or was suggested.

To the argument: Why not give it outright or out of the contingency fund of the foreign aid bill, which incidentally was made by several who voted against the bill, I must point out that this would preclude the principle of collective financial responsibility. People who vote in the United Nations should pay for the maintenance of the United Nations.

If we gave the \$100 million in addition to all the foregoing it would cost \$100 million whereas the bond proposal will cost the United States only a little more than half of that, or \$54 million.

I, therefore, urge the passage of this bill. It is the product of bipartisan effort and one that is in our national interest and vital to the security of the United States.

I heard it said by one of our colleagues today that over \$215 million was used by the President out of the contingency fund, that this, of course, was done through a subterfuge, and that this was the money which financed the Congo operations. This is just not so.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I understand the statement was made once before on the floor when I was not present. I would like to say that the statement is not as you have given it at all. I never said any such thing.

I said that \$215 million had been used to help the arrears of India, Yugoslavia, and other countries, including Cuba, to the tune of \$140 million.

I would like to point out to the gentleman that the record for this is in the foreign affairs documents in the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I am perfectly willing to be quoted, but I would appreciate being quoted correctly.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly what I am trying to do, quote the gentleman correctly.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I am sure the gentleman does not mean to make a mistake, but she keeps repeating to us that the sum for Cuba is \$140 million. It is \$140,000. That is bad enough without making it \$140 million.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. He is quite correct. I corrected myself in my original statement. One hundred and forty thousand

dollars for Cuba in my estimation is 100 percent too much.

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I agree with the gentleman, but she again inadvertently said \$140 million.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for correcting me. The gentleman is very apt at correcting others.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank my colleagues who have engaged in this colloquy, and I hope put the matter in proper perspective. The fact of the matter is this device was brought about, and it is corrected by this bond proposal. This seems to me to be good reason why it should be supported.

The only money which was used for any military operation out of the contingency fund was the amount of \$23,838,472 in 1957. \$3,170,850 used for UNEF out of the President's contingency fund in 1957, and the balance of \$20,667,622 was used out of the contingency fund in 1960 for the initial financing of the Congo operation. This is what the contingency fund is for. The rest of the money was appropriated, presented before this body, and was done through financing that was openly arrived at after debate before this body. So that these figures that have been scattered quite freely throughout the debate are not sound figures. I am very happy that we have had an opportunity to correct this at this point of the debate.

This will put us on a 32-percent basis, and would also set a precedent for us to continue at that level in any future operations of the United Nations.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAM] for the excellent minority views which he has submitted in opposition to this United Nations bond bill, loan bill, or whatever it is to be called.

I commend him for having the courage to speak out; for anyone who does so—as I have discovered—runs the risk of being accused of being irresponsible and pro-Russia.

Columnist Walter Lippmann, for example, has said that those who oppose the bond issue are disgruntled and motivated by crude partisanship. A Member of this body earlier in the year charged that anyone who speaks out against the bond deal is guilty of distorting the facts and engaging in extravagant emotionalism.

And the President himself, in his special message to Congress in January, implied that anyone who opposes the bond plan is pro-Russia. I refer to the statement in his message that failure to act "would serve the interests of the Soviet Union."

Then in the printed hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on page 164, you will find this statement by one John J. McCloy, international banker:

The Gross amendment—I can't imagine anything that the Russians would rather have than the Gross amendment.

I will compare my record of opposition to Russia and godless communism

with that of McCloy or anyone else, and I resent his statement; the implication that I am pro-Russia.

I make these observations to show the shoddy lengths to which some supporters of the bond issue will go. It is a crude and incredible way to try to sell any proposal.

Perhaps it would be well to review a little of the history of this proposition.

It was way back in December of 1961 that the United Nations General Assembly claimed a financial crisis and voted to float a \$200 million bond issue. It is interesting to note that almost half of the members of that body apparently did not think too highly of the idea. The vote was 58 for and 13 against, with the other 33 members either absenting themselves or abstaining.

Later in the same month, Assistant Secretary of State Harland Cleveland publicly announced that President Kennedy would seek authority from Congress to purchase up to \$100 million of the bonds, or one-half the total.

On January 30, 1962, the President transmitted to Congress a suggested bill "to authorize and appropriate up to \$100 million for the purchase of United Nations bonds."

"The United Nations is faced with a financial crisis," the President said in urging prompt action on his suggested bill. Administration spokesmen implied that failure of the Congress to act—and promptly—could result in the collapse of the United Nations. The Senate passed S. 2768 on April 5.

It is now September 13, 1962, as this body starts the consideration of the bond and/or loan bill. If, as we were told, the issue was so crucial, why the long delay?

My position on the issue is well known. I am opposed to the investment of a single dollar of Federal funds in what I consider a phony bond issue or the making of loans to the U.N. unless and until other member nations pay what they owe. Is this really so unreasonable? Why should not the United Nations be operated on a sound financial basis, with all members required to pay their assessments?

To me, it is incredible that American taxpayers—who already have paid far more than their share—should be required to pay for the international delinquency of such nations as the Soviet Union, Cuba, and even some of our so-called allies, like France. Why should the United States, a paid-up member of the U.N., pick up the bad debts of the deadbeats?

According to a United Nations report, contributions due the organization as of December 31, 1961, totaled \$93,915,569.45. It is my understanding that some 52 nations have failed to pay their assessments for the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East and 66 nations have not paid their assessments for the Congo operation.

In my study of the bond issue—and I have endeavored to read all available information, both for and against—I have tried to obtain a full and factual report on the true financial condition of the U.N. It has been a frustrating experience, as anyone who has had dealings



with State Department and the United Nations might expect.

In letters to both Acting U.N. Secretary General U Thant and Secretary of State Rusk, I sought, among other things, a simple accounting as to whom the United Nations owes money. The replies I received ignored this particular request.

I then dispatched a telegram to Secretary Rusk, requesting once again that I be provided with details of U.N. debts, and without further delay. The reply, from Assistant Secretary Frederick G. Dutton, stated that several copies of an "Analysis of the United Nations Financial Position as at December 31, 1961" were being submitted to the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, "for such purposes as the committee may deem appropriate."

In a letter to the committee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], I requested a copy and I am grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his courtesy in promptly complying with my request. Of course, it would not have been necessary for me to bother him had either the State Department or the United Nations seen fit to show me the same courtesy.

This financial statement purports to show that at the end of 1961 the United Nations had unpaid obligations of \$129.4 million. Subtracting net cash resources of \$15.5 million, the organization's deficit was listed as \$113.9 million. The report includes a breakdown of the amounts supposedly owed various governments for services rendered in connection with the United Nations Emergency Force and United Nations operations in the Congo, with the total amount owed to 26 governments and other payees listed at \$92.2 million.

It is stated that the amounts owed by the U.N. to various governments are provisional since, in many cases, they represent estimates, and it is now my understanding that the report is incorrect in some respects. In other words, no one seems able—or willing—to produce a full and factual report which would show the true financial condition of the United Nations. This is incredible.

Nevertheless there are some interesting figures in the U.N. financial statement, provisional or incorrect as it might be. For example, there is a category headed "Pay and Allow." Listed under this heading are 25 countries as being owed varying amounts which add up to a total of \$25,976,000.

Does this mean that the United Nations is paying the salaries of troops furnished by various countries for the U.N. Emergency Force and for U.N. operations in the Congo? If so, why? Certainly the United Nations did not reimburse the United States for the pay of our troops in the so-called United Nations police action in Korea.

Incredible indeed is the conflicting information you uncover if you start digging into the strange financial manipulations of the United Nations.

For example, I invite my colleagues to check page 21 of the printed House hearings on the fourth supplemental appro-

priation bill for fiscal year 1961. You will find this statement, provided by the State Department:

As of June 13, 1961, the U.N. working capital fund of \$25 million was completely exhausted. The Secretary General had borrowed \$12 million from the U.N. Special Fund and \$10 million from the U.N. Children's Fund (UNICEF).

This was for the purpose of paying expenses of U.N. operations in the Congo.

Then check the text of the President's special message to Congress on the U.N. bond issue, in which he says:

The shortage of operating funds thus created has reduced the working capital fund of the United Nations to zero and compelled it to hold back on the payment of bills and borrow from United Nations agencies.

I repeat the President's words, "borrow from United Nations agencies."

In direct contradiction, I have a letter dated January 25, 1962, from Frederick G. Dutton, an Assistant Secretary of State, in which he quotes the Deputy Controller of the United Nations as follows:

The Secretary General, of course, has no authority to borrow funds from the specialized agencies of the United Nations since their funds are not in his custody or control.

Are we to assume from this that the Secretary General raided the funds of special agencies without authority?

Incidentally, the letter from Assistant Secretary Dutton was a roundabout reply to my letter dated January 10 to the Acting Secretary General of the United Nations. My letter apparently went from the office of the Acting Secretary General to the Deputy Controller of the U.N. The Deputy Controller in turn wrote to Mr. Albert F. Bender, Jr., senior adviser, International Organization Affairs, U.S. Mission to the United Nations. He in turn wrote to Mr. Frank Hefner, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State. Hefner apparently then turned the correspondence over to Dutton, who finally wrote to me. I do not know why the Deputy Controller of the U.N. could not write directly to me and save the time and effort of others.

Then I have a letter dated January 16, 1962, from Maurice Pate, Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund. Remember now that the State Department submitted a report last year to the House Appropriations Committee that the Secretary General had borrowed \$10 million from the U.N. Children's Fund; then listen to this in Mr. Pate's letter to me:

May I say at the outset that no funds, either of government or private origin, in UNICEF accounts have been drawn upon for loan purposes.

Who is right—who are we to believe—President Kennedy and his State Department spokesmen, or the Deputy Controller of the United Nations and Mr. Pate of the Children's Fund?

In any event, it is perfectly clear that there would be absolutely no need for a bond issue if all members of the U.N. had paid what they owe the organization, and I again insist that American taxpayers should not be required to pick up the tab for the organization's deadbeats.

For years the United States has been paying far more than its share of the expenses of the U.N., and unless and until other nations pay what they owe, it is unthinkable that Congress would grant the President the authority he seeks.

We have heard a lot about the advisory opinion of the so-called World Court that special assessments, approved by the General Assembly, are legally binding on all members under the terms of the United Nations Charter.

It has been contended that this decision will make it possible to deny delinquent member nations the right to vote by enforcement of article 19 of the charter, which provides that a "member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amounts of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years."

It will be most interesting to see if article 19 is invoked if and when Russia becomes 2 years in arrears in the payment of its contributions. In any event, it is important to bear in mind that even if it were invoked, the member nation would not actually lose its seat in the General Assembly or the right to participate in debate.

Of even greater importance, if Russia was denied the right to vote in the General Assembly, it would retain its vote and veto power in the Security Council.

It is alleged by the President, Secretary Rusk, and other administration spokesmen that the bond loan plan is financially sound and really a good deal for the United States in that it would result in a savings to this country. With this kind of talk, I would not be surprised if the administration next tries to tell us that black is white and white is black.

What is financially sound about a plan whereby the United States, head over heels in debt, would borrow money at a 3.9 percent interest rate to use to loan the United Nations \$100 million at an interest rate of 2 percent? We would then pay, in meeting our assessments, 32.02 percent of the amount necessary to pay off the total U.N. bond issue of \$200 million, plus interest.

A Member of the other body figured that what this adds up to is that we would pay out \$236,706,480, and get back only \$128,072,000. In other words, this financially sound plan which is such a good deal for the United States would cost us, over the 25-year life of the bonds, \$108,634,480.

And they tell us it will be cheaper for the United States because if the U.N. bonds are not sold we will have to continue to pay approximately 47 percent of the costs of the U.N. Congo operation and the U.N. Emergency Force in the Holy Land. I cannot buy that argument, because there is no good reason why we ever should have paid more than our assessed share of the costs of these two operations which, as in the case of our regular assessment, is now 32.02 percent.

Will the bond issue, if successful, solve the financial problems of the United Nations? Of course, it will not. Testifying

before the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body, Secretary Rusk said this:

The bond issue is intended to pay the special costs for the military operations from July 1 of this year through 1963.

In other words, for a year and a half.

What happens then? Where will the United Nations get the money to continue its operations after 1963? Will another and even larger bond issue be floated?

As in the case of the unpaid assessments of many member nations, the time to place U.N. financing on a sound footing is now, not in 1963 or 1964, when I imagine we will hear cries that the U.N. is once again poverty stricken.

Why take the easy way out via a phony bond issue? This, it seems to me is a confession of gullibility; a confession that the United Nations lacks the morality and courage to insist on financial integrity in its members.

What is the alternative? I can suggest two:

First. Reject the bond issue and then insist that the General Assembly meet and assess all member nations for their proper share of the cost of operations in the Congo and the Middle East, and include these amounts in the regular U.N. budget.

Second. Approve the purchase by the United States of not more than 32.02 percent—the amount of our regular assessment—of the \$200 million of bonds, or a total of slightly more than \$64 million, with the important restriction that the bonds will be purchased only when all other nations pay what they owe the organization.

Neither alternative is designed, as I have no doubt critics will charge, to destroy the United Nations. To the contrary, I believe either would strengthen the financial structure of the organization.

I say this because I am convinced that other nations, including Russia, would be more inclined to pay their assessments if they were put on notice that the United States will no longer pay a disproportionate share of the expenses of the organization.

Of course, it would be helpful if at the same time our representatives at the U.N. would take the lead in insisting that article 19 of the charter be enforced, weak as this provision might be.

In closing, let me say that the position I have taken on this issue is pro-American, not pro-Russian, regardless of what the President, his New Frontier advisers, internationalists like John J. McCloy, or anyone else has to say to the contrary.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have never found the chart of human progress in a book of arithmetic. When one dear to me is grievously ill I wish to give to the patient every help within my power and not start quarrels and wrangles on things that have nothing to do with the life of the one I hold dear.

I have voted in this Congress to authorize \$4 billion for an experiment in space that we may reach the moon, that we may conquer space, and I have gladly done it. I have voted with all my colleagues in this House for defense appropriations running into billions of dollars. Can I now go home to my constituents and say that when we were asked for only \$100 million for the only international bridge to peace we have, \$100 million not for war but for peace, I withheld my vote?

I am not quarreling with my colleagues on the other side of this debate. We Americans enjoy the precious right to think and to agree or disagree with impunity. So I give respect to my colleagues who do not agree with me. I would ask them, however, to view this proposal in the light of what it is and not that reflective of unrelated prejudices. In a few words, this is a bill for a \$100 million investment in peace, nothing more, nothing less. The United Nations may not be perfect but it is the only international bridge to peace we have, and if we permitted it to collapse, history, I fear, would never forgive us.

In committee I voted against the amendment to trim the bill and cut down the amount of our bond purchase to match the money actually paid in by participating nations. I thought then, and I still think, that the deep, deep yearning of the American people for a world of peace, and not of strife, justified at least an investment of \$100 million in an effort to attain peace, regardless of how little or how much others contributed. But the cut was made. As the bill now stands we will purchase bonds up to \$100 million, but only as other nations pay in cash and in full their contributions. At the present time only \$27 million has been paid in by other nations so that the enactment of this bill would immediately bring to the depleted treasury of the United Nations only \$27 million. That in my opinion is far too little, but I abide by the judgment of my committee, though reluctantly, in accepting a compromise calculated to assure the bill's passage.

The one question before the Members of the House is—Are you going to make this investment for the cause of peace, an investment that may be no more than \$27 million, at the most \$100 million? Withhold your vote from this and then go back and face your constituents. You may be able to offer them some excuses. You may call the bonds phony, which they are not, but you may call them that. This is a land of free speech.

But what is the most precious thing your constituents want? It is peace on earth. This generation is entitled to have a chance to attain peace on earth. You do not wish your constituents when you return home to say: "You in the Congress are willing to contribute billions of dollars to conquer space. You are willing to appropriate billions of dollars for an arms race, but you are not willing to give \$100 million, not even \$27 million, to promote the most precious thing we have to look forward to—peace on earth."

I have the committee hearings here before me. Every witness who appeared before our committee, and they included not only Ambassador Stevenson but former Ambassador Lodge—made it crystal clear that the existence of the United Nations was hanging on a thread, that on our vote here on the pending bill was the decision of life or death. Witness after witness testified, both Republicans and Democrats—there is no politics in this.

Mr. Chairman, I would refer just for a moment to Africa. The Congo is in Africa. Certainly, the nations in Africa must have a better understanding of what is happening in the Congo and what the United Nations is doing there than some who are far, far away. Let me read from the list of nations participating in the UN bond purchases. Already, before we have acted, two countries in Africa have not only made pledges but they have paid up and seven other countries have pledged to make contributions. They are Ethiopia, Liberia—Nigeria—and how much is Nigeria giving? Little Nigeria is giving \$1 million. Little Nigeria that I think is destined to be one of the great countries in the world, and you are going to hear a lot about Nigeria. But at this time, in its founding years with many demands upon it, Nigeria is giving \$1 million and, yet, I find some of my colleagues have hesitancy when it comes to our great country purchasing \$100 million in the bonds of peace.

Then there is Sierra Leone.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONER. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me by chance how many of the countries you speak of that have agreed to accept the responsibility and purchase some of these so-called United Nations bonds are recipients of U.S. foreign aid?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I will be very glad to answer the gentleman and I am so glad he asked me that question.

Let us take Nigeria. Nigeria has a 6-year program and she is financing it, or at least most of it, herself. We are giving very little to Nigeria and what we are giving, we will get back twofold.

Mr. WAGGONER. We hope.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Let us consider some other country. Let us take Sierra Leone, for example. That is a little bit of a country and it is giving \$10,000 or \$20,000. We are giving very, very little to Sierra Leone.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman would admit that a great number of the countries that are participating in financing these U.N. operations are recipients of U.S. foreign aid, would he not?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wonder if the gentleman wishes to put it this way: Are they friendly to the East or are they friendly to the West?

Mr. WAGGONER. That is a question the gentleman would like to have answered.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. In other words these small countries are getting a little help from both sides.



Mr. WAGGONER. Then we do not know to whom they are friendly since they are taking help from both sides.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Let me assure the gentleman that we do not seek to buy friendship, that when we help a little nation to its feet it is not with the idea of buying its vote.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman is much older than I and has been around a great deal longer. Has he ever seen a successful attempt to buy friends?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. You can never buy friends with money, but understanding and friendliness will win you friends. The main motivation of the United States in helping less developed countries to their feet is to build a strong world of freedom under democratic government. Let me assure my good friend that we do not expect nations that we help to be our pawns in the General Assembly of the United Nations. We want them to vote their convictions. We want their help in building a better world. A fixed jury in the United Nations would be as hateful a thing as a fixed jury in the United States.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Of the 19 nations that have already purchased bonds in the amount of \$27 million, are not all of them participants in our foreign aid program?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. For as many questions as the gentleman can find in his mind to ask and I have time to answer.

Mr. WAGGONER. It was said earlier today that this is a strictly business proposition, that financing this operation is the same as businesses are financed every day in their ordinary affairs. Would the gentleman consider this a business operation?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Certainly I regard the United Nations as an instrument of peace as something higher than merely a business operation. We are assured that the bond issue is financially sound and that the money will be repaid, to that extent a normal business operation, but I consider the search for peace as something for which you cannot find a formula in the arithmetic books.

Mr. WAGGONER. I had hoped that the gentleman would consider it financially sound. If it is a financially sound operation do you not believe that it could be financed through financial institutions of this country by offering these bonds on the open market?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would say to the gentleman now that I hope to see the day when future United Nations operations will be financed by such a bond issue. It came up before our committee and I recall seven or eight of the members of the committee said they would subscribe for U.N. bonds if put on public

sale. I predict that when there is such a public issue the response will be tremendous. An investment for peace on earth, good will to men, is the best investment in all the world, either for our Government or for our people. But this is an emergency; we have not time to do it now. This money is needed now. I think the other will come, and I hope the gentleman will be one of the first to subscribe when the times comes.

Mr. WAGGONER. I assure the gentleman that the financial condition of the United Nations will have to be considerably different when they start putting their bonds on the open market.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Fifty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 213]

Anfuso	Harrison, Va.	Pfost
Auchincloss	Harvey, Ind.	Powell
Bass, N.H.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rains
Betts	Hosmer	Reece
Blitch	Jones, Ala.	Rivers, S.C.
Bray	Karth	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Kearns	Roudebush
Celler	Kilburn	Saund
Coad	Landrum	Schwengel
Cook	Lesinski	Scranton
Curtis, Mass.	Loser	Seelye-Brown
Davis	McCulloch	Shelley
James C. Davis, Tenn.	McDonough	Slack
Dawson	McSweeney	Smith, Miss.
Diggs	Macdonald	Spence
Dominick	Madden	Steed
Dooley	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Durno	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, La.
Evins	Marrow	Trimble
Fenton	Mills	Vinson
Ford	Montoya	Weaver
Frazier	Moorehead,	Weis
Gary	Ohio	Whalley
Goodling	Morris	Wilson, Ind.
Gray	Morrison	Yates
Halleck	Moulder	Zelenko
Harris	Norrell	
	O'Brien, Ill.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill S. 2768, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 351 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], may insert his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor today in support of the United Nations bond issue bill.

The United Nations is faced with the most serious crisis of confidence in its brief but turbulent history. Beset by

grave doubts over the efficacy of its operations in the Middle East and the Congo in which it has striven to transform itself from a debating forum into a viable peacekeeping agency, the international organization has stretched its resources to the limit and is now confronted with a financial emergency of major proportions.

Two major questions are before the House. First, is it in the national interest of the United States to help maintain the United Nations as an effective peacekeeping organization? Second, if so, is the proposal contained in this bill—S. 2768—the most appropriate means of providing needed short-term financial assistance to the United Nations. Expressed in the language of the bill, will Congress best promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing an appropriation of \$100 million for the purchase of United Nations bonds?

The nations of the world are following the deliberations of the Congress on this bill with particular interest. For better or worse, S. 2768 has become a symbol of American support for the United Nations. If we reject this bill, we will have turned our backs on the United Nations in the eyes of the world and have dealt a lasting blow to its prestige.

As many of you know, the United Nations headquarters is a part of the congressional district that I represent. Technically, it is extraterritorial, but it is within the bounds of the 17th District of New York. I have spent a great deal of time in the United Nations. I have passed many hours in the corridors, in the assembly hall and with members of the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committee who were delegates to the U.N. Assembly. I can assure you that whenever there are complaints with that body they come to my attention. The staggering problems of the U.N. and its mixed record of accomplishment are well known to me.

The manifest problems of the U.N. make it startlingly clear that as an institution, it must of necessity reflect all of the imperfections of our uncertain world. Certainly, the United Nations has not lived up to the original hopes of its founders. The great powers allied in World War II have not succeeded in existing in mutual harmony. The Soviet Union quickly subverted the U.N. Charter, frustrating the mandate of San Francisco. But if the original dream of the U.N. has not been fully served, it has emerged as a positive force in a way that was not foreseen by the founders.

In a rapidly changing world—a world in constant transition—torn by political and social upheavals which have seen old orders disappear overnight—the United Nations has played a central role in assisting some 50 new states make the difficult, often painful, transformation from colonial dependence to national sovereignty. These accomplishments have been brought about peacefully rather than through armed conflict. The United Nations has afforded these emerging nations with an arena in which they can achieve a sense of participation in the community of nations and

strengthen their burgeoning national identity.

It is true that many of these countries, lacking a tradition of self-government, have shown poor judgment and immaturity in their international dealings. This is inevitable. In the forum of the General Assembly, the new nations have been able to learn diplomatic skills and democratic procedures. Under the glare of the international spotlight they have been afforded a strong challenge to live up to the crushing responsibilities that have been so rapidly thrust upon them. The role that the U.N. has played in these events has been one of the most extraordinary achievements of the 20th century.

In assessing the role of the United Nations in world affairs, it is important that we not overlook its indispensable economic and social functions. Throughout the world the United Nations is doing significant work in such fields as child care, health, and education. Millions of people think of the U.N. in terms of their meaningful encounters with the thousands of doctors and teachers, economists, agriculture experts, and specialists in so many fields who have brought the highest skill and devotion toward improving the quality of life in our frenzied world. For these people the U.N. does not mean endless frustrating debates on Cuba, the Algerian question, or the admission of Red China; it does not mean shoe pounding, vetoes, troikas, and the like. The U.N. means malaria stamped out; better crops, healthier children; the scourges of poverty and illiteracy on the wane; improved educational facilities and opportunities for young people to be exposed to the joys of learning and to acquire needed skills to make them constructive citizens of their own country and of the world.

The third area which I propose to examine briefly is the United Nations as a peacekeeping organization.

It is true that the United Nations has been unable to carry out its original mandate of keeping the great powers together. However, it has succeeded in many significant instances in keeping the great powers apart.

When the pressure of steam in international relations rises to the exploding point, there has to be an outlet somewhere. Here is the escape valve that allows enough steam to blow off so that a direct confrontation between the great powers can be avoided—a confrontation of the kind that could trigger off world war III. The U.N. has served a notable purpose by interposing itself in critical areas where conflicts could well have led to total war.

This special U.N. role has come about through the extraordinary development of the powers of the office of the Secretary-General. A kind of international case law has been developed which has been tested and proven worthy many times since the inception of the Organization.

In the early years of the U.N., the Organization played an important role in halting Communist infiltration of Iran and Greece and in stopping aggression in Kashmir and Indonesia.

In circumstances far more adverse than any encountered by the League of Nations, the U.N. successfully thwarted aggression in Korea. The League of Nations failed in Manchuria, Ethiopia, and elsewhere. The U.N., on the other hand, has maintained the armistice in Palestine and helped save a dangerous situation in Lebanon.

The United Nations helped restore peace in the Middle East and the United Nations Emergency Force has served as a stabilizing element ever since. Show me the person who has visited this area who is not thankful that the United Nations blue flag flies over the lonely nomad's land between Israel and the bordering Arab states. Show me the person who is not grateful for the presence of U.N. personnel and for the fact that peace is being maintained without the presence of American boys. Right here you have a compelling justification for keeping the peacekeeping functions of the U.N. alive.

In the Congo the U.N. has assisted that war-torn country to move from anarchy toward some slight measure of stability while at the same time it has stemmed the aggressive interference of the Soviet Union. But for the presence of the U.N. in the Congo—with all its faltering and confusion—the world would have been faced with a blood bath of the most appalling proportions plus the establishment of a Communist beachhead, followed possibly by the triggering of a direct confrontation that could have embroiled the major powers.

Had not the U.N. proved a stumbling block to Soviet aspiration in both the U.N. and the Congo, we would be faced with serious Communist penetration of these areas. Here are striking instances where the U.N. has served in the best interests of the United States.

If America had directly intervened in the Middle East and in the Congo, other great powers would have intervened and a strong anti-American feeling would have been engendered.

If the United States were to withdraw its financial support of U.N. peacekeeping actions, there would be no alternative to the withdrawal of U.N. troops from the Middle East and the Congo.

The consequences would be disastrous for our foreign policy and for the free world. Unquestionably, there would be a renewal of hostilities, the possibility of the presence of American troops, and a strong likelihood of Soviet intervention. The U.N. must remain in these critical areas and can be maintained only with the strong support of the United States. This support is in our best national interest.

The issue is clearly drawn. Does the U.S. Congress wish the United Nations to survive as a viable peacekeeping organization which acts in the best interest of peace and security in an imperfect world, or does it wish to have it fade into a meaningless, ineffective debating society? By adopting the latter course we will have played directly into the hands of the Soviet Union.

Now, what is the logic behind the bond issue? The first question that must be asked is: Does this proposal promote the

foreign policy of the United States? The second question is whether the proposal contained in this bill is the most appropriate means of providing short-term financial assistance to the United Nations.

The answers to these complex questions are not easy. First, there is the very practical consideration that the General Assembly has acted. The General Assembly has concluded that a bond issue is the most practical means of solving the United Nations financial emergency for this year and next. A resolution was passed to that effect. It is the only means of interim financing adopted by the General Assembly. For the United States to defeat this proposal would create a serious crisis while a search for another financing plan is undertaken.

The bond issue will not constitute a precedent. It will serve as a temporary device for financing the Middle East and Congo operations while a long-range study of future financing of the U.N. is undertaken.

Setting the interest rate at 2 percent will keep it low enough to minimize the burden of repayment upon smaller nations while allowing the repayment of the bonds to be spread over a 25-year period will make it possible for all nations to participate without undue financial hardships.

Adopting this proposal would reduce our present disproportionate share of the Middle East and Congo operations to the level which we are assessed for the regular budget. Our share of the bond proposal will be 32.02 percent in marked contrast to the 47 percent we have been paying for the UNEF and Congo operations.

Recovery of our investment will be guaranteed because the principal and interest due the United States will be deducted from our regular annual U.N. assessment. It is further pointed out that this proposal will in no way reduce the outstanding indebtedness of nations in arrears and will in no way reduce their future assessments.

A number of related questions remain to be considered. It has been suggested that there are alternative means of meeting the immediate financial crisis of the U.N. In my judgment all of these suggestions have serious flaws.

Using the President's Contingency Fund to purchase the bonds would exhaust by more than one-third the whole fund. The fund was intended for unforeseen purposes. The U.N. bond issue was by no means unforeseen.

The use of counterpart funds presents the difficulty of converting from soft to hard currency and would require the consent of the nations possessing the funds in order to be used outside their territories.

For the World Bank to loan the needed funds to the U.N. would involve a major change in its charter and would be unfair to the nations who have already contributed to the bond issue.

It has also been suggested that we cancel the indebtedness of the U.N. to the Department of Defense and only authorize the President to loan the balance.



This would tend to hinder the efforts of the Secretary General to raise the necessary funds for it would breed deep suspicion of our motives in other nations. It would also in the long run be a greater cost to the United States.

Since \$100 million is not a large amount when compared to the space or defense budget of the United States it has been suggested that we simply give the money to the United Nations. This too would suffer the drawback of not complying with the General Assembly's resolution on interim financing. More fundamentally, it negates the principle of collective financial responsibility.

For these reasons I am convinced that the bond issue is the most suitable means of meeting the U.N.'s current financial crisis.

I am impressed that as of September 5, 19 nations have purchased \$27,750,000 in bonds and 31 nations have pledged to buy \$45,818,257—a total of \$73,568,257 in announced purchases and pledges for 50 nations. An additional 16 nations have indicated that they are in favor of the U.N. bond proposal while 24 nations have the matter under consideration.

I am impressed that Germany and Switzerland, neither of which is a member of the U.N., have announced substantial pledges. I am heartened to see that among the supporters of this proposal are many of the newer members of the world organization. All of this is indeed most encouraging.

There is, however, one aspect of the situation which disturbs me greatly. This is the apparent failure to set forth the future steps necessary to improve the U.N.'s woeful financial condition. What will come after the bond proposal? What permanent financing plans are being considered?

The hope seems to be that the General Assembly will adopt the advisory opinion of the World Court and that the Secretary General will commence collecting back debts from delinquent nations. In the Department of State's helpful compendium—"Questions and Answers on the \$100 Million U.N. Loan Proposal," it is question 23 "What after the bonds," which receives the weakest presentation. I would like to quote the answer in full for the RECORD:

It is true that the bond issue is just an interim measure to finance the United Nations for the next year or so. This is all that it was intended to be. It was designed to finance the United Nations;

(a) Until an advisory opinion could be secured from the International Court of Justice, this opinion be adopted by the General Assembly, and the Secretary General have time to collect the back debts from the delinquents;

(b) During this interim period nations that had been unable to pay would have time to pay their back debts as well as their current assessments for the regular budget, without adding on top the heavy current costs of continuing these operations; and

(c) To give the member states and the Secretary General the time needed to work out a more permanent solution.

Any plan the administration comes up with will have to be tested with many of the members of the organization and then with the Congress. Solid support will have to be built for a financing arrangement which will

both provide the amount of funds needed for the organization and meet the legitimate criticisms of those members who are less able to pay. This will take both time, negotiating skill, and undoubtedly some compromise as is true of any major proposal involving 104 nations.

The administration has stated the kinds of solutions which are being considered. They include special scales for peacekeeping operations, the developing of additional sources of revenue for the organization, the return to a system of assessed and voluntary contributions, paying for peacekeeping operations by various consortiums of countries who find these operations in their interest, and many other suggestions.

At this stage in the development of the United Nations it is very important that—whatever system is adopted—emphasize to the maximum possible extent, the concept of collective responsibility. The bond plan, financed as it is at the regular percentage scales, is a good base from which to start.

In addition, we must remember that several steps must yet be taken: (1) the Court's decision must be implemented by action of the General Assembly and (2) even after that, it will take some time to determine how effective the program to collect arrears can be. This has an important bearing on the solutions that may be found acceptable.

Therefore, while admittedly it might be nice if we could have a neat financial plan for the future all wrapped up before we make this decision, the real world which includes the United Nations has not yet developed this agreed solution. It can only be achieved through months of hard work which still lie ahead. Heaven knows the President, the Secretary of State, and all of us are pressing for an early and satisfactory solution.

After reading this statement it is not impossible to conclude that the U.S. Government has not given serious thought to a permanent financing plan. They admit as much in their pamphlet "Operations and Financing of the United Nations," when they state:

The Executive, the Congress, and the United Nations agree that long-term loan financing shall not set a precedent. As soon as present financing is settled and the Court opinion rendered, U.S. representatives to the U.N. will work with the Secretary General and other member nations to develop methods of financing designed to be equitable, produce the required revenues, and to avoid continuing financial crisis.

It is true that a number of witnesses before the committee spoke in general terms about some of the suggestions that are being considered. But none of these proposals were spelled out very clearly. This omission is in need of remedy.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind that this bill should be passed. But we would be derelict in our duty if after having passed S. 2768 we were to think that we had done all that is required of us in meeting the present emergency.

It is incumbent upon the Congress to take the necessary steps to see that all efforts and energies are expended in the drafting of a long-term financing proposal for the U.N.

I, therefore, will offer the following amendment which I hope will be adopted:

On page 2, line 23, add the following:

The Department of State is hereby instructed to submit to the Congress not later

than January 1, 1963, a report on steps taken in the 17th General Assembly of the United Nations on long-term financing of the United Nations.

Before I close, I would like to pay tribute to the members of the committee for their diligent and constructive work on this bill and to thank them for the courtesy they extended to me when I testified in its behalf.

Mr. Chairman, this is a time of great frustration in human history. We inhabit this globe forever poised on the brink of nuclear cataclysm. Our technological and scientific achievements have developed at a pace far beyond the capacity of our values and institutions to respond. We have become the creatures of our own inventions, the prisoners of our ingenuity.

These have been fateful years for the American people. For too long this generation has borne with fortitude the painful necessity of making crucial decisions on which hang our survival. We can no longer conceive the destinies of the nations of the world as something separate and apart from the future of America. Our fate, our fortune, the life which we will bequeath to our children are inextricably bound up with lives of all mankind.

The world is always with us. We cannot turn our back on the inexorable rush of events outside our country. We can no longer seek refuge in geographic isolation and in our unrivaled material abundance and technical prowess as we have done in the past.

Forty years ago America rejected the 20th century and went on a headlong spree in pursuit of a gilt-edged utopia. We rejected our commitment to the world when we turned down the League of Nations. We and the world are still paying an incalculable price for that shortsightedness—for our belief that as a nation we could linger forever in the smalltown arcadia of our youth.

It is disastrous folly to believe that we can solve our national frustrations by turning our back on the complex, constantly shifting struggles of our times. We can yearn in vain for easy answers, for quick solutions, immediate rewards, and for dramatic victorious actions. International politics are too complex and too dangerous to be solved by easy slogans.

We must face unceasing demands, live with enterprises and institutions that at times falter, and with responsibilities that often are neither gratifying nor fruitful. Problems have deepened in dimension and we must confront perpetual ambiguity in a world that will take our wealth, respect our might, but not love us for it.

As we come perilously close to losing our way in the crosscurrents of change and uncertainty let us not forget that the United Nations remains our best hope for some measure of world order. A world without the United Nations would be a tragedy of unending proportions. The U.N. must survive this crisis and can do so only with the dedicated efforts of the United States. Our stake in world survival is too great to allow the U.N. to go the way of the League of Nations.

and become a forum of meaningless debate—a haven of lost dreams.

I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there could be any doubt among the Members of this body as to my stand with regard to our being pressed into a matter because of a moral issue involved, especially after the Philippines debate when I stood here before you for 15 minutes to talk against our being pressured into a moral commitment made by the Executive Department of our Government; yet here again is another instance of where the Executive Department has committed funds of the United States and we are being asked to get this thing back on the track and finance it in order that we can get repaid the funds we have let slip through our fingers from the Contingency Fund of the President.

I would like to point out that the word "moral" comes from the Latin word "mores" meaning the way of the times. It is getting to be the way of the times for us to bail out the Executive when he commits funds that were specifically authorized for a given purpose and uses them for another. We are creating a moral responsibility for us to continue on in this way in the future.

In a situation such as the one facing us today—where we are faced with the grim prospective of the failure of our international organization unless it can be given financial support, it might be well to examine the past for a guide in making our present decision. Certainly if the U.N. fails, it will have ample precedent and will go to a family grave already containing the bones of its predecessor—the League of Nations.

It is important to note that the political climate in which the League of Nations failed was one of isolation—many honest and intelligent men believed this Nation could go it alone. This view was dramatically exploded in the holocaust of war.

Today we face the possibility of the weakening of the League's successor—the U.N.—an atrophying so to speak. However, the political climate which presided over the League's demise has itself perished long ago. The "lone wolf" concept is gone; and no one seriously contends for its return nor trusts its efficacy in a time of increasing interdependence.

With the death of the U.N. would come the end of the only efficient international forum in a world desperately needing international understanding. A forum which has come to symbolize "coming of age" to the newly emerging nations. A forum wherein they receive valuable practical application of the operations of a representative government. The delegates from the newer nations, for example, frequently return to their lands to a position of high office and there put into practice the knowledge of governmental methods received at the U.N.

The brutal fact is that in the divided world in which we live we cannot afford a power vacuum such as that caused by

the weakening of the United Nations. The numerous brush-fire hostilities which spring up around the world are the potential sources of future world conflagrations. We cannot allow the Communists to quell these because we know from the past that their quelling is usually accomplished by consuming both participants.

The Communists, on the other hand, are violently opposed to our intervention. In such a situation the best possibility for confining the brush fires is an international force such as that sponsored by the U.N. in the Congo and in the Middle East.

Without such an international force, the possibility of general war increases. We may not be pleased with all the actions taken in the past—they may not have been the best solutions and in some cases may not have been desired at all; but the important thing is that no practical alternative exists for insuring that local hostilities will not become worldwide ones.

No one questions that today total war is suicidal. We keep our defense spending up as insurance that no aggressor will be lulled into believing that aggression against us or our allies would be anything but suicidal. The premiums on this defense insurance policy amount to something in the neighborhood of \$300 paid by every citizen of the United States. This spending deters planned aggression.

Realizing that total war is suicidal, it becomes vitally important to attempt to achieve better understanding among nations, to aid in the emergence of the new nations with a minimum of friction, and to curtail the brush fires. To date the achievement of these goals has been insured in large part by the U.N. The premium on this peace insurance policy amounts to \$1.11—that is the per capita cost of the U.N. to the United States in 1962. It is submitted that this is cheap insurance and that we should not now allow our policy to lapse.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of S. 2768, a bill to authorize a loan of up to \$100 million to the United Nations which is presently faced with a financial crisis arising from expenditures for peace-keeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo.

The problem before us today is whether or not we shall support U.N. operations undertaken to fulfill the charter pledge to secure peace, advancement for all men, and the upholding of human dignity.

There are those who recognize that the U.N. will not be all things to all men, that it must necessarily labor under staggering handicaps, that it is an instrument of mankind with a concomitant proportion of man's frailties.

Yet to these people—who have weighed its successes against its failures—the U.N. represents a bulwark against a disastrous, final conflict. They consider that the U.N. has stood firm against the tidal wave of conflicting interests, unbridled passions, and fanatic extremisms which has threatened to engulf and destroy this planet.

It is not to these people that I direct my plea today. It is to those who would

have us scuttle the U.N. and send it the way of the League of Nations that I speak.

I sympathize with and understand the discouragement of those who grow disheartened over the changing world around us. They long for the days when a powerful nation might issue an edict and the rest of the world snapped to attention. They wish for America the position of a proud and mighty nation which needs only walk softly and carry a big stick to impress upon those less powerful than we that we mean business.

But the years, interspersed by two world wars and several local conflagrations—have shown us that the policy of the mailed fist is an unsuccessful one. It leads only to needless bloodshed, misery, and heartache for mankind.

I take your time to refresh your memory with these reflections because they only point up the characteristics of the changing world in which we live.

Men have come slowly and painfully to the realization of the stark truth. This old earth takes a couple of whirls and we come round full circle to a truism which we have managed successfully to ignore in times past; namely, that more is accomplished through reason than through hasty acts of passion.

The United Nations is an instrument of peace which we cannot in conscience summarily set aside. Its detractors dismiss it as a mere forum for debate, but it is more: it is a vehicle for action.

Those who charge that it serves the enemies of the United States would do well to examine the record. The Soviet Union has been successfully thwarted in numerous instances. As early as 1946 the U.S.S.R. was attempting to extend its sphere of influence in the Middle East. Soviet troops withdrew from Iran as the result of U.N. pressure. Would this have been possible without a world organization exerting pressure as a unified body?

In the case of the Communist invasion of South Korea, does anyone honestly believe that takeover could have been prevented without the unified action of the United Nations?

Within the U.N. Organization itself the Communist attempts to gain control have been successfully thwarted at every turn. Witness the refusal of the majority of the members to seat Red China in the last session of the General Assembly.

I could cite cases ad infinitum, but I shall not take the time of this body. It is enough that in every instance of U.N. action the designs of the Soviet Union have been thwarted.

Those who oppose a loan to the U.N. on the basis that the Soviet Union has not paid its assessments for the operations in the Middle East and the Congo completely miss the point. Of course, the Soviet Union would withhold monetary support of operations which are opposed to its own best interests. It is to the advantage of the Soviet Union to foster perpetual warfare between the Arab nations and the people of Israel. Communism thrives on dissension.

It is to the advantage of the Communist cause to see a divided Congo. Communism is nourished by disunion.



Communists welcome the opportunity to intervene forcibly in the affairs of other nations and would hope the U.N. would get out so they could move in. Had United Nations troops not responded to the Congolese call to help them restore unity, the Congolese leaders in their desperation would have turned to the Soviet Union.

This is not the time for a discourse on the problems of the Congo. Suffice it to say that separated from the wealth and resources of Katanga Province the Congo cannot stand alone. The United States does not follow a program of attaching to itself as satellites weakened countries unable to stand alone. The inference is obvious: It would be mere child's play for the U.S.S.R. to extend its sphere of influence to the Congo preparatory to encircling the African Continent with its own special brand of Iron Curtain policies.

Mr. Chairman, an important tenet of our foreign policy is to foster freedom and independence among the so-called underdeveloped nations of the world. It is our belief that encouraging the buildup of stable economies and governments in these newly freed former colonies will draw them more firmly into the Western camp. The United Nations serves our policy in this area, for so long as it stands as a tribute to the ability of men to reason out their differences without resort to war, that long do we postpone the physical clash of ideologies. Our aim is to build a bastion of free nations who will discourage resorting to war as the means of solving problems.

To those who charge that the United States bears too great a proportion of the cost of supporting the U.N. and its operations, we can only respond that in recognition of the growing prosperity of other nations, the United States has successfully pressed over the years for a reduction in its share of the expense.

In reply to the charge that the United States will be paying the Soviet share of the Congo and Middle East operations, we point to the World Court decision which upholds the stand that continued refusal to pay arrearages will result in loss of vote in the General Assembly.

The main aim of the pending bond issue is to end the system of voluntary contributions by big powers and make everyone share in the peacekeeping costs on penalty of losing their General Assembly votes.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Members of the House that this is constructive legislation. It deserves everyone's vote of confidence and a resounding vote when we in this body put our names behind this important and vital legislation to the future of our own country as well as to the entire free world.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the bill before the House. I shall vote for it because it is the best bill we can get, though it is not good enough—on at least two counts.

First, it is not good enough that we should be voting on this bill in the middle of September; this vote should have been taken 6 months or more ago.

Second, it is not good enough because it may contain less money than it should and more conditions than it should.

The United Nations is in serious financial trouble because it costs money to keep the peace in the Middle East and the Congo, and because the Communists and a few other members happen not to approve of these peacekeeping operations. Peace may be priceless, but in this case the price of peace in these two strategic areas is approximately \$12 million a month—a paltry sum compared to the alternatives.

We knew all of this when the Congress met in January. We knew the United Nations was in financial trouble then. We knew then that money must be found or the cause of peace in the Middle East and the Congo would have to be abandoned.

We knew then that the United Nations had worked out a plan for resolving its financial crisis. The plan was presented by the Acting Secretary General as one of his first acts of office. It was approved by a large majority of the General Assembly. It had been studied and endorsed by international financial experts, including the President of the World Bank. All available alternatives had been explored and rejected.

As the richest nation in the world—as the nation which has more to gain than any other nation from a healthy, effective United Nations—as the most influential of all members—the least that might have been expected was an immediate, vigorous, generous response to the United Nations in its hour of crisis.

Nine months have gone by since the United Nations asked its members to come to the rescue—9 months of uncertainty while the world waited to see whether the United States was going to do its share or scuttle the peacekeeping forces of the United Nations in the Middle East and the Congo.

We have argued. We have quibbled. We have compromised. We have declined to be generous. We have eliminated the initial loan of \$25 million which the President asked for. We have tied every U.S. nickel for loans to the United Nations to a dollar-for-dollar matching of loans from other members.

We have insisted that another member's pledge is not good enough; not one U.S. dollar goes on the barrelhead until the matching dollar has been put up first by other members.

We have insisted on a double guarantee of repayment. It was not good enough for us to rely on the integrity of the United Nations to repay the U.S. loan, though the funds for repayment are to come out of obligatory assessments levied upon all members; we insist that the amounts due us in repayment be deducted in advance from our regular assessment.

The extraordinary thing is that the restrictions we have placed on this legislation hurt no one but the United States. They limit the freedom of action of the

President to pursue U.S. interests independently. By adopting a strict matching formula we put other nations in a position to control the scale and timing of U.S. support of the United Nations; we put the United States in the position of the follower instead of the leader.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, other members have been less dilatory and more forthcoming than the U.S. Congress. Nineteen members already have actually purchased some \$27 million of United Nations bonds and 31 others have pledged to buy United Nations bonds to the extent of an additional \$45,818,257. I should have much preferred to see the United States at the head of the line—as befits our role as leader of the free world—as advocate and defender of all that the United Nations stands for. The best we can now do is take our place behind others—with all our idle qualms and nervous reservations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to pass this legislation by a whopping big majority.

This would at least help to wipe out the impression that the United States is a reluctant dragon.

This at least would show that when the time for talk is finally over—when the chips are finally down—this House is ready to stand up and be counted on the side of the United Nations—on the side of peace in the Middle East, in the Congo, and everywhere else in the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, during the course of this debate on the legislation authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support of this measure.

The United Nations was born 17 years ago after the holocaust of World War II, as a result of the fervent desire of the vast majority of mankind to live in a peaceful secure world where the rights of each and every individual and nation are recognized and respected. Since the signing of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco in 1945, we have come a long way in service to humanity. The membership of the United Nations has more than doubled, and it has provided a forum for peaceful discussions and settlements of international problems which could otherwise have resulted in armed conflict.

The same principles of the equality of man and the freedom and dignity of the individual, as expressed in our own Constitution, are set forth in the United Nations Charter. Since its inception the U.N. has established a remarkable record of accomplishment in maintaining international peace and security, despite the many and repeated efforts of the Soviet Union to defeat the very purpose of the U.N.

The role of the United States in the U.N. is a most important one. Although we are but one voice in the General Assembly, our position there is still pre-eminent, and we are a great source of influence. The interests and goals of the U.N. are in line with our own desire for a

peaceful existence in a world free from strife and unrest.

It is true that the United Nations authority is somewhat restricted, in that it has no sovereignty over territories or individuals. However, it is not a world government, nor was it intended to be. It is as effective as its member nations can make it, and its motivating force must also emanate from these member nations. During its existence, the United Nations has successfully prevented wars and aggressions in a number of instances; it has extended economic aid to many countries; has brought independence to various trust territories; and has been working toward the achievement of a disarmament treaty. Sometimes the peace is uneasy, but hostilities have been terminated and order restored on many occasions where but for U.N. intervention the situation could have flared up into another major war.

I believe in the future of the United Nations, and feel that we must continue to broaden and strengthen its influence for international development and security. Our support of the United Nations is the world's last best hope for mankind, and if the Organization needs emergency funds to meet the cost of peacekeeping operations and to fulfill its obligations, then I think the United States as a member in good standing of the United Nations should rightly shoulder additional responsibilities along with the other nations which have pledged their financial assistance in meeting the costs of the necessary actions.

The recent advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice will undoubtedly have a very profound impact on the many nations that have not met their financial responsibilities to the Organization. I am convinced that when faced with the possibility of losing a vote in the General Assembly for failure to pay assessments even the most recalcitrant member will bring its payments up to date.

I certainly hope that my colleagues will vote overwhelmingly in favor of this legislation so that the United Nations can continue its vital work.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the United Nations bond bill.

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations is on the brink of a financial crisis. As of December 31, 1961, the debt of the world Organization amounted to \$129.4 million. How did this deficit come about? The root of the United Nations financial crisis is twofold: The expansion of political and security activities represented by the U.N. Emergency Force in the Middle East and the U.N. Congo operations, and concomitantly, the refusal of member nations to meet the financial obligations involved in supporting these activities. For the larger proportion of the U.N. debt comprised the arrears of member states on these two special operations.

Thus, in November 1961 the General Assembly authorized the Secretary Gen-

eral to offer \$200 million in bonds to cover the deficit on these operations and to finance future UNEF and UNOC activities. We now have before us in this Congress a bill allowing the President to purchase up to \$100 million of the U.N. bond issue, matching our purchase with the total amount bought by other countries.

Those who criticize the U.N. bond issue for not offering a permanent solution to the United Nations financial difficulties are imputing to the bond issue a purpose which its proponents never assumed for it. The bond issue does not pretend to be a final solution to the United Nations financial problems. Its purpose is essentially to grant the U.N. breathing space to work out a final solution.

Those who oppose the bond purchase on the basis that it will constitute a dangerous precedent in U.N. financing view it wholly from the narrow perspective of a fiscal solution. They ignore its broader implications. The bond issue is not simply a means of financing; it goes far deeper than that—to the very core of the political and security functions of the United Nations. Failure to approve the President's request would force the withdrawal of U.N. troops both from the Congo and from the Middle East. Withdrawal of U.N. troops from the Middle East would result in a renewal of hostilities in that area. Withdrawal of the U.N. presence from the Congo would leave a power vacuum in central Africa that would invite active Soviet intervention. Thus, the U.N. bond issue is essential to the main purpose of the United Nations: the maintenance of peace and security. It is thereby also essential, I submit, to the foreign policy interests of the United States, since withdrawal of U.N. forces from these two areas because of inadequate finances would risk Soviet intervention.

Besides, the United Nations has already taken a first step to the permanent solution of its difficulties in financing special peacekeeping operations. It submitted a request for, and received from the World Court this summer, an advisory opinion stating that expenditures authorized for UNEF and UNOC constituted expenses of the Organization within the meaning of the charter. Thus, under the terms of the assessment provisions of the U.N. Charter the General Assembly could withdraw the voting right of any member state whose arrears on peacekeeping assessments equaled 2 years of its regular assessment.

The Court decision thereby provided the important missing link between financial obligations and voting rights in the General Assembly. It is possible, in fact, that the General Assembly may never actually have to apply this sanction but that the threat of its application alone will convince members to pay their assessments. It is worth noting that during July two U.N. members who had previously contributed nothing to the Congo operation—Libya and El Salvador—made substantial payments.

I repeat: The purchase of U.N. bonds by the United States will allow actions necessary for the maintenance of peace

and security in the Middle East and the Congo to be continued until a final solution is found for the U.N. financial difficulties. Failure of the United States to purchase U.N. bonds would force an end to both these operations and would thereby seriously jeopardize world peace and security.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, certain events which occurred more than 40 years ago are relevant today.

In the presidential election of 1916 both parties advocated U.S. membership in the League of Nations. In 1919 and again in 1920 the proposal to ratify our membership, though couched with substantial reservations, was defeated and we abandoned at that point in history our partnership in international affairs. I say that that decision was a regrettable mistake.

"Of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these: 'It might have been.'"

What would have been the course of history if we had been a member of the League of Nations from 1924 to 1931 when the league seemed to be gaining in the cause of world peace? And what would have been the course of history when there occurred the Manchurian War, Mussolini's adventure in Ethiopia, and the formation of the Rome-Berlin Axis?

Let us imagine that during this period the wisdom, strength, and the sense of right that are our claim to world leadership were exercised then. I think that the Second World War might have been avoided. The question that faces us today is the same that faced the Congress 40 years ago. Will we make the same mistake? Will we let the United Nations go down the drain like the League of Nations? I say no. I think that Americans believe that the United Nations, with all its imperfections, has helped the cause of world peace. It has been said that the presence of dissidents obstructs the function of the U.N., which is to maintain peace.

The record does not support the assertion. The presence of delegations from Communist countries did not prevent the U.N. from helping to secure the withdrawal of Soviet troops from northern Iran as far back as 1946. They did not prevent the U.N. from helping to put down a Communist-led insurrection in Greece a year later. They did not prevent the U.N. from bringing a stop to fighting between India and Pakistan over Kashmir; between Israel and the Arab States in 1948; and between the Arab States and Britain, France, and Israel again in 1956.

The presence of delegations from Communist countries did not prevent the U.N. from organizing the defense of Korea against an invasion from the Communist government in the north, later supported by the Chinese Communists. It did not prevent the U.N. from sending a peacekeeping mission to the Congo to prevent chaos, civil war, and the risk of world war III. Nor did



they prevent the U.N. from working out a nonviolent resolution of the issue between the Indonesians and Holland over Dutch West Guinea.

The record shows that the U.N. has, in fact, been able, under trying circumstances, to preserve the peace and to do it despite everything that the Soviets and other Communist members have been able to do to prevent it from pursuing this historic role.

Take Korea. The United States bore the great brunt of that action, but 14 members of the U.N. also contributed troops and an additional number contributed supplies. Would any more have taken part or made contributions if there had been a permanent organization of 40-odd members? If so, would it have improved the effectiveness of the defense of Korea?

Take the Suez crisis. The United States supported, and still supports the U.N. Emergency Force financially and logistically. Would American troops have added to or detracted from the capacity of this force to maintain a delicate peace in the Middle East for the last 6 years?

Take the Congo. We helped pay for the U.N. operation in the Congo and we backed it up with a difficult airlift. In this dangerous and sensitive situation, great patience, bolstered by strength, has prevented open confrontation between the major powers.

I submit that the resolution of the quarrel that separates us from our foes rests more fully in an international parliament than it does in threat, belligerence, or bluff.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my support to S. 2768 because I believe its passage is important not only to the foreign policy of the United States but to the tenuous hope we have of ultimate world peace.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in my congressional career that I have discussed a matter involving foreign policy in this House. I have refrained largely because I consider foreign policy too delicate a problem for the give and take and pushing and hauling of partisan debate.

I speak today because I am convinced that failure to pass this bill could lead to the collapse of the United Nations and because I believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people do not want that to happen.

The United Nations has been described here as an agency which has fallen far short of the glowing hopes nearly two decades ago. It has been described as an imperfect weapon in the war against total war.

All these things are true, but who would dare face the bleakness of a brawling world in which nations refused to even discuss their differences.

The distinguished Speaker of the House a few hours ago emphasized the nonpartisanship of this problem. He used one word which impressed itself deeply upon my mind. That word was "patience."

The Communist world firmly believes that we are an impatient nation. They are convinced of our ability to respond to a fiery challenge, but they think that our national patience will erode before the long, grinding, vexatious course of a 50-year cold war.

When I note our efforts, our victories and our defeats in the United Nations I have a feeling that it is something like wrestling on a slippery soapy tile floor. When you engage in that kind of wrestling match, you expect some hard bumps.

Our choice here is whether we continue to wrestle for the ultimate triumph of our cause or abandon the arena forever and serve notice on our citizens, including our children, that we have abandoned all hope for peace.

I have heard it stated many times here that our efforts in the United Nations and elsewhere in the international arena have failed because, it is claimed, we have been unable to have our way in every corner of the globe.

I have heard it said that we have more enemies than we had before we started.

If we accept that dismal philosophy, why not go all the way? Why not suggest that because of the evil in the world after centuries of effort by men of the cloth that we turn our backs on them and tear down our churches?

I am sure that a vote today against this bill might very well please some people in your districts and mine. It would have a special appeal to the uninformed orator at the end of the bar or to the dogmatic know-it-all in some country club locker room.

Personally, I do not care what those people think. I am interested in the survival of our country and I refuse to be a party to the scrapping of all hope because we have not yet forged the perfect weapon for international peace.

If you want to scrap the United Nations here and now that is your privilege, but before you do it directly or indirectly, have the courage to admit what you are doing.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, all who remember the story of Alice in Wonderland will recall her problems in knowing what was reality and what was not. Today, more than at any time in our history, it seems to be more and more difficult to separate reality from fancy. In wandering through the maze of evidence, history of financial insecurity, and the speedy growth of the United Nations from 50 members at the time of its inception on June 26, 1945, in San Francisco—to its 104 member nations in the space of 17 years—and not to speak of the mushrooming of the specialized agencies and international organizations to 16, which cover every area of economic and political influence from the Food and Agriculture Organization down to, or up to the World Meteorological Organization—it is not too difficult for outsiders to begin to feel a little like Alice did during her adventures.

The Charter of the United Nations is an eloquent and idealistic expression of the hopes and aspirations of the human race. It has been compared to the U.S. Constitution by some who feel the aims of the United Nations are comparable to the aims of the United States. While the aims may be similar the results surely are far different.

Many of our citizens have become discouraged with the United Nations. They feel—and rightfully so—that this Organization has not fully lived up to its original promise, or its potential for good. At the time we joined, as a nation, we looked forward to the time when all nations would adopt as their own—and conduct their affairs in accord with—the objectives outlined in the United Nations Charter. If and when this laudable aim becomes a reality, we can feel that our hopes and expectations for this world organization have been fulfilled.

Meanwhile, however, we must face the fact that until that has taken place—the United Nations must necessarily serve as a forum for parliamentary diplomacy, in which our Nation—in concert with others—can attempt to develop the hopes and expectations of the world.

In speaking today I call attention to my resolution, House Joint Resolution 596, which I introduced on January 10, 1962, and which has been before the House Foreign Affairs Committee since that time. It, of course, has been ignored—as have many other resolutions of like nature—because it does not conform to the request of the President that the U.S. purchase \$100 million worth of bonds, for the purpose of bailing out the U.N. from its financial difficulties. My resolution would simply require all nations professing to subscribe to the principles of the United Nations Charter to live up to their obligations by meeting their share of costs. Until this membership requirement is recognized by members I see no possibility of the U.N. attaining its necessary stature.

We have been considering the financial straits in which the United Nations finds itself today. It is not hard to determine, of course, when going through the reports and the "Statement on Collection of Contributions," printed and regularly distributed by the United Nations Secretariat—just why this Organization is in this sad state of affairs. I suppose the first and foremost reason concerns the common error which the original group of nations fell into—of allowing a veto in the Security Council. It did not take onlookers, or the actual members of the U.N. too long to realize that not all the nations who subscribed to its charter and who drew the cloak of the U.N. about them—did so not because of their love for their fellow man, or neighboring countries—but because of their desire to propagandize and use the Organization for a soundingboard for their particular political purposes.

The financial problems are tied up in the actions and nonaction of some of the 104 members. The present deficit, however, cannot be laid at the door of

the new small and underprivileged countries, which include Sierra Leone, Syria—formerly a part of the United Arab Republic—Mauritania, Mongolia, and Tanganyika.

These new nations are not expected, of course, to assume full costs as other members are expected to do. However, I want to point out as noteworthy that in the latest listing of pledges and actual purchases by some members of the U.N. bonds, that one of the newest members, Sierra Leone, first pledged \$10,000 and then raised it to \$28,000. Sierra Leone has a population of only 2,500,000. Tiny little Mauritania, with a population of only 650,000, has pledged \$4,082. By these acts, these small nations have indicated an interest in the survival and solvency of the United Nations which obviously is not shared by those countries most responsible for its practically bankrupt condition.

This brings us quite naturally to a discussion of the Communist bloc of nations—11 in all when Outer Mongolia is counted—and their attitude toward the United Nations. It also brings up the question of what—if anything—can be done to bring these nations of the U.N. into a more responsible capacity, as members. Needless to say, they are the worst offenders, as far as delinquent payment of assessments are concerned. Of these Communist-bloc countries, however, we have to exempt Yugoslavia, who between May and June of this year, pledged to purchase \$200,000 of U.N. bonds. The remaining 10, however, are not only delinquent, but in my opinion have made it clear they do not intend to pay up their fair share. As far back as 1960, the attitude was expressed in the 1960 Report of U.S. Participation in the U.N., part V, concerning budgetary, financial, and administrative matters. I read:

The meetings of the Assembly's Committee (Administrative and Budgetary), were marked by a sustained Soviet-bloc attack on the Secretary General, the present structure and organization of the Secretariat, and the conduct of the operations in the Congo. The Soviet bloc repeatedly stated its absolute refusal to pay any part of the ONUC costs.

The United Nations, whose structure comprises five main sections, the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat of the United Nations, under whom are listed eight committees or commissions, and in turn, under whom are 13 specialized agencies, as well as three other international organizations, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Caribbean Commission, and the South Pacific Commission—is a farflung organization, with its influence and tentacles reaching into every corner of the earth. It not only has grown tremendously since its inception in 1945, but it is obvious to anyone that this is bound to become more and more of an expensive organization to maintain. Therefore, I feel it is not wise for the United States to place itself in the position of being the underwriter of the U.N. financial problems. In all effective organizations, when anyone joins, they assume responsibilities for certain

things. If they do not live up to their responsibilities, they normally either leave voluntarily or are asked to resign from membership. This may be a harsh attitude to take, but it is also a known fact that dissidents can ruin any group. It appears to me and to many others that if the Charter of the United Nations is too difficult to live up to, a statement attributed to Secretary General U Thant—that the U.N. Charter needs revising—is true. There certainly appears to be no doubt in anyone's mind that the administrative and financial setup of the U.N. needs revising.

Secretary General Thant has also been quoted as stating that running expenses of the U.N. will be at least \$86,640,000 in 1963. This represents an advance of \$4,500,000 over the appropriations for this year. Further, these appropriations do not include cost of 14 projects, including conferences at Geneva.

The United States is not only assessed 30 percent of the budget costs, but we also contribute millions annually to special U.N. funds. As of last April, the U.N. was in the hole for \$146,100,000 because of peacekeeping operations in the Congo and in the Middle East. These, incidentally, are not a part of the regular budget. The money received so far from the sale of U.N. bonds, which you will recall was, as of September 12, \$27,750,000 in actual purchases out of \$73,168,257 pledged, has already been spent, according to Secretary U Thant.

The Secretary has also stated that a 5-percent increase in staffing will be necessary next year to meet demands for more activities. The United Nations now employs 4,072 people here and at Geneva, and their salaries comprise about 56 percent of the total budget. Meetings of the U.N. from 1954 to 1960 have averaged 1,500 a year, and meetings scheduled for this year total 2,198. All this will mean a tremendous increase in expense.

This is a clue, I believe, to one of the things wrong with the United Nations. For example, innumerable debates, declarations and resolutions expanding the U.N. effort have been approved by an overwhelming majority of the U.N. members, according to Secretary General U Thant. However, of this overwhelming majority of members, each of whom, we must remember, has one vote in the General Assembly—regardless of their size or populations, or resources—cannot as yet accept full responsibility for their acts. Meanwhile, however, they are in a position, through their vote, of being responsible for increasing the responsibilities and obligations of other member nations. To carry this Alice in Wonderland approach a little further—many who are large enough and able enough to carry their responsibilities, refuse to do so—and with full immunity from punishment or reprisal. I am, of course, referring to the Soviet Union—who ignore the World Court advisory opinion concerning the legality of the U.N. Congo and Middle East peacekeeping efforts, and have run up a delinquent account of \$32.8 million—one-third of the total arrears of \$81.9 million as of July 31 of this year.

This would parallel, it seems to me, the utter foolishness we would be exhibiting if we let a large group of carefree citizens troop onto the House floor and vote appropriations left and right for every pet project they could think of.

While I hesitate to admit it, this, of course, is what sometimes is done during the deliberations of Congress by supposedly older, wiser, and more responsible adults. Too often in the past and in the present as well, it seems we have had a field day at the expense of the taxpayer, when voting for various spending measures without the faintest idea of whether or not the money is available, or what it might later cost the country.

But to indicate the increase in spending taking place at the United Nations, a watchdog budget advisory committee of 12 nations showed that in 1958 the actual expenses of the U.N. were \$62,500,000. In 1961, this jumped to a figure of \$71 million, and in 1962, to \$82 million.

Our House Committee on Foreign Affairs has, in its report on S. 2678, which we will be voting on, prepared what appears to me to be a "study in frustration." The report admits the cause of the U.N. deficit to be the Congo and Middle East peacekeeping operations. The Congo operation—UNOC—costs the U.N. about \$120 million per year, to finance its 18-nation, 18,000-troop operation. The Middle East force—UNEF—maintains 5,100 troops along the Israel-Egyptian border, and this costs the U.N. about \$20 million a year.

The financing undertaken by the United States includes 32.02 percent for its regular U.N. budget assessment. We also pay the same percentage, 32.02 percent for the UNEF and UNOC operations. As a further study in frustration, we find that out of the 104 member nations of the U.N., 66 are in arrears for the Congo account, and 56 in arrears for the Middle East assessment. Therefore, the United States, in order to maintain what we evidently consider to be important contributions to maintain the peace, has been making additional payments called voluntary contributions, which actually has resulted in our paying 47.70 percent, or \$114.5 million of the Congo expense, and 46.95 percent, or \$57.6 million for the UNEF military costs.

Various reasons have been set forth in the committee report for the failure of U.N. members to pay their fair share of Congo and UNEF assessments. First, the report states the Soviet-bloc countries oppose the operations and would be happy to have them fail. I might interject here that they also oppose our country and would like to have us fail. Some smaller nations, while exercising their right of 1 vote each most of the time, feel the peacekeeping operations are the responsibility of the larger powers and we should assume the cost. Again, other countries maintain that under the charter terms, the special assessments are not binding on the members as are the regular assessments. Then, some of the new and less developed countries simply maintain that they are unable to



pay the relatively small assessments levied against them.

The committee report also admits that collection of arrearages is not the answer. Even in the unlikely event that the Soviet bloc would feel obliged to pay their delinquent special assessments—because of the World Court advisory opinion—this would not be done until the end of their grace period of 2 years provided for in article 19 of the charter. Therefore, states the report, this would not solve the immediate problem.

Somehow, the committee reasoning has followed a full circle, and we find ourselves, if we accept its statements, not only in the position of having to shoulder a burden rightfully belonging to other countries, but also accused of playing into the hands of the Soviet Union if we insist that they and other delinquent nations have to shoulder their own responsibility.

Offhand, I do not believe I can recall having read a more apologetic report by a committee of Congress, during my service as Representative from North Dakota. The report carefully lists all the facts and reasons we should rightfully be disgusted—and then proceeds to tell us we cannot afford to be disgusted because it would put us in a bad light with the Soviets. Just who are we trying to impress? And, incidentally, just who are we trying to protect?

We are further cautioned in the report that we cannot afford not to finance this "Alice in Wonderland" adventure. Neither can the United Nations expel the Soviet Union because she has the veto power and therefore is in a position to prevent a full vote in the Security Council, and neither can the U.N. obtain the necessary two-thirds vote in favor of any important revision of the charter which all concede is needed to correct its basic deficiencies, such as the right of each of the 104 member nations to an equal vote, regardless of ability to accept responsibility for their vote.

This all reminds me of the famous comedy "The Man Who Came to Dinner," excepting for the fact that this most definitely is not a comedy, but we seem to be in the same position as the family who could not get rid of their guest, even though he became a burden.

The committee report further admits there is much to criticize and little to praise in the U.N. record in the Congo, yet it concludes that the U.N. must be credited with keeping the Congo afloat, and states that while further U.N. funds cannot assure a solution of the Congo problem, and I read:

It enables the United States to meet an immediate major foreign policy problem in the most economical and effective manner.

This, of course, I seriously question.

In closing I want to say that I join wholeheartedly with my colleagues who prepared the minority views contained in the committee report. I recognize the need for an international forum, which the United Nations effectively provides, where representatives of sovereign nations may sit together and discuss and negotiate international issues. However, I do not feel the United Nations is a proper agency for the use of force in

dealing with domestic and internal problems of member states. International aggression and crisis is not, in my opinion, the situation which exists in the Congo. I cannot, in good conscience, vote for a bill which will in any way encourage a further intervention in Congolese domestic affairs. Neither can I vote for a bill which will have the effect of hanging an albatross about our necks which we do not appear to have the courage, fortitude, or initiative to remove before it destroys us.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the attention of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] and other members of the committee, because it is my intention to present at the proper time an amendment to the bill as reported by the committee, and I would certainly like the committee's reactions to it.

I recognize that in many of these matters the committee that has studied the matter certainly has a broad area of information and knowledge that sometimes is not available to other Members, and I think we should all seek advice and be concerned about the attitudes of the members of the committee that has reported out the legislation. On the other hand, and I say this with all due respect for the members of the committee I do not think that necessarily all wisdom resides in committees, and I am sure that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House would admit that sometimes they can get some ideas elsewhere. But I intend to propose this amendment, and I would point out in the beginning I do not propose it on a partisan basis.

I offer it only because I think it is an essential prerequisite, if we are to make the loan authorized by this legislation. It is an essential ingredient and a prerequisite to the future repayment of the loan. But even more, Mr. Chairman, it is, I think, an essential prerequisite to the sound operations of the United Nations itself. The amendment would be a substitute for the committee amendment which added section 5 to the bill. The amendment would eliminate section 5, which merely expresses approval by the committee and by the Congress of the decision of the International Court of Justice, and in its place, say this:

No loan may be made to the United Nations under this act until the General Assembly of the United Nations adopts the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the financial obligation of members of the United Nations.

Let me explain why I think the adoption of this amendment is essential.

First, why are we considering in the Congress today this loan and the need for it? The answer is perfectly clear because the United Nations is in financial difficulty. Take it one step further—why are they in financial difficulty? I believe it is perfectly clear again that they are in financial difficulty because of the uncertain status of the assessments for the cost of the United Nations operations in the Middle East and in the

Congo. It was the status and the nature of the assessments against the members for that operation which caused this financial difficulty and which causes them to come here and say, "We need \$200 million and we ask for a loan from the United States." I repeat, if there is any question about this issue, I hope a member of the committee will interrupt me. I say that very honestly and very sincerely because I do want to be accurate. I repeat—the United Nations is in this financial trouble, which is the reason for this loan, because of the uncertain status of the special assessments for these two operations. Because of that uncertain status, last December the General Assembly asked by resolution that the International Court of Justice help them out of this uncertainty. They requested an advisory opinion of the Court. They asked the Court to determine if these expenditures constituted—and I quote—"expenses of the organization" within the meaning of article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations. That was the question submitted to the International Court of Justice. If it was found that they did constitute "such expenses of the organization" assessments or apportionment among the members could be considered then as being on the same basis as the general assessments and the nonpayment would be subject to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations with respect to delinquency in the payment of assessments including the matter of the continued right to vote.

Now the International Court of Justice has rendered a decision. I would point out that this was subsequent to the consideration of this issue in the other body. It was subsequent to the hearings of the committee in the House. It was handed down on July 20. The Court held that the expenditures were "expenses of the organization within the meaning of article 17, paragraph 2."

Now we are faced with this difficulty. The decision of the International Court in interpreting the Charter of the United Nations is not like submitting a question of interpretation of the Constitution to the Supreme Court of the United States. A decision of the U.S. Supreme Court is self-implementing—it becomes the law of the land.

A decision, however, of the International Court of Justice does not become the law of the United Nations. It is not self-implementing. It is an advisory decision. I would point out that I think that this differentiation is necessary, because in section 5 of the committee bill I think a person might get the impression that because it is a decision of the Court that therefore it is self-enforcing; but I think the public should know that it is not. The General Assembly of the United Nations can ignore it, or they can accept it. But it is because of the fact that it is not self-implementing that I suggest that if it is to be effective we should say that this loan will be predicated upon whether they carry out that decision. This is not some formula for operations that the United States is dictating, not some formula set up by the Congress through saying that "this is

the only way to do it, this is the way you have got to do it because we so decide." This is a decision of the International Court of Justice and it was made at the request of the United Nations itself in an attempt to get rid of the uncertainty, the uncertainty that is the cause of the financial trouble. And we are asked to make a loan to help them out. If this International Court decision is to have any meaning, it must be accepted and it must be adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. I do not think there can be any question about that. Otherwise uncertainty will continue to exist with respect to the status of these special assessments.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore come to what I think are rather simple facts. Certainly if this bill is enacted, whether we are for it or against it, it would seem that only good business judgment dictates that this amendment should be adopted. So, as I say, we come to these simple facts: No. 1, this loan is required because the United Nations is in financial difficulty today.

No. 2. It is in difficulty because of the uncertainty as to the status of expenses of certain operations of the United Nations; and

No. 3. The International Court has decided as to the status of these expenditures and what they should be if the United Nations finances are to be conducted on a sound basis and in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

The question before us, then, is whether we are going to make a loan to alleviate this financial problem, without insisting that the organization put their financial house in order by conforming to the decision of the International Court of Justice. Mr. Chairman, good business commonsense dictates that before we make this loan we insist that the United States accept the decision of the Court.

If anyone is to have any respect for us and for the United States, it seems to me we must insist on this, just as sound business judgment; and let me say that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House which reported this bill recognizes that the United Nations should adopt the Court's decision.

In fact, they say so in so many words in section 5, and also in section 4. They agree that the United Nations has to do something to get its financial house in order, and one of the things they should do is to implement that Court decision.

Why not insist? And that is the question I ask. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] will address himself to it. Why not insist that it be done as a prerequisite to this loan? It is all involved in the financial condition of the U.N. It is a business proposition. At least we are told it is. We are told there is a provision for repayment and we have conditions for repayment. It is a business transaction, they say, a business transaction which is in our interest, they say. But why not insist, then, that there be a prerequisite that they get their financial house in order?

If such action would be dictating to the United Nations, as my friend from

Wisconsin has suggested when he was asked a question by the gentleman from Iowa, may I ask, what is wrong in dictating that the United Nations merely carry out a court decision which the United Nations itself asked for, a decision that is directed to preventing a recurrence of the kind of situation that makes this loan a necessity?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Let me assure the gentleman that our committee has given careful consideration to his proposal, and let me further state that I have a great amount of sympathy for the gentleman's position. But if we take an adamant position and insist on this prerequisite—insist that the International Court of Justice advisory opinion must be acted upon—a court whose jurisdiction we ourselves do not automatically accept—we would find ourselves in a bit of an embarrassing position.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The United Nations recognizes the Court, though, because it asked for the decision, and we joined in voting for the resolution that asked for that decision.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes. And the Court's advisory opinions have been generally accepted by the U.N. in the past.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. What have they got to worry about?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is what we have to worry about. By adopting the gentleman's amendment, we would be creating an image of the United States which is not necessarily true. We must remember that some of the nations, members of the U.N., have already agreed to purchase the U.N. bonds without imposing similar requirements upon us.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not think the gentleman has answered my question, because I just do not know why good judgment does not dictate that if we are going to make a loan to somebody we should have the right, and the responsibility, of saying, we cannot give you this loan unless you are going to do the things that the Court has said they should do, to get their financial house in order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to compliment the gentleman on a very persuasive argument. I would also like to emphasize that I agree with him that all wisdom does not reside in committees, as he has indicated by his suggestion in this matter. This was discussed in committee, and the alternative to section 5 in the bill was presented, which suggested it was the sense of Congress that the United Nations take immediate steps to implement and approve the advisory opinion. Maybe that is perhaps a mandatory suggestion, as the gentleman from Wisconsin says, of injected direction. We would like the United Nations to move as rapidly as possible.

As the gentleman points out, there is no reason why they should not move. But if we make this a requirement for

any assistance by the United States, we are putting on a limitation which no nation has made, and it might give the Soviet bloc an opportunity to provide some obstacle which does not now exist. I think it should also be pointed out that a mandatory provision such as this puts a limitation on the Executive which is probably unnecessary and probably undesirable.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let me comment by saying that I think they have come to the point, when we talk about prestige and the respect which others have for the United States, that one of the things we could do and be most effective to increase the respect in which the United States may be held in the world is to start using some good judgment and commonsense, good business judgment. I do not think they expect us to be weak kneed, wishy-washy, and fishy on these things. They have come to us and they have asked for a loan. If this bill passes with the amendment I suggest, we will be saying "Yes, we will help you out to the extent of 50 percent of your request, but there is the World Court decision, and one of the things you have to do before we can make the loan, one of the conditions is that you have to get your financial house in order, your business house in order. That is all we are asking. Do what the Court has said the charter requires you to do."

In my opinion, it would increase the respect in which we are held in the world, if we caused them to say "The Yankees at least are starting to get down to sound business; they are not just passing money out helter-skelter, without any conditions or terms connected with it."

Mr. Chairman, it is suggested we should impose no conditions. The committee put in this bill the 50-50 condition. That is a condition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin for the sincere expression which he has made as to the solution of this problem. I think the gentleman has made an excellent point, that we have already imposed very severe conditions in this bill where we are going to match dollar for dollar, the conditions precedent being that the other nations are going to participate also. I do not, however, think that we ourselves should demonstrate any uncertainty that we have any doubt whatsoever that the World Court decision is going to be adopted. In fact, I think we should look forward with a great deal of confidence that this decision will be adopted with great promptness.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I just cannot see how writing it in here is going to raise any question that we have any uncertainty about it. If that is the case,



why did you put in section 5? Section 5 could have the same implication, but I do not think it does have that implication.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will yield further, section 5 does have the implication without tying the President's hands, which is exactly what we are trying to do—to express the concern which we all possess on this very question as to whether we are carrying our own load.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thought the gentleman just suggested if we put this in, then we would be expressing a doubt as to whether the General Assembly really would implement the decision. I say if that is the case, we can get the same implication from section 5.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will yield further, there are 104 sovereign states. If we ourselves tie a condition into it how does it bind the other sovereign states? There are only 80 nations that have indicated they will purchase and have purchased or intend to purchase bonds.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is all right.

Mr. GALLAGHER. This is more than two-thirds of the 104 that is required. I do not believe there is any doubt about it, and I think just to delay this matter and tie it up beyond another session would really not be serving the interests that we are trying to serve today.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I cannot, frankly, understand how we can say we are interfering, if all we do is tell them "You have got to comply with the decision of a court and the decision which you, the United Nations, requested." It is a decision that intimately relates to their financial ability, to their fiscal responsibility. It has to do with their financing and how they collect assessments, and who owes what. That was the purpose of asking for the decision. The decision is there. The amendment merely says "If we are going to make you a loan, first get your house in order and comply with the decision of the Court, not some gimmick we have designed as a condition, but a decision of a court." I keep emphasizing that fact.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I am sorry that I was called out to the telephone while the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] was speaking, because as the gentleman knows, this amendment was drafted by me and offered in the committee. It came within two votes of having been adopted by the committee. But after it was rejected I myself began to wonder whether I had been as wise as I thought I was in offering it. I have some doubts about the wisdom of it, both legally and practically. I am afraid it will make it harder for us to deal with the people we have to deal with.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And, is it not also morally right, as far as the United Nations is concerned, and as far as we are concerned?

Mr. JUDD. That is right. But there have been two doubts that have come up in my own mind since I proposed this amendment to the committee. One is that the language says, in effect: "We doubt whether you are going to adopt the opinion of the World Court which you yourself requested." I do not like to approach it negatively. I think we ought to say, as we have said in section 5, which prevailed as a substitute for this amendment at the time it was considered in the Foreign Affairs Committee, "You asked for this opinion. The Court has decided. We assume and take for granted that you are going to do it, and we are pleased with what you are going to do."

The second question is the extent to which we want to tie our own hands. We ought to leave ourselves some freedom of action. If we enact the proposed amendment into law, we could not act if the Soviet bloc succeeds in preventing action by the General Assembly. Do we want to say to the Soviet Union, "If you can manage to prevent a two-thirds majority from adopting the advisory opinion, the United States has committed itself and the U.N. will have to pull out of the Congo." I do not believe that is what we want to do.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think I have an idea that may set the gentleman's mind at rest a little bit on that score.

The United Nations Assembly meets on the 18th, next week, next Tuesday. This is Thursday. It would seem to me it ought to be the first item on their agenda, to get their financial house in order. If all the dire consequences are going to result that we have heard here will result if we do not make the loan, that means the financial house will have to be in order or the dire results will occur. That should be the first item on their agenda.

If you find that you cannot get this adopted by the General Assembly, we are going to be back here in January. This thing has gone along since the first of the year. Time has proved it is not of the essence. Then we can look at it again. But I cannot see just letting them leave it on the sidelines somewhere, a court decision that is directly in line with what we are considering here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot help but repeat the old saying which well describes what the gentleman from Minnesota is trying to get over to us, about the girl who said to her mother:

Mother, may I go out to swim?

Yes, my darling daughter.

Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,

But don't go near the water.

Mr. JUDD. This diversion is always amusing, but let us go on with the substance of the argument. I question, I repeat, whether the United States best serves its own interests when to some extent we commit ourselves to a course of action ahead of time. That is the reason I, in a sense, rejected my own child.

I feel we ought to make clear that we expect them to approve the World Court opinion and that this decision provides a sound foundation for the finances of the United Nations. If they do not do what they should, then we still have freedom of action and in the meantime we have not handcuffed ourselves.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let me go back. I can understand the gentleman's attitude. A lot of people say we ought to give the President carte blanche and all kinds of authority, but to me, I just think there are some things you have to stand up and say there are conditions, these are things we think are only sound and responsible. I do not know how you can have anything more responsible than, if you are going to make a loan, for the recipient of the loan to comply with the Court order and put his house in order.

Mr. JUDD. You must remember we are dealing with many nations older than we are but who do not have the resources we have.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But they are asking for \$200 million, and we are asked to put up 50 percent of the money.

There are 104 nations in the United Nations. We are one nation with one vote. We are to put up one-half of the \$200 million that is needed. It seems to me we have the right to say, "We will give it to you when you get your financial house in order."

Mr. JUDD. There are just two more points. A lot of these countries do not have the dollars and do not have any way under heaven to get the dollars.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That has not anything to do with the World Court decision, that problem will still remain.

Mr. JUDD. But the gentleman says countries other than ourselves of the 104 member countries ought to produce as much as we.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No, that was not my argument at all.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman says the World Court opinion ought to be the first order of business of the U.N. General Assembly. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Suppose the President says the first order of business is to bring in a tax bill in January. Do you think the committee would or could do that? You would have to call witnesses, you would have to hold hearings, and that takes a long time. My point is that they could not take it up the first thing without completely revamping the established and traditional procedures of the U.N.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. This is a question of interpreting the charter. It is like interpreting the Constitution. If we send a matter to the Supreme Court, what they said would automatically be the law of the land. Here they go to the Court to interpret their charter and the interpretation has come down. All they have to do is accept it. That is all they have to do. There is not any determination of any technical language or anything else. They merely have to accept it and say, "We will live by the Court's decision." Why did they ask for the Court's decision if they are not going to

pay any attention to it and obey it when it is handed down?

Mr. JUDD. As in any other legislative body, the U.N. members believe they have a right to debate.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There does not have to be any debate on such a matter as far as I am concerned.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere belief that the grave question of war and peace, which takes so much of the time and money of the taxpayers of this country—yes, even of the world—cannot be answered very quickly or with a wave of the hand. Answers have been sought for centuries, albeit not very successfully. There is no easy solution that anyone can give today to this serious question. Yet we must continue to try, as we have been trying.

The hope of the world was shattered at the end of the First World War when some intransigent individuals frustrated the wishes of our great war President, Woodrow Wilson, and kept us out of the League of Nations. This spelled the doom of that body.

In my opinion the United Nations today, despite its frailties and weaknesses, is the hope of mankind. Without the United Nations who knows if the harsh conflicts which are keeping the world in turmoil would not result in a shooting war instead of a discussion of a solution to the many serious problems presently existent?

The United Nations must be strengthened if mankind is to be preserved.

Let it be remembered that the United Nations has acted as a buffer for this Nation and as an instrument of our foreign policy when we thought it wise to do so. It has saved us the anguish of direct confrontation with contending nations that might well have resulted in a holocaust.

With these preliminary remarks, I urge that the measure at hand be enacted into law.

The United Nations loan bill, approved on a bipartisan basis, authorizes the President to loan up to \$100 million to the United Nations, subject to the proviso that this country shall match dollar for dollar the amount of bonds actually purchased—not just pledged by other countries—at 2 percent interest repayable over a period of 25 years.

Forty-six nations have pledged to purchase a total of over \$72.5 million of bonds as of August 1, 1962; this includes 19 nations who have actually purchased \$27,750,000 of bonds.

The need for the bond issue results from the grave financial crisis which the new Secretary General, U Thant, found upon taking charge last year. The bond plan was overwhelmingly approved over Soviet opposition which sought to deny the United Nations sufficient funds, obviously to sabotage its work and perhaps bring it into disrepute. This money will be used to meet outstanding debts and ongoing costs. The unwillingness of some, and the inability of other member nations to pay their assessed shares for peacekeeping operations in the Mid-

dle East and the Congo was the principal factor of the present financial crisis.

The Congo operation, which the Soviets opposed, cost the United Nations \$10 million a month; and the Middle East operation, \$750,000 monthly. Together this is about twice the United Nations regular budget. It is the hope of the Secretary General that these situations will be solved at an early date.

The loan money will reduce the U.S. share of the cost of the Congo and Middle East operations from the present 47½ to 32.02 percent.

The International Court of Justice, in July, gave an advisory opinion to the effect that a country failing to pay special assessments would lose its voting rights on the same basis as prescribed by the charter for nonpayment of funds owed under the regular budget for the preceding 2 years.

I do not think it is necessary for me to reiterate that withdrawal of the United Nations forces, for lack of funds, from the Middle East or the Congo may have the contending forces at each other's throats. I have not forgotten the Fedayeen that crossed the border into the Gaza strip which precipitated the Sinai incident in the Middle East. That area has been quiet since the United Nations forces occupied the border between Egypt and Israel.

The world dare not permit a change of the situation in that area today, especially in view of the arms sold by the Soviet to Egypt.

Events in the Congo are too recent for me to recount at this time; but implicit in the general question is the fact that but for the United Nations, our boys might have been shouldering guns in that area.

Shall we permit the possibility of Soviet penetration in the heart of Africa? Who knows but what big-power confrontation there, as in Berlin, might arise, with serious results?

This authorization of bonds, as stated by President Kennedy, represents an investment of one-tenth of 1 percent of our defense budget.

Although it is true the United Nations cannot be our sole reliance for building a peaceful world, it is, nevertheless, an extremely important force for unity in the free world.

For the Communists it is a constant worry.

We must build it up.

Passage of the present bill will help do so.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, like most Americans I am hopeful that the United Nations will prove to be an effective organization for world peace. Although at present it appears to me that the United Nations is proving a great disappointment and is not doing the effective job its originators had hoped for, we must still hope for a better day and look forward to it becoming an effective agency toward the developing of a lasting world peace.

The tremendous financial contributions made by the United States toward the operating budget of the United Nations is well known to us all. It seems to me the pending proposal for the purchase of U.N. bonds would weaken the United Nations, not strengthen it. This proposal might cause the downfall of the U.N. organization. There is a basic financial problem which confronts the U.N. which must be resolved if it is to continue as an effective international organization for peace. This bond proposal does not solve that basic problem and it is admittedly only a stopgap measure. To bail out the delinquent nations as this bond proposal attempts to do will only cause the entire financial burden to fall upon the United States with the other countries looking to us to pay all the bills while they go merrily on their way outvoting us and using the U.N. to serve their own personal needs. It seems to me when we assume so much of the financial burden, thus relieving other nations of their share of the costs, they will feel little or no responsibility to see to it that the U.N. succeeds in its purpose.

It also seems to me that the unpaid assessments which this bond issue will take care of are of doubtful purpose. The big share of this money is for the Congo operation. The United Nations was intended to use force only to cope with international crises and aggression. There is no precedent for the use of force by the U.N. to deal with domestic, internal problems of member states. There can be no justification for a continued United Nations military presence in the Congo. The present U.N. force in the Congo is not dealing with aggression. It is not there to resolve an international crisis but rather to attempt to resolve a conflict between political subdivisions within the Congo—a conflict which is purely domestic in nature.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated, I believe the purchase of these bonds will hurt the U.N. and not help it. I have always voted for the annual appropriations to support the U.S. share of the costs of the United Nations. But these so-called bonds are a different matter. As our colleagues Mr. BURLESON and Mrs. CHURCH stated in their report, the United States has hurt its own position, and similarly has hurt, rather than helped, the United Nations by assuming a totally disproportionate share of the expenses. They said further:

It certainly would increase the degree of responsibility of other member nations if they were paying their proportionate share. It would lessen suspicion of and resentment toward the United States. A benefactor who overassumes and overpays his legitimate share invariably produces such a reaction.

I, therefore, must vote against this proposal regardless of the arguments put forth in favor of it. And to those who believe these bonds are needed to keep the United Nations going I would have to support and agree with the remarks made by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE] when she suggested that if there is any great demand for the purchase of these bonds



then why not put them on the open market and let the people who believe this to be true to purchase them on the open market just as they would any other bond.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, although I had not planned to make a speech during the debate on this bill, because of the discussion that developed as the result of the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], I should like to make a few comments on his suggestion that we should develop an alternative to the present section 5.

I should like again to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin. The debate on this bill so far has been somewhat lackluster, perhaps because most Members know already how they are going to vote on final passage. And it was only when he suggested that we might provide, as a prerequisite to providing any money, that the General Assembly adopt the advisory opinion that we had lively discussion.

I would like to state, first of all, that in my opinion there is no realistic alternative but to continue to support the United Nations. The main question revolves around the specific restrictions, if any, we should put on the assistance we decide we are willing to give to the United Nations.

At this moment, I might say, I cannot find myself in direct opposition to the amendment which the gentleman from Wisconsin has proposed. This is because the restriction which he has suggested is a reasonable one. A plausible case has been made. Nonetheless, I cannot help but question whether it is the path of wisdom to adopt a mandatory provision so that we cannot provide any assistance unless the General Assembly takes certain formal action. I am not saying this restriction would be putting a pistol to the head of the United Nations. I am not saying that they would not move rapidly in this direction anyway. What we are trying to do is to push them onto a course which they voluntarily will take anyway. I am, however, saying that perhaps something less vigorous in this approach might be desirable.

The present language in the bill does not even suggest the advisability of implementation on the part of the General Assembly. It is for that reason that I am not particularly in favor of the present section 5. I do feel, as I just now suggested to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that Congress might well express its feeling that the United Nations should take immediate steps to implement the advisory opinion. But should we not suggest, instead of making mandatory? I would think that we might be able to develop some language which is stronger than in the bill now but less strong than the language proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I certainly would not close my mind to suggestions, but the thing that concerns me more than anything else is the image that we are presenting to the world today with all of the talks we had a year ago and are still having about the prestige, and so forth, of this country. It seems to me that one thing we have to do is to get their respect back, and I fear that a showing of weakness, a showing of lack of firmness, is simply the kind of thing that induces lack of respect. To me the thing needed is a little more attitude of firmness and determination, that this country knows what it wants, knows where it is going, and is reasonable in its conditions.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not find myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Wisconsin. I may say that it is important that we show firmness. I am not opposed to certain restrictions. However, it does not necessarily follow that we make it absolutely impossible to provide the aid unless this formal action is taken.

The gentleman suggests that before we provide any aid we must make it clear that the United Nations has put its financial house in order.

One of the problems in connection with this bond issue is that it is not actually going to result in having the United Nations financial house in order, any more than the General Assembly's approval of the advisory opinion is going to have that happy result. We are dealing with a palliative, not a cure. Making it mandatory on the United Nations to take immediate action if they want to get our money is not going to cure their financial trouble. As the gentleman from Minnesota points out, we may even make it more difficult for them to take this obvious step.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But it is directed to the problem of uncertainty with respect to special assessments because of these special operations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I may say I am in favor of suggesting specifically that the United Nations itself should take prompt and immediate steps to adopt this advisory opinion.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. A mandatory provision of this type that the gentleman from Wisconsin suggests could result in great danger, in that we are waving a red flag to the General Assembly, enabling them to go into a procedural wrangle which will really prevent the United Nations from doing its business. He says we should show confidence. This would be lack of confidence. There are 104 members in the United Nations. A two-thirds majority would be 70 nations. Eighty nations have already indicated or are considering that they will participate in the bond purchase. They will certainly vote their convictions to

protect the investment they will make in the United Nations. So I think we should not show uncertainty. Let us have confidence that the decision will be adopted, for I am certain that it will. The Soviet Union is very anxious about this decision. This is the first time they participated in debate. While I am in sympathy with the aims of the gentleman, I say his amendment would have the effect of a red flag, in the General Assembly, and would lead to a filibuster that would immobilize the business of the United Nations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am not sure I wholly agree with the gentleman's pessimism. I do not think other nations that pledge or advance money to the United Nations, as a result of this bond issue, would for that reason be influenced to their position with respect to approval of the Court decision. The fact is that approval of the Court decision should make it easier to collect arrears, which is one of the reasons the bond issue is necessary.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to underline this point. Everybody wants the General Assembly to adopt this advisory opinion. There is no question about that. The only question is in choosing the better approach, in deciding the best approach in getting the advisory opinion adopted. I think we have a better chance of getting it adopted if we do not put in their hands a weapon with which by wrangling, stalling, and dilatory tactics, they can delay the vote.

The present language invites approval, rather than the suggestion that you do this, you do what we want or else. I think we will get more votes for what the gentleman from Wisconsin and I both want by the language now in section 5 than we would get under the amendment I offered originally, which is what the gentleman plans to offer now. We want to get more votes in the U.N.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Since we are engaged in the process of thinking aloud, may I ask the gentleman from Minnesota whether perhaps the present language in section 5 could not be strengthened without going too far. In other words, there is no suggestion now that Congress feels there should be some prompt implementation on the part of the General Assembly with respect to the advisory opinion. The gentleman has suggested that with the present language we are taking it for granted, we are assuming such action will take place. Might we not put this proposition into more concrete form than the present language would suggest? In other words, should we not indicate that we believe action would be desirable, if not mandatory?

Mr. JUDD. Actually, I must say section 5 is a little stronger than the facts quite warrant. It says:

The Congress hereby expresses its satisfaction that the International Court of Justice has decided that the expenditures

authorized in resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly relating to operations in the Middle East and in the Congo are expenses of operation within the meaning of the United Nations Charter.

I think that provides a sound basis for obtaining prompt action.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. First, as to what the gentleman from Minnesota just said, he is leaving the impression that the court has decided something. That is what a lot of people are thinking; namely, that something has been automatically decided. In this instance that is not the case, as far as the decision of this particular court is concerned. It is meaningless unless the United Nations Assembly implements it.

The gentleman talks about votes in the United Nations. I think we ought to be a little concerned here about votes in the House of Representatives. We have heard all this talk that unless this loan bill goes through and we are in the position of giving them \$100 million, the whole United Nations is going to fold up and fail. That argument has been made continuously. They started to make it last January when the President sent this up here. They said it was necessary for the survival of the United Nations. Now they suggest that the United Nations is going to destroy itself merely because the Congress of the United States says that before you can borrow \$100 million from us you have got to conform to a court decision, that you will have to put your financial house in order. That kind of logic I cannot understand. They will not destroy themselves just because we put in that language.

Mr. JUDD. Nobody disputes the logic of the matter. The question is, Which way can you get them to do this, which is perfectly logical.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say that I do not think the United Nations, as a practical matter, is going to refuse to approve the advisory opinion. They sought this opinion, and it will help them in their present financial problems. The question is how can we get them to act as quickly as possible and, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] says, what is the best way? I happen to feel that the mandatory approach may not be the best method.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the United Nations Organization was conceived and organized during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations to achieve international accord and world peace.

Today we are debating the question of the U.S. purchase of \$100 million of United Nations bonds as recommended by President Kennedy. The Congo and Middle East peacekeeping operations proved to be very costly. And there are some member nations that have refused to pay their share of the special assessments authorized to cover these addi-

tional costs. As a result the World Organization is near bankruptcy.

This bond issue is designed to provide interim relief. Recently, the World Court ruled that the special assessments were binding on all members just as are the regular assessments. So it is likely all countries except the Communist bloc will pay their obligations in the future. If the World Organization can be tided over by the successful sale of this bond issue the prospects for a fiscally sound U.N. are good.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow the United Nations to founder on the shoals of bankruptcy. Peace is the great hope of all mankind and we cannot afford to throw away this chance to attain it. The existence of concord and harmony in the world is to the advantage of mankind. The costs that these bonds are designed to cover were incurred in operations aimed at preserving local order and world peace. It is significant that the Soviet Union has always refused to pay its share. We should approve the purchase of these bonds thereby giving the United Nations a real chance to attain financial soundness and responsibility. The World Organization deserves this chance.

The prophet of old said: "Where there is no vision, the people perish." I hope the Members of the House will have the vision to vote for this bill and also envision the time "when the war drums beat no longer and the battle flags are furled in the parliament of man and in the United Nations of the world."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, the people of today's world are faced with a problem more complex and pressing than any encountered by our ancestors. Never before has society been threatened with total destruction. Never before have the fruits of countless generations been threatened by the mistake of one. Never before have children had to grow up under the shadow of a mushroom-shaped cloud. I wish I could report that peace was right around the corner, and that soon the people of the world would embrace one another in brotherly love. But to report that would be to report a lie, a self-deception, and, consequently, to bring us further from the ultimate goal of peace. The world scene has not improved considerably. There are still trouble spots around the globe, and conflict could easily arise in any number of countries—Germany, Vietnam, Laos, Cuba, and so forth. Meanwhile, the terrifying weapons which could be used in such conflicts are not being contained by the two major powers, but rather are spreading slowly to other powers, thus enhancing the chances of disaster.

Few forums exist through which we can avert the extermination of the human race. One such means is the United Nations, a body designed to promote international understanding and world peace, a body where the two major power blocs can communicate and discuss with each other on vital issues, a body which can locate, inhibit, and prevent conflict. But the United Nations, one of our last

forums to insure the peace, will cease to exist unless we support S. 2768 or similar legislation, for the U.N. is in the midst of a financial crisis. The principal factor which caused this crisis was the unwillingness of some and the inability of other members to pay their assessed share for the United Nations emergency operations in the Congo and in the Middle East. The Soviet bloc and Cuba have argued that they are not legally obligated to pay their share of the emergency operations, and many of the smaller countries are unable to pay these heavy short-term costs on a pay-as-you-go basis in addition to their regular assessments. Consequently, the unpaid United Nations bills, plus borrowing from other accounts, totaled over \$113 million on December 31, 1961, and arrears on the regular budget, the U.N. emergency fund, and the Congo totaled about \$93 million. The Secretary General of the U.N. has found that the existing methods of decreasing the deficit are not sufficient, and that unless countries loan the international organization approximately \$200 million, a collapse of the United Nations peacekeeping operations will inevitably ensue. There is little doubt in anyone's mind that the United States is the only major power both willing and capable of sustaining the U.N. It is for these reasons that the Senate passed S. 2768, which would authorize \$100 million to be appropriated to the President for a loan to the United Nations, and it is for these reasons that I urge my colleagues to vote for S. 2768 today. As amended by the House, S. 2768 would authorize the President to match on a 50-50 basis loans pledged to the United Nations by other countries. Our loan, however, would not exceed \$100 million. The terms, conditions, and number of loans would be left to the discretion of the President.

Now let us examine critically the arguments offered by the opponents of the bill. Some say that the United Nations has accomplished nothing, and that to give them additional financial assistance would be to waste money. Granted, the United Nations has not succeeded in its every effort, but to conclude that it has not accomplished anything is to ignore the truth. Although the United Nations encountered and is encountering numerous difficulties in handling the Congo situation, it is a fact that law and order now exist again in the Congo, except for rare political or tribal disturbances. It is a fact that the Congolese Parliament was reconvened in July 1961 through United Nations effort and protection, and approved the constitution of a central government universally recognized and gaining daily in strength and experience. And it is a fact that the basic problem of the Congo, namely lack of training, is being tackled by a program of training and assistance under United Nations auspices. One must also realize that during the period when lawlessness and violence prevailed in the Congo, the Communists were ready to move in, and if the U.N. had not established law and order, a strategic area would have been lost to the Eastern bloc. As Clark M. Eichelberger,



executive director of the American Association for the United Nations, points out:

In retrospect, one can find mistakes. The fact of the matter is, however, that the United Nations has saved the Congo and probably the peace in Africa.

The United Nations has played a similarly important role in the Middle East. It was extremely influential in bringing about a cease fire and a withdrawal of troops at the time of the dangerous Suez crisis, and it was responsible for converting the Gaza strip from an explosive area to a quiet one. The U.N. Middle East Force stands today as an ideal example of how a small and relatively inexpensive international peace force can help to keep a tense area stabilized while political conflicts are resolved through negotiation and adjustment.

The United Nations favorable stands on Korea in 1950 and on Lebanon in 1958, and the United Nations efforts in the fields of health, food, technical assistance, and economic aid should also be considered by those who think the U.N. has done nothing.

Others feel that the United States cannot afford to spend \$100 million. They protest: "We can't give away \$100 million." To these let me say that S. 2768 does not propose that we give away \$100 million. It authorizes that we loan \$100 million. The difference between a gift and a loan is great—in this case a \$100 million difference. We will be getting this money back from the regular dues paid by United Nations members, including the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet bloc, and this money will be returned with interest. Furthermore, it seems to me that if we can afford to appropriate approximately \$50 billion annually for our defense, we can afford to loan \$100 million 1 year for the preservation of the peace.

Some argue that since the Soviet Union has refused to fulfill its obligation, Should we take the burden upon ourselves? To these let me ask this question: When do two wrongs make a right? If the U.S.S.R. decides to obstruct the actions of the United Nations, does this mean we should help her destroy it and similarly block the road toward peace? It is comforting to know that the destructive actions of the Soviet Union have not gone unnoticed and will hopefully not go unpunished. The International Court of Justice has recently determined in an advisory opinion that the emergency assessments are binding on the U.N. members, thereby enabling the United Nations to take away the voting rights in the General Assembly from any member nation refusing to pay these assessments.

In conclusion, one could say that the road to peace is an expensive and tortuous one, that in the past the United States has been the pioneer traveler on this road, and that the passage of S. 2768 will be in keeping with our leadership of the liberty-loving nations of the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, as the Committee today debates

whether or not the United States will invest \$100 million in United Nations bonds, United Nations troops stand alert in central Africa and the Middle East, exerting a truly herculean effort to maintain the peace in those troubled areas of the world. These efforts are but the latest in the United Nations continuous 14-year struggle against the forces of war and chaos.

Certainly these 14 years have not been without United Nations failures. In a sense every United Nations military action, successful or not, has been a failure to maintain peace through other diplomatic means. However, given the realities of the postwar world, where the use of force unfortunately has been a reality, the United Nations has helped immeasurably to preserve the peace.

In 1946 a civil war in Greece threatened the relative quiet of that postwar year. Communist-dominated Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria were supplying aid to the Greek rebels. At the time, however, no way existed to prove this fact to the international community. Without such proof, interference from this or any other country would have been unacceptable to the rest of the world. In the midst of this crisis the United Nations created a special commission which investigated the border situation and provided proof that the three countries were fomenting rebellion within Greece. Partially on the basis of the United Nations findings the United States supplied military and economic aid to a faltering Greece and received the thanks of the Greek people and the acclaim of the free world.

During the next year, 1947, fighting in Indonesia again caused the United Nations to act. The Security Council quickly called for a cease-fire and helped negotiate a truce. When the fighting again broke out in 1948, the Security Council continued as mediator and finally brought the Dutch and the Indonesians together to sign a peace agreement. The Republic of Indonesia came into being in 1949 and was admitted into the United Nations in 1950. Because of the United Nations work, a new nation was born without the direct intrusion of either the Eastern or Western Powers. Indonesia's struggle was isolated from the cold war because the world community acted in concert through the United Nations Security Council. If I may jump ahead in history for a moment, I would like to note that recently the United Nations again brought the Dutch and the Indonesians together to compromise the New Guinea dispute.

Developing simultaneously with the Dutch-Indonesian dispute was another major question—Palestine. When Britain first brought this problem to the United Nations in 1947, the General Assembly devised a partition plan to divide the British mandate into two separate states and an international Jerusalem. The Arab nations, unsatisfied with the plan, invaded Israel, and a full-scale war broke out in 1948, when the mandate officially ended. After long and frustrating efforts the United Nations concluded an armistice in 1949. Since then the United Nations has kept

a close watch on border violations. In 1956, when fighting flared up again, the United Nations created a special emergency force which is still on duty and patrols the Gaza strip today, preventing another outbreak of hostilities. The United Nations has not solved the Arab-Israel dispute, but it has prevented the dispute from becoming a full-scale war.

In June of 1950 the North Korean armies marched across the border into South Korea. The Security Council ordered the forces to withdraw, but the invasion continued. Then, for the first time in its history, the United Nations mobilized a military force, under U.S. leadership, and commissioned the new international army to drive back the North Koreans. This they did.

The United Nations action in Korea did not destroy our enemies. It did, however, focus attention on, and verify, the fact of North Korean aggression. It marshaled world opinion behind the organization of military power under the banner of the United Nations, and it brought together men, weapons, and material to repel the Communist invaders.

The United Nations Congo operation represents one of its most difficult peace efforts. In mid-1960 when chaos threatened the newly independent Congo, the Congolese Government asked for, and the Secretary General sent, a small force under the United Nations flag in an attempt to keep the peace. United Nations troops have been there ever since. United Nations action in the Congo prevented the situation from becoming the spark setting a global war.

I cite the foregoing as examples of how the United Nations during the last 14 years has prevented tensions and even armed conflict from exploding into worldwide conflagration. The United Nations, generally and on all major issues, has been consistent with our interests. In the 14 years of its operation the United Nations undoubtedly has saved the United States millions of dollars and perhaps thousands of lives.

As long as widespread illiteracy, hunger, and disease exist, the international situation will remain unstable. The United Nations efforts in these areas are not as spectacular as its efforts in the military and political, but, in the long run, they are more significant. They promise not a temporary peace based on short-lived compromises but a permanent peace founded on continuing progress.

The goals of the United Nations are monumental—the alleviation of pain, the reduction of disease, the abolition of hunger, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. These are goals made familiar to every American during the 1930's, and now they are being made familiar to the underprivileged of the world in the 1960's. Since 1949 the United Nations specialized agencies, UNESCO, World Health Organization, International Labor Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, and the rest, have been administering programs of technical and economic assistance designed to relieve misery wherever and in whatever form it is found. The United

Nations has brought the people of the world closer to the knowledge that these goals are real and can be achieved.

The accomplishments of the specialized agencies are so numerous and so diverse that it is difficult to present an organized picture of what they have done. All of the programs have one factor in common, however; they touch the people directly, benefiting individuals more than governments.

In Latin America, in the Near East, and in the Far East, over 1,000 experts are at work on national programs for fighting illiteracy and for mobilizing community efforts for needed projects. Forty percent of the adults in the world cannot read or write, and more than 250 million children receive no schooling at all. Through UNESCO the United Nations has set up two regional centers for training future teachers—one in Mexico and one in Egypt. National education centers are also in operation in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Jordan, Korea, Liberia, the Sudan, and Thailand.

In a large part of the world malaria has been virtually wiped out. But more than 1,300 million people are exposed to the danger of this disease. The World Health Organization instituted a program which has eradicated the disease in countries and territories with a total population of 298 million. Eradication programs in operation now cover about 612 million more people. The World Health Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund have also begun a program to stamp out yaws, a crippling infection which threatens half the people in tropical areas. Already 100 million people have been examined and 35 million given penicillin treatment.

Throughout much of the world hunger is still a great problem. Experts estimate that, of the 2,800 million people living today, from one-third to one-half face permanent hunger or malnutrition. The Food and Agriculture Organization's Freedom From Hunger Campaign faces a tremendously difficult task. The Organization has participated in more than 2,000 technical aid missions around the world. In Cambodia Food and Agriculture Organization technical experts helped the Government to set up a poultry improvement plan which has raised the egg output by 50 percent and decreased the chicken mortality by one-third. In Libya 6 years of United Nations work resulted in the production of more wool and better animals for slaughter. Just a few years ago El Salvador had to rely on the import of cheap surplus dairy products for most of its needs. Now after assistance from the Food and Agriculture Organization and UNICEF El Salvador has 200,000 dairy cows yielding about 2.4 liters per cow per day or some 480,000 liters for the population of 2,300,000.

United Nations accomplishments do not end here. In Liberia a community of 600 dwellings completely destroyed by fire was replanned and rebuilt. In Thailand a pulp and paper expert showed how a mill could increase its production and turn an operating deficit into a profit. After 4 years of work United Nations scientists and technicians showed

the Mexicans and Central Americans how to control plagues. A Yugoslav factory, which was idle despite new equipment, was put into full operation because the United Nations helped to train personnel. Thousands of European refugees have been resettled; Chinese refugees in Hong Kong have been assisted; and nearly 1 million Palestine refugees have been cared for.

I have not made a complete list of either the agencies or the achievements of these agencies. Note, for instance, the World Bank and its Indus River Basin and Volta River projects, and the International Labor Organization's school project in Greece and its bulldozers in Pakistan. In all over 9,000 experts have been recruited from 80 countries and territories since 1950. Also, the United Nations has sent 15,000 people to other countries for training, so they can continue to implement the projects which the United Nations has started.

All of the people of the world have benefited greatly from the activities of the United Nations specialized agencies. The cost to the American people for these programs has been small. In 1961 each American paid less than 64 cents to maintain all of the United Nations humanitarian efforts. This is because the United Nations has administered its aid money efficiently. It stretches the aid dollar far. For instance, the United States contributed \$69 million to the special fund, a United Nations organ created to implement the work of the specialized agencies. This \$69 million has generated, through the special fund, projects calling for a total of \$415 billion or almost six times the U.S. contribution.

In a recent meeting sponsored by the Association for the Advancement of the United Nations, Paul Hoffman, managing director of the special fund, explained the reasons why the United Nations can make effective use of development dollars. I would like to quote his comments because I think they illustrate why the United Nations has been effective in this area. Mr. Hoffman said:

All member nations of the United Nations are partners, and they are coming to believe they are partners in the great enterprise of building an expanding world economy and that no country is so rich that it can't profit by such a result and no country so poor it cannot help another country. Help through the United Nations eliminates all thought of charity—of the rich helping the poor. Help from the United Nations also is under no suspicion of ulterior motives. Recipient countries know that the United Nations only motivation is that of wanting to help. As a consequence, they will not only offer much more self-help in negotiating with the United Nations than they will with a single country, but they will accept conditions from the United Nations that would be unacceptable if insisted upon by a single country. Most significantly, recipient countries know that their aid comes from their fellow members, many as poor as they are. They therefore feel an obligation to exert their best efforts to bring projects to a successful conclusion.

Cooperation—of the rich and the poor, of the powerful and the weak. This is what the United Nations represents to the people of the world and to the United States.

If we agree, as I think we must, that the United Nations in its political and humanitarian roles is a valuable weapon in our peace arsenal, we must decide whether the bond issue under discussion is an adequate means of meeting the financial burden.

First, we must realize that, alone, the issuance of \$200 million worth of bonds was not designed to, nor will it, solve permanently the United Nations financial problems. These problems stem from a complexity of political and economic factors.

As of December 31, 1961, the United Nations had spent \$93.8 million more than it had collected. The major source of this deficit came from the failure of those countries politically opposed to special United Nations operations to pay the special assessments necessary to maintain those operations. Thus, the Soviet bloc and most of the Arab States consistently have refused to pay their share of the annual \$19 million cost for continuing the United Nations presence in the Middle East. Primarily because of these delinquencies the United Nations has been unable to raise about 30 percent, or \$26.4 million, of its basic budget for the emergency force.

The Soviet bloc also refuses to pay its share of the Congo costs. Here they are joined by France, Belgium, Portugal, and the Union of South Africa, all of which opposed the Congo operation. As a result of this opposition, the deficit in the United Nations special account for the Congo reached \$54.4 million on December 31, 1961. The deficits in the two special operations budgets caused about 86 percent of the total United Nations deficit. We must note significantly that only one-seventh of the deficit comes from arrearages in the regular United Nations dues.

Because a major portion of the United Nations deficit came from failure to pay the special assessments, the General Assembly sought to put these assessments on the same basis as the United Nations dues, with the loss of a General Assembly vote as punishment for delinquency. During the last session the Assembly asked the World Court for an advisory opinion on this matter. Just last month the Court decided that the expenditures in Gaza and the Congo are expenses of the Organization within the meaning of article 7, paragraph 2 of the Charter of the United Nations. The Court did not see any legal reason for excluding these expenses in the regular United Nations budget apportioned among the member states. If the General Assembly accepts the Court's recent decision, a firmer financial foundation for the United Nations may be found.

The final answer, however, remains in the future. Until then the Congress must consider the bond issue as the best solution for the present problem. Perhaps the most important feature of this plan is that it will give the United Nations a breathing spell of 1½ years. During this time the United Nations can continue all of its technical and economic assistance programs and its peace-keeping operations as it sets its financial affairs in order.



The bond issue is a means of involving more member nations in the special operations and spreading the financial burden for these operations more equitably at the same time. Unless member nations participate actively in the United Nations financial affairs, the organization will cease to exist as a world organization. Until now the United States has paid 47.5 percent of the Congo costs. When the General Assembly voted to repay the holders of the bonds out of regular funds, it assured that all the member states would be bearing their share. U.S. costs, therefore, would decrease from the present 47.5 percent to about 32 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the passage of this bill. This \$100 million investment is an investment in the future well-being of the world. It is economically sound and politically imperative. For 14 years the United Nations has been a valuable asset in our foreign policy efforts. If the United Nations succeeds, our \$100 million will be repaid in a peaceful future. If it fails, and if our action today in any way causes that failure, the accompanying tragedies will far outweigh the dollars we will have saved.

As the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] so eloquently reminded us earlier in this debate, how can we hesitate to lend \$100 million to the United Nations, mankind's hope for peace, when we readily appropriate \$50 billion for defense and arms?

I want to congratulate the committee on the presentation of this measure this afternoon, and commend the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], for the leadership he has shown. I join the members of the committee and the Members who have urged the adoption of this measure.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to divert the course of this debate for a moment. I should like to compliment our colleague from Wisconsin on the amendment he proposes to offer. I intend to support that amendment when the proper time comes.

During the last 6 weeks or so we have had quite a bit of comment and controversy relative to certain funds described, I think, by Mr. Cleveland as over \$200 million, and refuted by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. My constituents have been quite concerned about that, so on August 17 I directed a letter to the U.S. representative to the United Nations, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, asking him specifically about the money put up by the U.S. Government that was supposedly used to reduce the assessments of a number of countries, including Cuba, Yugoslavia, and Poland. In reply to my letter, I received in my office yesterday a hand-delivered document which is marked "via pouch, unclassified," so I feel at liberty to reveal the contents to the Members here on the floor. It does not necessarily support

the decision I intend to take on this bill, but I think all Members should have the benefit of the report of Mr. Stevenson in connection with the so-called assessment. His letter in part is as follows:

The allegation that U.S. funds have been applied toward the reduction of indebtedness by other members of the United Nations is incorrect. What has happened is this: The United Nations operation in the Middle East and especially the Congo operation have imposed such unusual financial and political strains on the United Nations that the General Assembly decided to set up a special plan under which to assess members for these expenses. The United States played a leading, and in fact a decisive part, in working out this special plan since we were convinced that if this had not been done the U.N. would have to abandon both efforts with resulting increased dangers to world peace and our own security.

Continuing to read:

At the risk of oversimplifying I will say that under this special plan assessments of some members were reduced by as much as 80 percent over what they would have paid had the regular scale of assessments been followed. Other members, in a position to do so, were asked to make additional contributions over what they would be assessed normally. The United States agreed to make such additional contributions as did other countries such as the United Kingdom.

He further stated:

The figures you cite with regard to Cuba, Yugoslavia, Poland, and India are the amounts by which these countries' assessments for the Congo operation were reduced as a result of the working of this special plan. The figures do not represent reduction in indebtedness. A total of 78 countries benefited in a similar way from the application of this special plan, not simply the four which you mentioned.

Actually, I am not sure that this explanation will satisfy my constituents. It is still the United States putting up money to pay the obligations of other persons.

I might add this: We hear that Congress seems to adopt an attitude increasingly of apologizing for what we are doing; that is, "This is miserable, this is terrible, but I am going to vote for it." It is not only confined to this particular legislation but it seems to be an increasing modus operandi by Members of the House.

Look at the report of the very committee that is submitting this legislation to this body, the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Turn to page 4 of the committee report. It says this:

Unless we are prepared to accept the risks of Communist penetration of central Africa and of active Soviet intervention in a renewal of hostilities in the Middle East, the United States must either take the action necessary to meet the United Nations financial emergency or prepare to assume certain peacekeeping responsibilities in these areas which are being borne by the United Nations—undoubtedly at greatly increased cost.

I might suggest to the Members who are here on the floor that I just returned from my district. The people there are vitally concerned and not with the Middle East and not with the Congo and not with the African nations, they

are concerned with Cuba right off our shores.

I would like to direct your attention to page 9 of the report. It says this:

The United Nations has turned out to be an organization within which the Soviet bloc has not only flouted the underlying purposes and principles of the United Nations but has made use of the United Nations to create dissension and to fan the flames of controversy.

Then on page 11 it says:

Although the committee anticipates that the United Nations operation in the Congo may be more effective in the future than it has been in the past, the committee offers no assurance that all major obstacles have been overcome or that satisfactory progress is assured.

No assurances whatsoever that this legislation will improve anything.

Many people said to me, What is the United Nations today? Regretfully, I could only say—it is a symbol of hope for peace. It used to be a symbol of peace, but it is getting further and further away. It has resolved itself, and I think these are the very words used in the report of the committee:

It has become an international debating society.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What has the United Nations done about this Cuban situation aside from giving them some help indirectly?

Mr. DEVINE. I might say to my very respected colleague from Iowa that I have examined the newspapers and periodicals very closely—I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services or Foreign Affairs—but I have not found where they have taken any action whatsoever to alleviate this situation 90 miles from our shore.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2768, as reported, which would implement the President's request of January 30, 1962, for an appropriation authorization to purchase up to \$100 million of United Nations bonds.

From time immemorial man's search for peace has been offset by his desire and instinct for conquest and defense. For just as long man has also sought to convert his productive capacities toward peaceful purposes and uses. We now live in a period in which armaments and weapons have become so destructive in their power that they can encompass the end of mankind itself. While some feel that the continuance of a tenuous balance of terrible deterrents can stave off a worldwide catastrophe, perhaps indefinitely, the situation today is such that mankind must meet squarely the necessity of eliminating war as an arbitrament of international disputes.

At the forefront of the alternative to the settlement of international disputes by war and threats of war is the United Nations. Many profound changes have

swept the world since the United Nations Charter was signed on October 24, 1945. The representatives of 50 countries, including the United States, shared at that time both the memory of the bitter ordeal of World War II and the high resolve to prevent the recurrence of war. Following World War I, Winston Churchill wrote:

Victory was to be bought so dear as to be almost indistinguishable from defeat. It was not to give security even to the victors.

His judgment was seconded by other world leaders who felt that war was a very poor instrument of policy—defeat in war stretches out its heavy hand to all areas of our planet and its agonizing burdens fall upon both victor and vanquished.

In attempting to build a structure for the organization of a peaceful world following World War II, the architects of the Charter of the United Nations put major emphasis upon peacekeeping and the renunciation of aggressive force in international relations. It is this peacekeeping function that threatens the financial solvency of the United Nations—it is this same peacekeeping function of the United Nations which has thwarted major Soviet designs on half a dozen occasions. In the early years of the U.N., Communist infiltration of Iran and Greece was halted; a truce was brought about in Kashmir and mediation brought fighting to an end in Indonesia. In the Middle East, the U.N. achieved and maintained the 1949 armistice agreements between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

Under a U.N. command, headed by the United States, 16 member nations in the period 1950–53 joined the Republic of Korea in a U.N. action to halt Communist aggression southward. United Nations resolutions condemned the aggressors and gave world backing to the defenders. In 1956 the U.N. brought about a cease-fire in Suez and organized a U.N. Emergency Force with troops from 10 small nations; a reduced but alert U.N. Emergency Force is still on guard along Israel's troubled borders. In 1958 a U.N. observer group was requested by the Government of Lebanon to counter Communist-supported subversion; Lebanon was not subverted.

In 1960 the Security Council authorized Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld to provide military assistance to the Government of the Congo which faced civil war and full-scale anarchy when its military forces mutinied only 5 days after its declaration of independence. Had the United Nations not placed its Emergency Force in the Congo, had those forces not moved decisively under the leadership of Secretary General Hammarskjöld to restore order and to prevent the import of military supplies and equipment from the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc, only one alternative existed to prevent a complete breakdown leading to Soviet domination of the Congo. This choice could only have led to a confrontation of other big-power forces. While prompt action of the United Nations, made possible partly by our diplomatic support, our military

airlift, and our financial contributions, has kept direct Communist power out of the Congo, of deep significance is the fact that the danger of a brush-fire war in the heart of this volatile continent was greatly minimized.

The critical issue before us today is: Are enough Members willing to take the risks necessary to insure the United Nations a new span of life in something like its original form and with something like its intended functions? So long as the United Nations exists and has the support of the United States, there is always the sobering possibility that even minor pickings and stealings brought there for discussion can develop into an all-out trial of strength between the Soviet Union and its major antagonist. Some time ago, therefore, the Soviet leaders recognized the importance of bringing our support to an end. They could hardly count on mustering enough votes in the General Assembly to pass measures directly injurious to the United States—a development which supposedly might persuade the American public that U.N. membership is too risky to be continued. But they saw that with the obedient votes of their satellites and the support of other member nations, they might be able to achieve one-third of the General Assembly membership needed to thwart positive actions under the charter. In this way, the Soviets expected to demonstrate to the American public that the United Nations had become helpless and useless and that continued membership on the part of the United States was a waste of effort and money.

Some of those who are most vocal in their opposition to the United Nations and particularly to the U.N. bond issue, are exponents of what is really a go-it-alone philosophy. One of the curious characteristics of these "go-it-aloners" is that, in their state of gloom over what they consider to be no-win policies, they are constantly overlooking the significant victories over communism that do occur and imagining Communist victories where there are none. They seem to feel that the U.N. is a Communist instrument and that the United States and its allies are constantly being pushed around at the U.N. by the Communists. This is just another myth. While the United States has not always been able to obtain action which it desired in the United Nations, we have not as a member-state had to use the veto block action that we opposed. On the other hand, the Soviet Union in the Security Council has used its veto power 100 times to block action which it opposed. In the General Assembly the Soviets' major efforts to weaken the structure of the United Nations Secretariat by substituting a three-man "troika" for a single Secretary General after the unfortunate death of Dag Hammarskjöld met with absolutely no support; the Soviets had to drop their scheme without even attempting to press for a vote. Similarly, on the issues affecting the financial stability of the U.N. the Communist bloc found itself overriden by an overwhelming majority. In the field of colonial issues, while we have not agreed with all the resolutions that

have been adopted, the Soviet efforts to tempt the Afro-Asian states into taking extreme positions, such as calling for an end of all colonies by the end of 1962, have met with no success. It is remarkable that the Soviet Union, considering its military and industrial power, is so relatively unimportant at the United Nations.

The United States has counted on the United Nations as the chief instrumentality existing in the world, apart from its own military strength and that of its allies, to deter aggression. Presidents Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy and other responsible citizens in America have hoped that by acting to settle disputes in different parts of the world, the United Nations would lessen the chance that the United States might become involved in them directly and they have considered this a substantial contribution not only to world peace but to American security as well.

No thoughtful American would maintain that the United Nations has solved or can ever hope to solve all of the world's problems. Certainly it is more than one can or should expect in this complex and hazardous world. Quite clearly it is too much to expect of foreign policy which almost invariably contains elements of calculated risk. But mankind will not accept the difficulties which we face as an excuse for failing to do all we can; indeed, it may be said for abdicating our national responsibility. President Kennedy has made it crystal clear that our foreign policy objective is to create and foster a world of stable, free, and independent countries, willing and able to meet their own problems in peace and freedom.

Our task is particularly difficult because we Americans are accustomed by long experience to quick and final solutions. We are all anxious now to get things settled overseas once and for all so that we can concentrate on the business and future of America. Yet neither today's twilight nor tomorrow's dawning can be easily shaped to our precise concepts. The rewards of hard but rightful decisions are not necessarily reflected in the next day's headlines—or even in the approbation of columnists—but only in the slow, patient, and implacable judgment of history.

The stakes are not less than the peace and freedom of mankind. The fate of our Nation, and whether our sons and daughters live in a world at peace or a world at war with nuclear destructions, pestilence, and death their daily lot, depends on the success or failure of our foreign policy and our support of the United Nations.

It is my strong conviction that the United Nations deserves the understanding and support of the American people and the American Congress, and I urge my colleagues this afternoon to demonstrate to the Soviets and the Communist bloc that the United States is dedicated to promoting and preserving the peace through a vigorous and financially sound United Nations. Even modest critics of some of the actions of the United Nations in recent years often



describe the United Nations in its capacity as a peacekeeping organization as a majestic gamble. Whether or not we accept such a judgment, the vote in this House on S. 2768 will be interpreted by people of all nations as a vote for or against U.S. support of the United Nations. In casting my vote, I shall vote in the affirmative, for if I must gamble, I

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2768, to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing a loan up to \$100 million to the United Nations. I do so with considerable reluctance because, at best, this bill is highly controversial.

First of all, the financing of the United Nations by a loan is merely a stopgap measure. This was testified to by the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Harlan Cleveland. The loan proceeds will have to be used to pay debts already incurred by the United Nations as well as its current operations in the Middle East and the Congo. At the end of March 1962, the deficit of the United Nations was \$120 million. The annual cost of these two programs is running in the neighborhood of \$140 million. So, it can be amply demonstrated that in a few months time the funds authorized by the bond issue will be exhausted and the United Nations financial situation will in no way be solved on a permanent basis.

The United Nations is relying on a favorable advisory opinion of the World Court which, in effect, legalizes the assessments for the operations in the Congo and the Near East as a part of the regular expenses of the United Nations. Action will have to be taken by the General Assembly to implement this opinion. Thus, countries in arrears will have to pay up their assessments or ultimately face the possibility of losing their vote in the General Assembly because, under section 19 of the charter, any nation whose arrears equal or exceed its assessments for the 2 previous years loses its vote in the General Assembly.

There is very little likelihood that some of the Communist bloc nations will pay up their back assessments. The same is true of some of those nations which are against the Congo operation on principle. There are still 30 nations behind in their regular assessments amounting to \$5,659,277. Fifty-two nations owe more than \$25 million for the Middle East operation and 66 nations owe \$51.5 million for the Congo operation.

The General Assembly proposal for a bond issue with a low interest rate of 2 percent repayable over a period of 25 years makes it possible for many smaller countries with limited resources to shoulder their share of the burden.

However, the proposed bond issue, so far as we are concerned, will have a net cost to the United States in the neigh-

borhood of \$54 million. This is based upon an outlay for the purchase of bonds and our share of their repayment against the repayment of principal and interest to the United States over the 25-year period.

From our viewpoint, it probably would be much better to make a loan of \$100 million to the United Nations for a short period at a rate of interest substantially equal to the average rate of United States Treasury bonds—currently about 3 percent. Under the language in the bill this method of financing would be possible—if the General Assembly agreed.

There has not been brought to the attention of the House Foreign Affairs Committee a single concrete suggestion as to how the United Nations can put its financial structure on a sound permanent basis. Until there is a solution found to this problem we are simply putting off the evil day when we will again be confronted with the bankruptcy of the United Nations.

The loan issue does have merit in that it spreads the cost of financing the current heavy indebtedness of the United Nations. Other nations have already purchased or pledged some \$72 million. The bill, as reported by our committee, provides that we will be given credit for our assessments to the United Nations for repayment of our share of the bonds. Under this arrangement we will also reduce our present cost of maintaining the peacemaking functions of the United Nations which is now more than 47 percent and our assessment will be reduced to 32 percent.

One of the methods of assisting the smaller countries with limited means to finance their special assessments for the Congo and Middle East operations of the United Nations was to reduce their assessments by 80 percent. Above and beyond our assessments, we appropriated \$11,400,800 as a voluntary contribution to assist in financing the emergency expenses of the Congo and in doing so a large number of countries were given credit on their assessments for this purpose. For example: Cuba, \$140,800; Poland, \$512,000; Yugoslavia, \$243,200; to say nothing of assistance to some of the larger countries like India, \$812,000; Japan, \$908,000; Brazil, \$659,200; and China, \$1,828,000.

I have consulted legal counsel for our committee and am informed that the following language in the bill, "The proceeds of such loan shall not be used to relieve states members of the United Nations of their obligation to pay arrearages on payments of any United Nations assessments, and shall not be used to reduce regular or special assessments against any such members," will prevent the \$100 million loan being used for this purpose in the future. I am also informed that under the general provisions in the basic law any funds used to assist the United Nations beyond our regular assessments must go through the regular appropriation processes.

In view of all these circumstances, why do I support this bill? As I have indicated, I would like to have another method of financing used rather than the bond issue. But action has been taken

by the United Nations; other countries are raising their share amounting to \$100 million, and time being of the essence there seems to be no alternative but to follow the approach used in the Senate bill.

It should be noted, however, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs went further than the Senate did in setting conditions on our loan to the United Nations. The Senate bill permitted the United States to loan up to \$25 million plus the aggregate amount of loans made or agreed to be made; that is, pledged, by other nations. Our committee eliminated both the \$25 million margin above the total made available by other countries and the pledged amount to be loaned as distinguished from the actual amount paid to the United Nations by other countries in determining the ceiling on our loan.

I believe the United Nations going into the Congo and the Near East and using its prestige as a peacemaking organization is one of its most important functions. If the Congress should fail to pass this legislation, I think, without question, the United Nations would have to abandon operations both in the Near East and the Congo. I believe this would be disastrous to our foreign policy by jeopardizing peace in both these areas. It would make the United Nations a mere debating society and just what the Communists desire—an ineffective organization which at the same time would be a sounding board for their propaganda.

The effectiveness of the United Nations in carrying out its peacemaking functions is demonstrated by the intensity of the Soviet bloc's opposition to it. The former Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Lodge, testified that over 200 Communist agents were ready to go into the Congo when the first crisis appeared there and were only prevented from doing so by the action taken by the United Nations.

However, I feel that the role of the United Nations in the Congo should be limited to its proper function; namely, attempting to keep the peace and to prevent international threats to such a peace. It should confine its efforts so that they will be in compliance with chapter 1, article 2, paragraph 7, which provides that the United Nations shall not intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

There has also been alarm expressed that with the admission to the United Nations of new and inexperienced nations from the Afro-Asian bloc there is the danger that the United Nations will embark upon a course of action of which we do not approve and yet would be committed to support. While theoretically this might happen, from a practical standpoint, I do not feel it is a valid objection because we always have the power of veto in the Security Council and in any matter of importance the General Assembly would have to adopt a policy by a two-thirds vote. Certainly with the leadership of the United States and our allies among the major powers, we should be able to control one-third

plus one of the voting strength of the United Nations.

For us to withdraw from the heart of Africa and allow the Communists to take over; for us to withdraw from the Near East and allow the Israel-Arab situation to get out of hand; and for us to take away the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations, in my judgment, would not only imperial our foreign policy and security, but might well bring on a crisis of unknown proportions. To protect our interests in those areas it would be necessary not to spend \$100 million for a loan, but to run the risk of sending our own boys to fight in defense of those areas at a cost that would make the expenses of the loan look like a drop in the bucket.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I still believe in the United Nations. I recently attended the 15th World Assembly on Health as one of the congressional advisers, and have written at length in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about some of our accomplishments therein.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I read the gentleman's report on the World Health Assembly and his participation in it, and I thought it was one of the most effective, hard-headed, realistic, sound appraisals of the work of that organization of any I have seen. I compliment the gentleman on his contribution and on his useful report about the work.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, I want the United Nations to live and function according to its original mission. I do not want another League of Nations.

However, there is some real question in my mind as to how best to effect this. I am concerned by seeming paradoxes and divergence of opinion as to the minority and majority views, the colloquy we have had here on the floor today, the question of fiscal responsibility or not within the organization, its definition of "function" and "mission," the need or not for this particular legislation, its future and where it goes in view of its policies and the addition of irresponsible new or emergent nations in a quantity sufficient to outvote those of us who are founders and have proven responsibility, the divergence in the question of the legality of the law of the nations within the United Nations, and the decision of the World Court. Therefore, being concerned, I look further into the people assigned in the Foreign Service of the State Department, and I am concerned about some of them and about the recommendations being made and the recent history of U.N. actions.

I would like therefore to propose some provocative and perhaps paradoxical questions and facts for the RECORD in the short time I have as the day is waning, and hope that they will be acknowledged and answered by voting time tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday, for two reasons, others and I gladly returned earlier

than planned, to the Capitol and this House, on call of the Armed Services Committee. I am privileged to serve there, and glad I returned, although both events were sickening to the point of nausea.

The first was the Joint Armed Services Committee and Foreign Affairs Committee audition of the Secretary of State, Lieutenant General Carter, acting Director of CIA, and a representative of the Department of Defense. I have never seen such lack of perception, such ineffectiveness and evasion, such dealing with our Nation's issues from a policy of fear—when we hold all the trumps—insofar as Cuba, the Congo, Berlin, and other troubled areas are concerned. It was made abundantly clear that the representatives of, and the tempers of the people themselves—would not much longer brook delay, dishonor, and ineptness. It made one wonder if the State Department is as strong as it presumably should be, or if the President has other advisers? On this floor yesterday two colleagues announced legislative bills introduced afloat this faltering situation in Cuba, and our do-nothing or "no win" policy of the administration—the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. From what I have heard in the Armed Services Committee today I admit I am frightened, but I hope not unwilling to stand and save our honor and esteem.

Second, I heard the greatest exposé of apparent "conflict of interest" on national or international record. It pertained specifically to the U.N. and its Congo actions. It involved the "establishment," behind the scenes in our sovereign government and the U.N. It documents, if not proves, the sale of lives for gain while maintaining power in invisible government, to say naught of our foreign aid administrator and the Secretary of the State Department.

No wonder we are bankrupt morally and financially—yet here we are today, considering ways and means of bailing out this organization of "one worldism," at our unsuspecting—and sometimes, I fear, uninterested—taxpayers' expense.

As though this were not enough, I would like to give our colleagues this additional background of the U.N.-Congo affair on which to base their considered, moral, political, social, and spiritual—I hope—judgment.

#### U.N. CRISIS

Because of its ill-fated meddling in the domestic political affairs of the Belgian Congo, the United Nations is now facing the most serious internal troubles of its 17-year existence. The best guess is that the U.N. with help from many sources—some surprising and bizarre—will survive this crisis, but its prestige will be badly injured, and its usefulness as a peacemaking body may be virtually ended.

Here, in capsule form, is the story of the political mess into which the world body has worked itself, and how it got that way:

In the summer of 1960, spurred on by the anticolonialism frenzy of the Afro-Asian bloc, the Security Council voted to send troops into the Belgian Congo to

bring about the complete restoration of law and order. To me, this meant that U.N. troops were expected to put an end to the pillaging and widespread slaughter of white residents which had broken out immediately after the departure of the Belgian military forces, or a civil action.

From the beginning the work of the U.N. task force was severely handicapped because Soviet Russia was engaged in a clandestine campaign to take over the Congo, and because the U.N. representative on the ground, Mr. Dayal of India, showed an open bias in favor of the Communists. Mr. Dayal got the peace operation off to a bad start, and his successor or U.N. headman, showed no better judgment. They persisted in playing favorites and mixing in local politics. The most flagrant example was the use of military force to compel Premier Tshombe of Katanga Province to submit to the Central Government of Cyrille Adoula. This needless war was eventually called off because it aroused public indignation both in the United States and Europe.

Now, 2 years after the U.N. operation started, the threat of civil war still hangs over the Congo, while the operation is costing \$10 million each month and threatening to put the world organization in bankruptcy because the majority of members refuse to pay their fair share of the assessed cost.

Last January the General Assembly of the U.N. authorized a \$200 million bond issue to make up for the loss of revenue incurred in the Congo operation, and the other U.N. peace operation now in being—the maintenance of troops on the borders of Israel and the Arab States. But even if sympathetic nations subscribe to this issue in full, the proceeds will be exhausted sometime in December or early next year. Because another bond issue would be unthinkable, the U.N. must get out of the Congo as soon as it can, or go out of business, because it cannot pay its bills.

In the face of this emergency, Secretary General U. Thant and the staff of the U.N. Secretariat are now engaged in a grim struggle to come up with some kind of a compromise proposal that will permit the U.N. to get rid of its costly Congo venture while still maintaining its prestige; that is, save face.

The formula at the present time—especially since September 3, 1962—is a plan to have the central Congolese adopt a new constitution which will authorize very nearly complete local autonomy for the rebellious Province of Katanga, while foreign policy and control of the armed forces remains in the Central Government. Legal experts for the U.N. drafted the proposed constitution, which is scheduled for adoption later in September.

However, the move for unity has been badly hurt already by the irresponsible action of Premier Adoula's government in jumping the gun in the matter of economic sanctions against Katanga. The use of sanctions is the last-ditch measure which the U.N. Secretariat has been touting in case all other methods fail to bring agreement. By imposing



sanctions prematurely—which he is powerless to enforce—Premier Adoula has once again hurt the cause of reconciliation.

The real key to the struggle between the contending factions is control of the lucrative tax revenues paid by the mining company, Union Minière, amounting to about \$40 million annually, which are now paid in full to the Katangan Government. Premier Adoula contends that his Central Government will go bankrupt and the Communists will take over unless a large part of this revenue is paid into his government at Léopoldville.

The U.N. plan calls for the payment of these revenues, beginning now, into a Belgian bank, which will keep control of these funds until Adoula and Tshombe agree on a constitution and a fair division of the money. While this arrangement seems reasonable on the surface, the fact is that the main properties of Union Minière are located in territory controlled by Tshombe's supporters and troops, and white officials of the company will refuse to turn over the tax money at peril to their lives.

In addition, Adoula's deficit is \$270 million, and even all of Union Minière's taxes would not come close to balancing the Central Government budget.

In the event that Tshombe balks against a final settlement, which today's early American news media reports, an alternate plan is being drafted by the U.N. Secretariat, with the strong backing of the Kennedy administration, based on the employment of economic sanctions to force Tshombe into line. The daily press reports that strenuous efforts are now being made by the State Department to secure the support of Belgium and Great Britain for this alternate plan, with Belgium reported as unenthusiastic but willing to go along, and the British Government sharply opposed.

The proposed sanctions include refusal to buy Katangan copper, most of which is purchased by Belgian interests; interference with postal and telegraph service to Katanga; and a requirement that no one may leave the rebellious province for travel abroad without a passport from the Central Government.

While economic sanctions are described officially as "measures short of war," the fact is that the Security Council has refused time and again to impose such measures against recalcitrant nations because of the dire consequences which are sure to follow. In attempting to impose its will on Tshombe by force, the U.N. is literally playing with fire. When it employed military force last year to subdue Tshombe, its military efforts were aborted by the strong defensive tactics of Katanga's soldiers. Resentment against this palpable interference in local affairs flared to a high pitch.

The economic sanctions scheme is full of other hazards. If Tshombe volunteers to give up the tax revenues from Union Minière, his present power will be largely gone. In this situation, the unpredictable Adoula may decide to crack down on Tshombe and put him out of

business once and for all. If that happens, the responsibility will lie on the doorstep of the United Nations.

The woes of the compromise seekers were further complicated a few weeks back when the Secretary General, U Thant, after a personal visit to the Congo, referred publicly to Premier Tshombe and his ministers as a "bunch of clowns." This needless insult may well win first prize as the worldwide outstanding diplomatic blunder of 1962.

Into this situation, already highly disturbing for U.N. partisans, a new complication has been thrust. The World Court recently handed down an advisory opinion that special assessments, like the Congo fund and the Middle East fund, were just as binding on U.N. members as regular budget levies. In other words, the defaulting members could be told to pay up or face loss of voting rights in the General Assembly.

Paradoxically, instead of being a boon, this ruling could put the U.N. in a situation at once both embarrassing and ridiculous. The popular belief is that the United Nations is now in financial hot water because Soviet Russia, France, and a few other big nations are refusing to pay their share of the Congo costs, while the Arab States and some others are refusing to contribute to the Emergency Force Fund. This is only partially true. The fact is that the great majority of U.N. members are defaulters in their financial obligations to the world body. A recent count showed that 78 nations, out of 104, owed part or all of their assessments for the Congo operation, while the backsliders on the Middle East fund number about as many. The world never needed demonstration of responsibility before admission to full privilege, than now.

Because the actual situation is so little understood, many people have been anticipating with pleasure that Soviet Russia and its satellites, in view of the World Court ruling, would either have to pay up or lose their voting rights in the General Assembly. This is hardly likely to happen. The majority of Assembly members can hardly fault the Kremlin, for failure to pay its debts when the majority is equally guilty.

The fact is that nearly 80 percent of U.N. members are constantly defaulting on their financial obligations. At the same time they propose to retain their full voting rights, and, ironically, there is really no way to stop them. The article in the U.N. Charter about the loss of voting rights is so equivocal as to be almost meaningless in most cases. The article says this:

A member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the member.

The last sentence is the escape hatch. The undeveloped or emerging countries, which are now in the majority, can simply take the pauper's oath; that is, they

may retain their voting rights by asserting that they lack the funds to pay up. As most of these countries are receiving assistance from special U.N. relief and development funds, these defaulters are in an excellent position to plead their case. In any event, no one expects the defaulters to pay up, and no one seriously anticipates that the majority members in the U.N. will solemnly vote to suspend their own voting rights. Under these conditions, I submit the advisory opinion of the World Court may be more embarrassing than helpful.

The Kennedy administration is now waging a major campaign to have the House of Representatives approve the proposed \$100 million loan to the United Nations. The loan has already passed the Senate. This is half of the \$200 million bond issue which the U.N. Assembly voted last January. But even if Congress comes to the rescue once again, this large sum of money will merely cure the U.N.'s current insolvency. The situation will be just as desperate a year from now if the Congo operation is continued, at plus \$70 million a year.

Even the sponsors of the plan to club Tshombe into line, realize that this is perilous business. Tshombe is a known friend of the United States and the free nations; in addition, Katanga by any measure has as much right to an independent existence as the numerous splinter states set up by the U.N. in recent years. For these reasons, the use of economic sanctions would never even be considered except for the almost hopeless financial box in which the U.N. finds itself. The only alternative is the concept of a war between the states, in which event, I submit the U.N. should never have delved into domestic affairs.

In voting the bond issue, the General Assembly of the U.N. stipulated that interest and amortization payments would be included in the regular budget assessments. It was claimed that this would guarantee repayment to the bond purchasers. Actually, it will do no such thing. There is no way to compel the moochers, who refuse to pay now, to meet these charges merely because they are tacked on to the regular assessments. Besides we would then pay 32.02 percent and be paying ourselves back to the extent of 32.02 percent.

The United States is taxed slightly more than 32 percent to meet the expenses of the regular U.N. budget, but actually it is paying more than 50 percent of all United Nations costs because of voluntary contributions, and various special funds. This country made voluntary contributions of \$5,305,596 to the Congo fund for the fiscal year 1961 and \$11,400,800 for 1962. These donations were immediately applied to the arrears of the "poorer countries"—including Cuba—in the hope that this generous action might induce them to pay the balance of what they owe. They refused to respond. Four of the African members actually owe just \$777 each, for the Middle East peace force; and \$10,321 each, for the Congo operation. It seems that a government truly interested in the welfare of the United Nations could

dig up funds somewhere to pay such obligations. This points up the need for responsibility before wearing long pants in the family of nations.

Thus the United Nations is teetering on the brink of disaster because of the ill-fated Congo venture from which it has no viable route of escape. The \$200 million bond issue is not a solution, because even with this huge sum in its treasury, the world organization will again be bankrupt either at the end of this year or early in 1963. The advisory opinion of the World Court, that the members have a moral duty to pay up, is not a solution because the majority of members will simply flout this ruling.

This is the impasse to which the world organization has been brought by its anticolonialism spree, during the course of which it cast aside good sense and wise policy in order to deal from a policy of fear and to follow the dictates of the Afro-Asian bloc.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World, Nov. 12, 1961]

#### DECLINE AND FALL OF U.N.?

"We are witnessing the decline and fall of the United Nations. If it lasts more than 2 more years it will be a catastrophe for humanity."

Those words, attributed to a veteran U.N. diplomat by Joseph Newman in a recent issue of the New York Herald Tribune, suggest that we take a good look at the U.N. and get truthful answers to the following questions:

1. Is not the structural pattern of the U.N. the same as that which was drawn up for it by an agent of the Kremlin a few months previously at Dumbarton Oaks?
2. Did not this same, then secret, Soviet agent arrange for and preside as its chief executive officer at the San Francisco conference that adopted his plan for the U.N. Organization?
3. Was it not this same Soviet agent that accompanied President Roosevelt to Yalta as his chief adviser and got F.D.R.'s agreement that Russia was to have three votes in the U.N. to our one?
4. Was not the proclaimed purpose of the U.N. to be securing of the peace?
5. Has the U.N. better served the peace concept of the Soviets than it has served our concept, when it is realized that when the U.N. was established there were only 200 million enjoying the "peace of total submission" whereas today there are over 900 million under the yoke of tyranny?
6. Is it not true that whereas initially we were allowed to have the dominant voice in its councils, today we are in the minority as to voting, yet paying over 60 percent of the costs?
7. Is the U.N. preserving the peace when it is using military power to subdue that part of the Congo that chooses to resist Communist tyranny?
8. Is not the U.N., through its numerous agencies, such as UNESCO, usurping our right of self-government under our Constitution?

These and many other questions tend to spoil our illusions re the U.N.

I. V. HORNER.

TULSA.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 11, 1960]

**PRAVDA FORESEES WEST LOSING U.N. MAJORITY**  
Moscow, September 10.—Pravda today forecast a time when the United States will be consistently outvoted at the United Nations. It expressed confidence that sooner or later the West will lose what the Com-

munist have long assailed as its "mechanical majority."

The Communist Party newspaper published a front page editorial on the balance within the United Nations as Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev sailed toward New York for the U.N. General Assembly opening September 20. His passenger liner passed out of the Baltic Sea today toward the Atlantic.

#### MAKEUP CHANGED

Commenting on the changed character of the United Nations caused by the influx of new members from Asia and Africa, Pravda said:

"The events of recent times are an indication that the situation in the United Nations differs considerably from that which existed 10 years ago."

In 1950 the United Nations had 55 members, most of them closely allied with the West. By the end of this year's Assembly session, its membership will be almost twice that. Many of the recent members are newly independent and neutralist in outlook. Pravda said:

"The international authority of the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries has been immeasurably increased, and many new states have embarked on a path of peaceful policy, states which have won their independence in the struggle with imperialism."

#### SEES U.S. BALKED

"The American voting machine, which was built during the first years of the existence of the United Nations, now often suffers from stoppage and many of those who once automatically raised their hands when orders came from Washington now refuse to serve foreign interests."

Mr. Khrushchev obviously hopes to win friends from among these newcomers at the U.N. General Assembly.

As his ship sailed through the strait between Denmark and Sweden escorted by two Soviet destroyers, the Soviet Premier sent good will messages to the Premiers of Sweden, Norway and Denmark. A Tass correspondent on board reported: "The sea is calm and the sun is shining bright."

#### DEMAND ON ARMS

The Pravda editorial repeated Mr. Khrushchev's demand for "general and complete disarmament," first made before the Assembly last year, and left no doubt that he would continue to press for it at the United Nations.

The fact that the Soviet Premier is heading his country's U.N. delegation, Pravda said, is taken by world public opinion as "new proof of the constant and sincere desire of the Soviet Union to take the problem of disarmament out of the blind alley into which the Western Powers have put it."

#### MEMO MAKERS, PRESS, BLAMED FOR CASTRO RISE

(By John V. Horner)

Two Democratic Senators charged last night that a group of "memo makers" in the State Department and elements of the American press combined to hand Cuba to Fidel Castro and the Communists.

Senators EASTLAND of Mississippi and DODD of Connecticut asserted Cuba was delivered the same way that China was "handed" to the Communists some years ago. They declared "memo makers" and not Secretary Herter are making foreign policy at the State Department.

Mr. Herter issued a statement calling the allegations "shocking and unfounded."

The blast by the two Democrats was based on testimony given to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by two former U.S. Ambassadors to Cuba, Earl E. T. Smith, who was in Havana when Mr. Castro came to power, and Arthur Gardner, who preceded Mr. Smith.

"The testimony of both these gentlemen demonstrates that American foreign policy is not made in the office of Secretary Herter on the fifth floor of the State Department," the two Senators said. "It is made on the fourth floor by the unknown policy planners and memo makers who fill the Secretary's 'in basket.'"

The offices of officials who deal with Latin American affairs are on the fourth floor of the Department building.

#### PUBLIC SEEN MISGUIDED

Senators EASTLAND and DODD quoted the Ambassadors as saying that Fidel Castro was the hero of the "in-basket brigade." They said these persons worked with pro-Castro elements of the press to make the revolutionary leader appear as a Robin Hood.

"They misguided American opinion in exactly the way the 'in-basket brigade' of 1945 misguided American opinion with the myth that the Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers," the Senators said.

"The State Department has not been cleansed of those elements whose policies contributed so much to the loss of China to the free world. Secretary Herter, the man on the quarter deck, is not in charge of the ship."

Both Mr. Smith and Mr. Gardner were critical of William W. Wieland, Director of the State Department Office of Caribbean Affairs. Both also indicated belief that Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State and now Ambassador to Argentina, suggested policies that aided the rise of Mr. Castro. However, Mr. Smith expressed the opinion Mr. Rubottom did so only after "terrific pressure."

#### SENT TO TIMES MAN

Former Ambassador Smith said Mr. Wieland sent him to Herbert Matthews, a member of the editorial staff of the New York Times, to get a briefing on Cuban affairs before the diplomat went to his post in Havana. Senators EASTLAND and DODD described this as an "extraordinary revelation."

Mr. Smith told the subcommittee he believes Cuba is becoming a Communist satellite. He said agencies of the U.S. Government and the press played a major role in bringing Fidel Castro to power. The revolutionary forces overthrew Gen. Fulgencio Batista January 1, 1959.

Mr. Smith said the American people assumed that because Batista was a dictator, Castro must represent liberty and democracy.

#### POLITICS REVEALED

"The crusader role which the press and radio bestowed on the bearded rebel," he told the Senators, "handed the people to the leftwing political philosophy with which, even at that time, he was already on record."

"His speeches as a student leader, his interviews as an exile while in Mexico, Costa Rica and elsewhere clearly outlined a Marxist trend of political thought."

"The official U.S. attitude could not help but be influenced by the pro-Castro press and radio, and certain Members of Congress picked up the torch for him."

Mr. Gardner said it was common gossip that Mr. Rubottom stopped a shipment of military equipment to General Batista on the New York docks. The shipment was arranged under the mutual aid pact, he said.

At the same time, Mr. Gardner testified, arms and ammunition were being shipped surreptitiously to the Castro forces almost every night.

#### HITS SPEEDY RECOGNITION

Mr. Smith criticized the speed with which the United States recognized the Castro government. He said the State Department recognized the revolutionary government before Fidel Castro reached Havana in January 1959.

"I would like to recommend," he said, "that some higher authority such as the National Security Council determine what our



attitude to another nation should be, then all the actions of the State Department should be guided by such policy as laid down by the National Security Council."

Mr. Gardner said that as Ambassador he endeavored to place the facts about Mr. Castro and the Cuban situation before Mr. Herter, former Under Secretary Robert Murphy and others in the State Department. But he said he was "ignored, overlooked and circumvented."

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the U.N. is nearing an ignominious end, unless those who control its destinies begin to show a higher degree of perception, duty, and fiscal and political responsibility.

Therefore, we are in the paradoxical position of having to defeat the U.N. bond issue in order to save the U.N. itself from an administrative and fiscal death—brought on by participating in civil strife.

I strongly feel that at this time we should take no further action in extra support of the U.N. or its actions, until we are straightened out as to information and fiscal responsibility, and the same applied to that organization.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I was among those who listened with a great deal of interest a little earlier this afternoon when the suggestion was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], that we might well give consideration to an amendment whereby section 5 of the pending legislation would be amended in order to make it mandatory that the United Nations, before we would subscribe to any of this bond issue, would accept by the necessary two-thirds vote the recent decision of the International Court of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, I also listened to the arguments made by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], a member of the committee, in which the gentleman stated that he thought this would be equivalent to waving a red flag in front of some of the members of the United Nations. In addition he said that he thought it was unnecessary because he felt that in view of the fact that about 80 members of the United Nations had already agreed to subscribe to this bond issue, that more than the necessary two-thirds could be counted on to accept the decision.

Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I have read carefully the entire hearings—record of hearings—in this matter, and that, frankly, is the only reason that I deign to take the time of the Committee and appear here in the well of the House at this late hour this afternoon. I certainly must respectfully disagree with the very sanguine estimate that has been made by the gentleman from New Jersey as to the likelihood that this decision would be adopted, for this reason: I call the Committee's attention to the very interesting colloquy that occurs, beginning on page 97 of the committee hearings and extending through page 100 of said hearings, between Mr. Plimpton, the Deputy Representative of the United Nations, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS],

a member of the committee, whom I regret to say is not on the floor at this time. But the gentleman from Ohio points out, in any event, in this very important colloquy, that when the question of Hungary was brought before the United Nations as to whether or not that should be submitted as a question for the agenda of the United Nations, that there are 52 members of the United Nations who are Afro-Asian nations, and that 42 out of those 52 voted against us on that particular issue. This was largely on the question of whether or not this should be on the agenda. Now, I ask the members of the Committee when a vote comes in the General Assembly of the United Nations as to whether or not powerful Soviet Russia shall accept this decision of the World Court or else be deprived of its vote altogether in the General Assembly by the mandatory acceptance of this decision, how do the members of the Committee think those same 42 members of the Afro-Asian bloc in the General Assembly are going to vote? I, for one, am much less optimistic than some about the acceptance of that decision. I see no reason at all why we should not insist that this be made mandatory before we accept this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would also say something in commenting upon what was mentioned by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. Some of us who rise in opposition to this bill as presently written are involuntarily cast in the role of being opponents of the United Nations. I do not classify myself in that category. I realize that there is a role for the U.N. in the world, that it is useful to have an international forum for the discussion of peacekeeping tasks which can be safely carried out by a world body but, frankly, I have been sorely disappointed, as I have sat here on the floor throughout most of the debate this afternoon, that we have not heard more discussion about some of these peacekeeping operations of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I sat here yesterday throughout an hour's special order and listened to a very well documented suggestion or charge by one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], that there might well be certain international economic and financial interests that are prompting the strange goings-on that we are sanctioning today in the Congo. Yet I have not heard anything today in response to anything he said in the course of that hour, except that yesterday afternoon one gentleman—I think my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], who went so far as to suggest that this is extraneous and that the issue of Africa has nothing to do with this.

Another man went so far as to say that this \$100 million is sort of an insurance premium, that we have to pay this in order to keep the peace.

I wonder why it is that at the very hour, almost, that we are considering this bond issue here, another committee of the House of Representatives is sitting elsewhere in the Capitol deciding whether or not we should authorize the

President of the United States to recall 150,000 reservists. Why is it that tonight peace hangs by a more fragile thread than it has in many a year? Why is it that we are threatened by Cuba, 90 miles from our own mainland? Why is it we have a war raging in southeast Asia, if the United Nations has been all that some of these men would lead us to believe it has been? I am afraid there have been some gross exaggerations in the course of the debate. I would suggest we look more carefully at the role the United Nations has been playing in the last few years.

Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago the Nation listened to a very remarkable address by one of our most distinguished living Americans, former President Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover, of course, has a reputation as an internationalist who supported not only the idea of the founding of the United Nations Organization, but also many years ago urged our membership in the World Court in a time when this was decidedly not a popular course of action to advocate. Therefore, when his remarks are viewed against this background I think it is fair to say that they represent the point of view of a man who subscribes thoroughly to the principle of international cooperation. As the members of the Committee will recall, former President Hoover advanced the idea that a Council of Free Nations should be established in view of the inability of the United Nations to carry out its functions in some instances because of the oft-exercised Soviet veto in the Security Council. I wish that today we were discussing an authorization of \$100 million for the establishment of such a Council for Free Nations for I think that it would contribute far more to the safeguarding of the peace of the world than the blood transfusion which we are today being asked to administer to the United Nations.

I speak as one who believes that there is a need for an international organization both as a forum for the discussion of those issues which affect the people of the world and also to provide machinery to safeguard the peace of the world when it is threatened. However, I am also obliged to number myself among those who decry the double standard that has been employed by the United Nations in adjudging the role that it should play in those disputes that threaten the peace. A couple of examples will certainly suffice to illustrate what I mean. The U.N. has cast a benevolent eye and given its blessing to a plan whereby the Papuan natives of West Irian will be turned over after a period of time to the administration of Mr. Sukarno of Indonesia. We were recently criticized by both the Premier and the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, heretofore one of our staunchest allies, for our failure to render them any moral encouragement whatsoever in their initial protest against this forced transfer of sovereignty and control.

Likewise, the U.N. with our assistance and under the urging of the Afro-Asian bloc has engaged in the condemnation of the colonialism practiced by Portugal. However, we fail to hear any urging by

the Afro-Asian bloc that there be an equally strong denunciation of the far more repressive type of colonialism carried on by the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Finally, we come to the sorry record that the U.N. has made for itself in the Congo. This is of particular importance, of course, because it has been admitted that the proceeds of this bond issue will be used primarily to support the continued maintenance of the U.N. forces in that unhappy country.

In August 9, 1960, the Security Council passed a resolution which specifically affirmed this principle that "the U.N. forces in the Congo were not to be a party to or intervene in the resolution of any internal political conflicts." Despite that resolution it is a well-known fact that in the so-called December war the forces of the U.N. proceeded to involve itself in an internal dispute in an operation of which Paul Henri Spaak, the Belgian Foreign Minister, was able to say that it had been in certain respects carried out under conditions that were truly inhuman. We are often told that the U.N. is merely a policeman on the beat, and only its presence in the Congo has prevented a confrontation of the great powers, which in turn would lead to the holocaust of nuclear war. It has been pointed out by persons far more expert in the field of foreign policy than I that the suggestion that the Soviets will dispatch troops or otherwise militarily intervene in the Congo in the event of a withdrawal of the U.N. troops is an entirely unreasonable hypothesis. The record conclusively shows that the Sino-Soviet bloc has committed its forces only when it has been in control of an adjoining land mass. This was shown to be true both in the case of Korea and in southeast Asia. Furthermore, at this particular juncture of world affairs there is every reason to believe that the Soviet Union may be so busy in such areas as Berlin and Cuba that the disorders in the Congo have been relegated to a secondary status in their plans for fomenting disorder. Be that as it may, I think that a fiction is being perpetrated upon the American people to suggest that the only alternative to the U.N. operations in the Congo is a military confrontation in that area of the great powers.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, the hostility toward Moïse Tshombe and the province of Katanga in the Belgian Congo on the part of the United Nations and the United States is hard to explain.

The decision was made to keep the Congo together. This followed the loi fondamentale, drafted by the Belgians as a constitution for the Congo after they gave up control, but only up to a certain point. The loi fondamentale provided a highly centralized government. It was clearly understood, however, that the constitution was a provisional one, to be effective only until the provinces involved could draft a permanent constitution.

The loi fondamentale had to be confirmed by the Congolese House of Rep-

resentatives before it became law. Prior to ratification, Katanga seceded. Tshombe is on sound ground when he argues that the loi fondamentale was not in effect when he withdrew.

Undoubtedly, the Belgians felt that a strong central government was needed by the Congo. There is little evidence that their conclusion was the correct one. They had already made a mistake in allowing themselves to be pressured into giving the Congo independence when the country was not ready for it. The Congo unity came about in the first place because it was colonized by the Belgians. Like many other African countries, this unity lay behind a false front, which screened ambitious politicians and hostile tribesmen.

In July 1960 Congolese soldiers in the Congo ran amok, killing and raping. The whites fled; the Belgians intervened to protect their nationals. On July 11, 1960, Tshombe declared Katanga to be a free and independent nation. Shortly afterward the United Nations plainly indicated its hostility to this action, a hostility which has been maintained since. Unquestionably, the United States bears a large part of the responsibility for the U.N. position and the U.N. hostility.

There ensued horrors and atrocities, carried out mostly by tribesmen in northern Katanga who were hostile to Tshombe. Meanwhile, U.N. troops had entered the Congo, but they did little to maintain order. Tshombe, meanwhile, was organizing an army, enlisting white mercenaries to give himself a quickly effective force.

There is little need to detail all the dreary round of events which followed in the Congo, including the murder of Lumumba, the pro-Communist radical leader, in February 1961. Lumumba was in the hands of the Katangan government at the time. A violent reaction against Tshombe followed, and the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution which called for the withdrawal of "Belgian and other foreign military and paramilitary personnel, political advisers, and mercenaries." The resolution also authorized the use of force if necessary, to prevent civil war in the Congo. As has been the case consistently, all the moves taken under the resolution have been against Tshombe.

In March 1961, 14 Congolese leaders met in Tananarive, capital of the Malagasy Republic. Almost all the top officials were there save Gizenga. An agreement was reached to replace the centralized structure with a loose confederation of states. In Léopoldville there was to be a centralized government in a neutral zone similar to the District of Columbia. This conference recognized some of the realities in the Congo situation, which included the fact that the centers of power lay with the local leaders in the provinces.

The U.N. paid no attention to this settlement. The situation between Katanga and the U.N. deteriorated. In April 1961 Tshombe attended a conference at Coquilhatville, where he was arrested and thrown into prison. It was assumed that Tshombe's regime would

collapse after his detention. This did not happen. The U.N. launched an attack on Tshombe which failed. Hammarström, U.N. head, was killed in a plane crash. A second attack on Tshombe by U.N. forces followed, during which the U.S. aircraft carried troops and war material into Elisabethville. The U.N. forces were charged with many atrocities during the fighting. It is questionable whether the organization—formed to press for and keep world peace—will ever regain the prestige lost in the Congo.

Tshombe's forces were beaten by the U.N. and Elisabethville was captured. An agreement was reached which, on the surface, promised to end the Katangan secession, but the secession was not ended and has not been ended to date.

It is useless—as his enemies frequently do—to accuse Tshombe of duplicity. All concerned in the sorry Congo mess have been guilty of duplicity. The U.N. violated its charter and everything it stood for when it made war on Tshombe. The Congo enemies of the Katangan leader were guilty of duplicity on many occasions, including the one where Tshombe was seized while attending a conference.

We are faced with some very hard facts. Obviously the United States and the U.N. have been wrong in their Congo policy. The extra costs incurred as the result of the U.N. Congo venture are the reason the Congress of the United States is asked to vote a \$100 million bond issue for the U.N.

This so-called bond issue will not solve the U.N.'s financial dilemma unless it gets out of the Congo. If the U.N. and the United States persist in efforts to force Katanga to subordinate itself to the central government headed by Adoula, the U.N. must return to this Government asking for more funds. If the U.N., and the United States wage war on Katanga again, the province, with its mines and industries, is likely to be wrecked. If so, the Belgian Congo is turned into a poorhouse. In this event, we will be asked to pick up the tab. Meanwhile, Soviet Russia, while refusing to pay its arrears in U.N. dues, applauds our war on Tshombe. We are playing the Soviet game in the Congo.

The arguments we use to excuse our pressure on Tshombe are very weak and illogical. One is that Katanga's surrender is necessary in order to permit the Congo to be viable. Certainly it would seem desirable for Katanga to be a part of a Congo federation. But this does not require the domination by the Central Government which Adoula and his backers, including our own State Department, seem to feel imperative.

The contention that the Congo was an entity under the Belgians and should remain an entity is specious. For example, 2 great French territories in Africa were divided into 12 separate and independent nations. The secession of one state from another with U.N. and U.S. approval is common. Senegal quit the Mali Federation in 1960. Syria left the so-called United Arab States, and there are many other examples.

Unless we change doctrinaire policies and admit past errors, the U.N.'s future,



Africa's future, and indeed our own future, is very dark. Undoubtedly the Afro-Asia bloc at the U.N. wants Tshombe crushed, but the Afro-Asian bloc increasingly is dominated by nationalism and racism. We cannot base our course on nationalism and racism without endangering our own future.

With reluctance, therefore, I urge the defeat of the U.N. bond issue until we show clearly that our future attitude toward Katanga and related matters in Africa is based on our own self-interest.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. THOMAS MORGAN, was very fair in giving the proponents, as well as the opponents, of this bill ample opportunity to present their viewpoints. The hearings themselves—and the consideration of the bill in executive sessions—consumed more than a month's time. The printed record of the hearings has filled 649 pages. It is obvious, therefore, that the committee has given careful consideration to this legislation.

Nevertheless, on issues as complex as this one, differences of opinion and judgment are bound to come to the fore. And I, for one, must differ with the decision of the majority of the committee to recommend the approval of the proposed loan to the United Nations.

I do not believe we should make this loan. I do not believe that the loan will serve our national interest—or the best interests of the United Nations. I am firmly of the opinion that we should defer action on this legislation until such time as the United Nations General Assembly—which will meet in New York on September 18—will have an opportunity to settle two pending issues: The issue of the United Nations course in the Congo, and the question of arrears of countries which are members of the United Nations.

I would like to make a few comments about those issues, and why I believe that they should be resolved before the U.S. Congress votes to provide financial assistance to the United Nations in excess of our regular and special assessments.

First of all, I have serious reservations about the United Nations continued military presence in the Congo. There is no evidence that I have seen to prove that the Congo is presently threatened with aggression or outside intervention. The existing threat to stability and the maintenance of order in the Congo comes from within the borders of that country. It has its origin in the conflict between different political factions in the Congo. It is strictly domestic, internal in nature.

I do not believe that the United Nations was constituted to cope with the internal problems of its member nations. This Organization is composed of sovereign states and has no authority to interfere in their internal affairs. As a matter of fact, I can think of nothing

that will destroy the United Nations faster and more thoroughly than an attempt on its part to become involved in the domestic disputes of its member states. For this reason, I am deeply concerned over the direction in which the United Nations is moving in the Congo. It seems to me that, at present, United Nations military personnel in the Congo cannot be justified on the grounds that the United Nations force is there to cope with aggression, or to settle an international dispute, or to forestall an international conflict.

The question of continued United Nations presence in the Congo should be reexamined carefully, and this reexamination should be undertaken by the United Nations General Assembly before we provide additional funds for the Congo operation.

There is also a second reason which argues for a delay in reaching a decision on the legislation before us. This concerns the arrears of countries which are members of the United Nations.

The reason for the United Nations financial crisis is obvious. The United Nations is in trouble because its own members are overdue in paying the bills for the operations which they have authorized. As of June 31, 1962, the United Nations deficit amounted to \$137 million. On that date, some 70 countries owed the United Nations money, in regular and special assessments, for 1961 and prior years. If those arrears were paid up, the United Nations would not be courting financial disaster.

A few weeks ago, the World Court handed down an advisory opinion which has a direct bearing on this issue. The Court said, in effect, that the U.N. special assessments for its peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and in the Congo are as binding on its members as the assessments for the regular U.N. budget. Since, however, this opinion is advisory only, it must be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly before it becomes binding on its members. Should this happen, delinquent members will have to pay their arrears or run the risk of losing their vote in the General Assembly under article 19 on the U.N. Charter.

This is the second matter that should be settled by the General Assembly prior to the approval of additional financial assistance in excess of the U.S. regular and special assessments. Should the United States rush to the United Nations aid at this moment by providing stopgap assistance, the pressures which may force United Nations members to face up to their financial responsibilities will be relaxed.

With the U.N. General Assembly scheduled to meet next week, a delay of a few additional weeks or even months on this legislation is not an unreasonable request. The U.N. Organization cannot survive, and it cannot count on continued support of the American people, unless other countries of the world face up to the responsibilities of membership in that Organization. By deferring action on the bill before us, the possibility that they will face up to those responsibilities will be enhanced.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the United Nations, our country has a responsibility to that Organization. We also have a responsibility to the American people whose tax dollars support the United Nations. I believe that we can best discharge both responsibilities by deferring action on the bill before the House.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHA] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRANAHA. Mr. Chairman, I support the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the President of the United States on this bill now before us. The people of Philadelphia believe in international efforts to achieve and maintain peace; they believe in the purposes of the United Nations and they hope and pray that this Organization can succeed in its assigned task.

We wanted the U.N. originally to be established in Philadelphia. We worked hard to attract the Organization to Philadelphia. We did so because the traditions of our city and of our people support the concept of international peace, and the establishment of machinery to achieve peace and maintain peace.

This bond issue on which we are now voting will not guarantee the future success of the U.N.; without the help of such a loan, however, it is certain the U.N. will fail. We must not let that happen out of neglect or disinterest or mistaken fears.

It will not help the Communist cause by passing this bill; quite the opposite, in fact. Communism wants the U.N. to fail. It wants the peacekeeping efforts of the U.N. to be repudiated. The Communists will never forget that the U.N. was the legal instrument for blocking communism's attempts to take over Korea, Iran, and the Congo. Communist countries have refused to pay their share of U.N. peacekeeping operations. The World Court says they must pay, under the charter. This loan is necessary to enable the U.N. to avoid bankruptcy until steps can be taken to collect the huge sums owed by the Communist countries to the U.N. In any event, we are assured under the terms of the loan that we are going to get our money back. I stress that, because this is not a giveaway, it is a devastating blow against communism's efforts to destroy the U.N.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill S. 2768 to authorize the purchase of up to \$100 million of United Nations bonds.

The financial crisis of the United Nations is well known to all of us, as are

also the reasons which have brought about this crisis. Its annual budget is around \$82 million, but a number of the member nations have fallen behind in paying their assessed contributions amounting to some \$95 million. Several ways have been proposed to solve this situation and to restore the fiscal integrity of the United Nations, one of these being a \$200 million bond issue of which we are to purchase \$100 million worth of such bonds.

The United Nations is not the perfect international organization as originally visualized when it was established back in 1945. It has its weaknesses and its shortcomings. But it is the only organization on a vast international scale which has devoted itself solely to the prevention of war and the promotion of peace. Its record of achievements may not be as successful as we should like it to be, but neither is it one of utter failure. In the Congo, in the Middle East, and in other areas of the world it has achieved a notable degree of success. The United Nations has also had some success in the effort to maintain and protect fundamental human rights, to provide economic and social assistance, to alleviate the refugee problem in many parts of the world, and to bring about a better understanding among the nations.

It is clear that if we did not have the United Nations the world situation would be much more tense and more chaotic than it is today. The United Nations still serves as a very effective forum of world opinion with which Khrushchev must reckon and which he cannot afford to ignore. He has tried continually to paralyze its efforts and its influence for the good. If we refuse to help strengthen the United Nations by providing it with the needed funds we shall be playing right into the hands of Moscow. A weak and ineffective U.N. will be an easy push-over for Khrushchev and his ilk, and that would remove the last hope of humanity to achieve peace in the world.

In a letter to our distinguished Speaker on September 11, 1962, President Kennedy wrote as follows:

There are many good reasons to support this loan. You have heard these reasons from this administration, from President Eisenhower, President Truman, and other distinguished leaders of both political parties. I would add one final thought: In historical terms, the United Nations is still in its infancy—and without our full support it will have no chance to grow into the mature institution foreseen by the farsighted men who wrote the charter for an organization "to secure succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

Mr. Chairman, not until mankind develops a better institution or a better way to keep the peace of the world should we discard or weaken the institution we now have, despite its faults. The United Nations is, after all, a reflection of mankind. If what is reflected is not to our liking, we must strive to improve it. If we kill it altogether, there will be nothing to improve and no further hope of attaining something better. The doom of the United Nations may also spell the doom of mankind with its hopes and dreams of lasting peace, freedom, and security.

The purchase of these bonds is actually a loan which is to be repaid over a period of years. It is not a giveaway. It is an investment in peace, an investment in better international understanding. Positive action on our part here today is bound to be noted in many parts of the world and, I am hopeful, will inspire other nations to follow our example by purchasing U.N. bonds. Our rejection of this proposal would only serve to discourage such nations and may prove to be a fatal blow to the United Nations and to the hopes of humanity.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bill. Let us not make a political football of this issue. This is not a question as between Democrats and Republicans. It is a question for the whole Nation, regardless of political affiliation. The whole world is watching our action and our decision today. Let us show to the nations of the world that when it comes to problems of world peace we stand united and speak with one strong voice. They will have more respect for us.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Chairman, over 15 years ago a well-known financier and a very wise man—Beardsley Ruml—made a prophetic statement about the United Nations. In 1945 Mr. Ruml said this:

At the end of 5 years you will think the United Nations is the greatest vision ever realized by man.

At the end of 10 years you will find doubts—within yourselves and all throughout the world.

At the end of 15 years you will believe the U.N. cannot succeed. You will be certain that all the odds are against its ultimate life and success.

It will only be when the U.N. is 20 years old that you will revere and laud the dedication of those who devoted their energies to it through its turbulent course. For by then we will know that the U.N. is the only alternative to the demolition of the world.

The first stages of this prediction have turned out to be remarkably accurate. I would remind you that a year ago, as the 16th General Assembly met in New York, the United Nations was without an executive head, and without a plan to avert bankruptcy.

At this moment a desperate question mark seemed to hang over the fate of the world organization. The small but noisy minorities in this country who still cling to isolationism, or who are prepared to risk war by go-it-alone intervention, jumped up and down in shrill glee. They were convinced that the U.N. was finished. They were, of course, abetted by the Russians who did their best to paralyze the executive arm of the U.N. with their infamous troika proposal.

At the same time gloomy prophets and the hip-shooting analysts, who dominate parts of the press, administered the last rites and prepared to bury the U.N. in the public prints, even the responsible press

and news magazines wondered out loud in unison: "Can the U.N. survive?" The implications seemed to be that if it did survive, it would be but a shadow of its former self.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the U.N. survived. It not only survived, but emerged a better, stronger instrument for keeping the peace—subject to only one qualification. That qualification is the question of finances.

At this very moment, the United Nations—supported by the United States—maintains the peace in the Middle East and the Congo.

At this very moment, at U.S. initiative and under the auspices of the U.N., the nations of the world are still seeking some formula to halt the deadly arms race and put the world on the path toward disarmament.

At this very moment, at U.S. initiative and under U.N. auspices, the nations are meeting in an effort to find other formulas for cooperation in outer space.

At this very moment, at U.S. initiative and under U.N. auspices, the nations are working on concrete plans to turn the next 10 years into a great decade of economic and social progress.

This, then, is the major business today of the United Nations: peace, cooperation in space, and rapid improvement in the standards of living for the world's impoverished majority. All of these activities are carried on through the U.N. Each of them, if successful, will bring enormous benefits to the United States.

I need no statistics to make the point that such urgent, complex, and costly work can hardly be accomplished by an organization in the depths of financial crisis. It is for this reason that a resolution of the financial crisis of the United Nations does, in fact, involve the capacity of that Organization to do its work in the years and months immediately ahead.

We have been told by competent and respected financial authorities that the bond proposal is the best way to restore financial stability to the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for full U.S. support for the bond issue.

I want to see the U.N. financial crisis resolved at the earliest possible moment.

I want to see the United Nations get on with the urgent business of world peace and world progress.

I want to see the United Nations fulfill the final prophecy of Beardsley Ruml.

The way to do that is to back the financial plan carefully worked out and approved by the overwhelming majority of the Members not by riding off in some different direction.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Illinois, the committee was prepared to discuss any of the peacekeeping operations that may have been brought up. There was more than sufficient time. No time was requested to bring up the matter of the peacekeeping operations. For that reason, no time was used to discuss them today.



Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2768, because I believe it is essential for the continued success of the United Nations.

The United Nations founded in 1945 announced one of its main goals was the protection of fundamental human rights. The U.S.S.R. has done everything it can to damage the efforts of the U.N. to insure these rights. The Soviets have made repeated attempt either to control or paralyze the U.N., but in view of the deterioration of the international situation it is most important that all democratic countries join together to make the U.N. effective and ever increasingly effective to advance the aims outlined in the charter of 1945.

"What does S. 2768 propose?" It provides for the purchase of up to \$100 million of the U.N. bonds to help meet the fiscal crisis which was caused by either the refusal or omission of certain nations to pay their share of costs of the United Nations peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and Congo.

Our House committee has substituted a strict dollar-matching formula in place of the Senate action. Pledges do not count. The President may loan only an amount equal to the total of the bonds purchased by all other nations. There is language that will help insure repayment of the amount of principal. The amount of principal and interest due the United States is to be deducted from our annual membership payments.

Our committee has adopted new section 5 expressing satisfaction over the World Court opinion holding that expenses of U.N. operations in the Congo and in the Middle East are "expenses of the Organization" within the meaning of the U.N. Charter. The effect of all of this will be to deprive members 2 years in arrears on their assessments of their right to vote in the General Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives is presumed to be the body closest to the people and I think we should emphasize that the Gallup poll clearly showed the overwhelming support of the American people for the United Nations as our best hope for peace in February 1962. The American Institute of Public Opinion of Princeton, N.J., revealed the results of three separate questions as follows:

First. How important do you think it is that we try to make the U.N. a success? Eighty-three percent said, "Very important."

Second. In general, do you think the U.N. is doing a good job or a poor job? Seventy-eight percent answered the U.N. was doing a good or fair job.

Third. Do you think the United States should give up its membership in the U.N. or not? Ninety percent answered, "Should not."

I think one of the most important things to consider during the debate on the U.N. bond purchase is that the cost of the U.N. might well be considered a part of our national defense. Adequate safeguards have been spelled out by the

House Foreign Affairs Committee. The committee is to be commended for its good work. S. 2768 should be adopted by a large vote to show the free world the United States believes in the importance of a strong United Nations.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support S. 2768.

As has been said, this does represent a request for authority to lend up to \$100 million to the United Nations. I believe, as has been suggested many times during the course of this debate, that it is in the interests of the United States to support and to pass this legislation, as has already been done in another form in the other body.

Of course there are difficulties. Of course it is true that all of us have found that the United Nations has not in many ways lived up to the perhaps excessive expectations that we had for this Organization when it was first founded in San Francisco. But that is no reason for us not to support this legislation at this time, because it is a question of what the alternative would be. What would we do if we did not have an international organization to which we could take some of these problems, these peacekeeping problems to which the gentleman from Illinois has just referred, some organization to which we could take them and find that they were carried out effectively, as they have been done in the Middle East, in the Gaza strip, and carried out in a way that they could not have been carried out by the United States directly without the involvement of the Soviet Union and other nations and a distinct possibility of a world war.

Reference has been made several times in the debate to John McCloy. I should like to refer to some of the things that Mr. McCloy said before the Committee on Foreign Affairs when he testified, because he expressed better than I can the essential facts which support this legislation.

I might say that, so far as qualifications are concerned, both on the basis of his experience as the President's disarmament adviser and his tremendous experience in postwar Germany in creating the foundations for the economic revival of that country, there is no American who is better qualified to speak on this subject.

He is a man in whom our committee has great trust and his testimony was moderate and reasonable.

With reference to the United Nations, he said:

Imperfect as it may be, it functions and if we allow it to collapse, it would not be a very long time before mankind would be demanding the re-creation of a new institution along similar lines just as we did after the collapse of the League of Nations.

He said further:

I have been as critical as any of the attitude of some of the neutrals, of so-called nonaligned states, in their tendency to be bold, provocative, and critical against those whom they do not fear and to be moderate or even conciliatory in their hesitation to offend those whom they do.

However, he says:

If we did not have such an institution as the U.N., we would rapidly have to invent one.

He said further:

Any thought of permitting it to collapse at this moment or of failing to do anything within reason to maintain its vigor seems to me to be completely out of the question so far as the interests of the United States are concerned.

Finally, what I consider to be the essential statement that he made and also the basic point in this whole discussion, he said:

I believe we should go to great lengths to preserve the United Nations even if for no other reason than that it might just serve as a ledge to save mankind from going over the brink into the cataclysm of a thermonuclear war.

That is the issue essentially which we face in considering this question today.

Reference has been made to the Congo. Obviously, this is an area of great controversy. But I should like to point out what Mr. Khrushchev has said about the U.N. operations in the Congo. He said:

But the experience of the Congo puts us on the alert. This experience shows that the U.N. forces are being used precisely in the direction against which we have warned and which we resolutely oppose.

This was in September 1960 in a speech to the U.N.

In February 1961 he also said:

Having weighed all the circumstances, the Government of the U.S.S.R. has come to the conclusion that the interests of Congo independence as well as those of U.N. prestige require the speediest termination of the so-called operation in the Congo and the withdrawal of all foreign troops.

So this is what Mr. Khrushchev thought and still thinks about the operations of the U.N. in the Congo. If the U.N. has acted contrary to his desires and interests, perhaps it has moved in the right direction.

Mr. Dulles said something which is significant in this connection, too, in testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body. Mr. Dulles said:

Of course, I recognize that this charter does not do what many people would like to guarantee at a single step—perpetual peace. But the world does not move in a single step from a position of virtual anarchy to the condition of a well-rounded political order. These steps are made falteringly. I say that here is at least a step that presents itself to us that may well be and has a good chance to be a step forward on new, firm, and higher ground.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is the alternative which I should like to emphasize—the alternative of where we would be if we did not have this international organization, imperfect as it may be, and with all the difficulties it has experienced in its career. I say I would not wish to be the one who would give the push—I would not want to be the one to give the impulse to send this Organization over the brink and thereby, perhaps, contribute one more step to the creation of conditions which might bring on a total war.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

# CUBA

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I know that every Member of the House is deeply concerned about the developments in Cuba. Yesterday the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services held a joint meeting in the committee rooms of the House Committee on Armed Services. The Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Rusk, the Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Lt. Gen. Marshall Carter, and Mr. William Bundy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, appeared before the two committees.

During that discussion many members felt there should be some expression by the Congress in the form of a resolution.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to introduce this afternoon a House concurrent resolution which expresses the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. For the benefit of the House I will read the resolution:

Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared to the Congress that we should consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety;"

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that "an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States, and, consequently, each one of the said Contracting Parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations;"

Whereas the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 declared "The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extra-continental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union;"

Whereas since 1958 the international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic and military sphere of influence: Now, therefore, be

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States is supported in his determination and possesses all necessary authority—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Castro regime from exporting its aggressive purposes to any part of this hemisphere by force or the threat of force;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported offensive military base capable of endangering the United States Naval Base at Guantanamo, free passage to the Panama Canal, United States missile and space preparations or the security of this Nation and its citizens; and

(c) to work with other free citizens of this hemisphere and with freedom-loving

Cuban refugees to support the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cuba for a return to self-determination.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to call the Committee on Foreign Affairs together tomorrow afternoon if possible to consider this resolution for the legislative schedule in the House early next week.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I want to agree with what the chairman of our committee has said. I think this is a strong resolution. It registers the sentiment of the Congress and of the American people. I would like to join the gentleman in introducing an identical resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. I welcome the co-sponsorship of this resolution by any Member of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state to the House that on behalf of the Armed Services Committee I, too, have introduced an identical resolution. This resolution was considered before the Armed Services Committee this morning.

Mr. MORGAN. I appreciate the support given by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and assure him that I intend to support the measure dealing with the callup of Reserves.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and with my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] in supporting this legislation. I agree we might not have written it quite the same way, each one of us, but it does give us the sense that the country has of the danger we are now facing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the people of America are very much concerned about the situation, not only throughout the world but particularly the threat of Cuba, 90 miles away from our shore, which threat comes from the Soviet Union.

This resolution is a strong one, properly so, and an appropriate one.

I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, as well as the minority members of both committees, for the expressions made today.

As Speaker of the House I will cooperate with the Committee on Foreign Affairs in bringing that resolution up as quickly as possible. I am in hopes that the situation will be such from a committee angle that I can program this under suspension of the rules on Monday next.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House in introducing this very timely resolution. I assure him of my full support.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned a while ago in general debate on the U.N. bond issue this matter by indirection. I want to join in the submission of this resolution, which I have been privileged to hear before today, as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services indicated.

I would particularly call your attention to the second resolve or paragraph (b) therein. In a situation wherein there are Migs and capable rocket launchers, as outlined by the Secretary of State, the CIA, and the Department of Defense, mentioned in a joint meeting of the two committees, this would appear to be an already fact in existence. Therefore, I would hope that the leadership and the distinguished chairman, as well as my colleague from Pennsylvania, would bring this up in such a manner, even if speed is essential and backing of our Commander in Chief is paramount, that we have adequate time for discussion, even prior to hearings; and take a reading, not only among our people but as to the end effects of that resolution in particular.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the distinguished gentleman's committee, and particularly of the Committee on Inter-American Affairs, I greet this news with great emphasis, that we are going to have an opportunity in the very near future to make it quite clear what we as representatives of the American people feel about recent developments in Cuba.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairmen of both committees for proceeding in this fashion in introducing the resolution. I want to register at this time, however, my deep concern, over a measure of this vast importance being brought to the floor of the House under suspension of the rules, which would limit debate to only 20 minutes on a side. There would not be any amendments in any event. I am satisfied with the feeling in the House that this matter should be moved with great expedition, but I do not believe any measure of this importance should be handled under such procedure, and I want to register my very deep convictions on that at this time.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman will have to take that up with the leadership.



Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] in voicing a protest here and now against bringing up this resolution or any legislation to provide for the calling of 150,000 reservists under suspension of the rules. I know of no reason or no emergency that requires either piece of legislation being considered under a gag rule.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I just returned from my district and I can report to the membership that President Kennedy's statement of last Tuesday was received with overwhelming approval by the people of Milwaukee.

I want to commend and congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], for drafting and introducing the resolution which we are discussing. I think it is a very timely and a very strong resolution, and I am delighted to join in cosponsoring it.

It is my sincere hope that the resolution will be acted upon expeditiously because I believe that the American people desire this type of an expression from the Congress. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I will exert every effort to see that this resolution may be reported out and brought before the House without delay.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the United Nations, and so I support this authorization to lend it part of the money needed to keep it alive.

If this money can bring peace to the Congo, I will consider it one of the best bargains we will ever make.

If any situation ever had the makings of a tragedy, it was the Congo. On the one hand, there was the happy prospect of a relatively wealthy colony with a high level of literacy joining the free world as an independent nation. Even when the tragic period of violence followed independence, there was the United Nations, able and willing to restore order and keep the Russians out. All this could have been so successful that the Congo could have become a paragon of free world cooperation.

But there was one vital flaw in this prospect—the shortsighted avarice of a mining combine with powerful connections in a number of countries, including Belgium and Great Britain. By encouraging secession in Katanga, and by taking out more money from the Congo than the U.N. has put in, this combine has bled the United Nations, damaged the unity of the West, and done irreparable harm to the stand of the Western nations in the eyes of the rest of the world.

By its actions, the combine has put the remaining colonies on notice that they cannot expect independence to come peacefully if there is a large private financial stake involved in without holding or delaying real independence.

It was tragic to see a Western business operation, owned partly by Western governments, sabotaging a vital policy of the West.

At the moment, the prospect has improved. The Governments of Belgium and Great Britain now support the proposals for national reconciliation in the Congo. I fervently hope that this support is sincere and will continue. For if the mining combine is once again permitted to call the tune, the \$200 million U.N. loan will merely have postponed disaster, not avoided it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*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. The proceeds of such loan shall not be used to relieve states members of the United Nations of their obligation to pay arrearages on payments of any United Nations assessments, and shall not be used to reduce regular or special assessments against any such members.*

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1171. An act to assure continued fish and wildlife benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas by authorizing their appropriate incidental or secondary use for public recreation to the extent that such use is compatible with the primary purposes of such areas, and for other purposes, and

H.R. 10129. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 319. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide

that the provisions of section 4(1) thereof, relating to long- and short-haul charges, shall not apply to express companies;

S. 962. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in the investigation of aircraft accidents, and for other purposes;

S. 1924. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868) with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah;

S. 2182. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit schemes in interstate or foreign commerce to influence by bribery the outcome of sporting contests, and for other purposes;

S. 3019. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland;

S. 3138. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise;

S. 3282. An act for the relief of Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling;

S. 3297. An act for the relief of Joannis Dounis;

S. 3298. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski;

S. 3335. An act to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3452. An act for the relief of Dr. Hassan M. Nouri;

S. 3475. An act to provide further for cooperation with States in administration and enforcement of certain Federal laws;

S. 3566. An act to change the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park; and

S. 3589. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire certain lands in Wright County, Minn., and exchange them with the State of Minnesota for State-owned lands in the Superior National Forest, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2357. An act to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia.

S. 3086. An act to provide for a reduction in the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 3315. An act to relieve owners of abutting property from certain assessments in connection with the repair of alleys and sidewalks in the District of Columbia, and

S. 3317. An act to amend provisions of law relating to personal property coming into the custody of the property clerk, Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2356) entitled "An act to amend the act known as the 'Life Insurance Act' of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the 'Fire and Casualty Act' of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BEALL, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, and Mr. MILLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that Mr. HARTKE was appointed as conferee on the bill (H.R. 4670) entitled "An act to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia," in place of Mr. MORSE, excused.

### WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the need for law in the world community is the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization. The achievement of world peace through law is a wonderful dream which could become a reality. Americans since colonial times have insisted that there is a rule of law which is superior to the rule of man. Now many Americans are endeavoring to carry the concept of the rule of law into the international field as a method of preserving world peace. This public focus upon the rule of law is extending throughout the hemisphere and it can achieve good for humanity if the task is taken up by enough people.

You ask what exactly is this international rule of law idea? The basic idea is that international disputes should be settled without resort to arms. It is the building of an international law which is adapted to today's world both as to content and as to universality of acceptance. The idea that there is a higher legal obligation than a nation's own local jurisprudence must be demonstrated to the world so nations can accept the obligation without loss of national sovereignty or pride. The rule of law where it prevails within nations must mean liberty, justice, and equality for the individual. It embodies the natural law, and the great principles common to all religions. Essentially it is what is right and just under the rule of reason as developed by the experience of man.

The American Bar Association has established a world peace through law program which is a commendable project. The program's objective is simple, but vital—to substitute the rule of law for the rule of force. Through the efforts of the world peace through law program, continental conferences have been held for the Americas, for Asia and Australasia, for Africa, and the Middle East. These conferences have received the support of the Ford Foundation and the International Cooperation Administration and they precede a proposed world conference. Each conference has adopted a consensus which proclaims the imperative need for judicial settlement of international disputes, and suggests standards for judges on international judicial institutions.

The delegates to the conferences envision a program of research, education, and action. This is a program in which we can actively participate by constantly offering the rule of law as our country's plan for a peaceful world.

Charles S. Rhyne, chairman of the Special Committee on World Peace Through Law of the American Bar Association, and a past president of the ABA, recommends as a plan to achieve peace that the United States announce to the world that its plan for peace is the universal rule of law on a worldwide basis. We should, he urges, describe this plan of peace through law as a plan which in-

sure liberty, equality, and justice for all men as well as for all nations:

We must achieve peace under law primarily through development of methods to utilize a judicial concept in the resolution of disputes between nations. The need here is to focus the crystallized opinion of the people of the world upon the rule of law and what it can do for mankind.

John Foster Dulles, speaking on the role of law in peace said:

To accomplish peace through law will take patience and perseverance. It will require us at times to provide an example by accepting for ourselves standards of conduct more advanced than those generally accepted. We shall be misunderstood and our motives misinterpreted by others who have had no such training as we in doctrine of law. There is no nobler mission that our Nation could perform. Upon its success may depend the very survival of the human race.

Developments in the last few weeks have indicated that we are still engaged in an ever-increasing arms race with Russia. At present there seems to be no end to this arms race. Will we go to war—or will we apply the rule of law in our international disputes?

We desperately need a law of nations under which international tribunals will apply the rule of law in international disputes. Of course, voluntary compliance by nations would be necessary to enforce decrees and judgments of a world court against nations. Would Russia submit to the judgment of an international tribunal? We do not know; but it is obvious that the world no longer has a choice between force and law. As President Dwight D. Eisenhower said:

If civilization is to survive, it must choose the rule of law.

International rules of law have been successful; for instance, worldwide adherence to the law of the sea, law of the air, the law of diplomatic immunity, and the postal convention demonstrate working universal and worldwide law. The rapidly decreasing size of the world intensifies the need for new institutions to help resolve new international problems. The United States may not have done all that it could do to insure the success of an international tribunal. The International Court of Justice created by the United Nations in 1945 has played only a minor role in the settlement of international legal disputes.

The refusal of some nations to accept the Court's jurisdiction at all has caused the Court to suffer. The Court has no jurisdiction in many disputes unless the nations agree that it has in a particular case.

Our country accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in 1946 but with a reservation excluding from the Court's jurisdiction "disputes within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." The Connally amendment added to our reservation the clause "as determined by the United States of America." This country was the first to provide that the jurisdiction of the Court should be determined not by the Court but by us. Several other nations followed our example. Perhaps the United States should reconsider this reservation and determine whether or not it is such

an impairment to the effectiveness of the Court that it should be removed. If an international tribunal is to be effective it needs the wholehearted support of the United States.

We must support the movement of waging peace through the rule of law. Charles Rhyne, speaking to the Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law at Rome in April stated:

It is an unfortunate truth of our era that at a time of so many spectacular achievements, the area of knowledge of how to replace force with law is, in fact, the world's greatest underdeveloped area. We must create a means to bring to this ever-mounting offensive against war not only legal talents, but at least a portion of the political, scientific, and technological talent we now lavish on preparations for war.

Mr. Speaker, the rule of law can be an effective means of achieving world peace and an alternative to a world dominated by brute force. This program is a program of realists and it is one in which we may all join.

### THE ALLAN B. ROGERS MEMORIAL AWARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the death of a young man whose personality and ability give promise of a full life, rich in service to his fellow men, brings grief to a whole community.

So it was with Allan B. Rogers, only 31, and editor of the successful and respected Lawrence Eagle-Tribune published in Lawrence, Mass.

Allan came from a family of newspapermen. His father and grandfather owned and published and built the Eagle-Tribune into one of the most influential newspapers of Massachusetts.

With pride in his heritage, and with a love for journalism that he acquired during his formative years, Allan quickly learned the teamwork of skills that create from many sources, and within a few hours, that most modern of products, the daily newspaper. By his natural aptitude, industry, and happy faculty of inspiring confidence among his coworkers, he earned his way to the position of editor with the best years of his career still before him.

Because a newspaper is so closely identified with the whole life of a community, Allan took an active interest in civic responsibilities. By helping to make Greater Lawrence a better place in which to work and live, he was providing the spirit and the leadership that exemplify the highest ideals of journalism.

His fellow editors recognized his worth by electing him president of the United Press International Newspaper Editors of Massachusetts. In the spring of 1962, the UPINEM decided to name one of the annual competitive awards in honor of a person connected with one of the 45 Massachusetts papers served by the UPI.



Three days after this meeting, Rogers died at the Phillips House of the Massachusetts General Hospital.

He was so eager for life and so confident that he could enrich it with his own contributions, that many people found it difficult to believe that he had passed away.

But time, in its sweet sad way does ease the shock of grief. Then comes the need to honor and perpetuate the memory of one whose journey through this life helped those he met along the way.

The United Press International Newspaper Editors of Massachusetts, in tribute to their late president, have announced that, from now on, the best editorial award in the annual UPINEM-sponsored competition will be known as the Allan B. Rogers Memorial Award.

The best locally produced editorial on a local subject will be judged on the basis of vigor and style.

Vigor and style as fresh as the dawn. That would have pleased Allan B. Rogers as this award, dedicated in his memory, will bring comfort and quiet pride to his family and friends.

#### TIME OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight Saturday to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### "NOW, MR. McNAMARA HAS SET UP A DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY AND IT IS HIGH TIME WE GOT IT"—HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone would expect all Missourians to be in complete agreement on national issues. I would certainly say that there are a great many issues upon which former President Truman and I are in sharp disagreement. There is one subject, however, which I am happy to state we agree upon completely and that regards the establishment of a Defense Supply Agency in the Department of Defense in order that there may be greater effectiveness, economy, and efficiency in the procurement and management of supplies and equipment which annually cost the taxpayers some \$25 billion. Regrettably, much of the expenditure is fruitless and wasteful.

In the September 1962 issue of the Military Review there is an excellent article regarding the President's responsibility. President Truman has added a foreword which I consider to be worth the reading of every taxpayer in the country. President Truman's article follows, verbatim:

#### THE PRESIDENT'S RESPONSIBILITY

(By Harry S. Truman)

(The Military Review is grateful for the opportunity to present this statement by a former President of the United States. Mr. Truman's personal message serves to introduce our readers to the articles following which deal with the direction of our military forces at the highest level.—EDITOR.)

Just 15 years ago this past July I signed into law the bill that set up the National Military Establishment and created the Office of Secretary of Defense. The bill was not all I had asked for from the Congress, but it was a first step in the direction of unification. Even while World War II was still on, I had spoken out for unification. After I became President, I called on Congress to give us the kind of defense machinery that would fit the needs of the times.

As Commander in Chief, the President knows perhaps better than anyone else how much it takes to get all the services pulling in the same direction. There are a great many different factors that go into the making of a command decision, but in the end there has to be just one decision—or there is no command. I learned that lesson in France in 1918.

The Presidency of the United States is the greatest and most honorable position in history. It is actually six jobs rolled into one—and, under the Constitution of the United States, there is no way for the man who has that position to get out of any of them.

You can talk about lightening the burdens of the Presidency, but no matter how the Government is reorganized there are always these six functions to be carried out, and there are always decisions that can be made only by the man who is in the White House at the time.

There are some who would change our system of government so that the responsibility would be more widely distributed.

Under our Constitution this is not possible, and I just happen to think that the Constitution has served us pretty well for all these years. I think that it is good for the people to know who is responsible; that is the only way a democracy can function.

That is not to say that the responsibilities have not become graver and the decisions tougher than was true when Henry Knox was Secretary of War under George Washington and the whole Army had less than 5,000 men. There are five times that many today in the Pentagon alone. It is a far cry from the cavalry captain who would take his troop to rifle practice in the sagebrush to the huge organization of Joint Task Force 8 that carried on the nuclear testing this spring. The older readers will remember, as I do, the days when the mess sergeant went out and did his own shopping for the company's needs; now Mr. McNamara has set up a Defense Supply Agency, and it is high time we got it.

Of course, size is only a small part of the change. I suppose it takes someone my age to appreciate the difference between horse-drawn artillery of the kind we had in World War I and intercontinental ballistic missiles, between using runners on foot and the electronic communications of our day. But you do not have to be very far along in age to understand what difference nuclear weapons make.

Today the defense of the United States is wherever the free world is being defended. The strength of our allies is part of our defense, and our strength contributes to theirs. Someone has said that the President of the United States is now the Commander in Chief of the free world; I suppose that in the sense that the United States has the responsibility of providing the leadership for the free world, the President is the one who carries that burden.

How does he do it? I am sure that the burden has become even greater than it was when I was President, and of all the President's functions that of Commander in Chief has grown the most in importance and in its demands upon the incumbent. But I think that the basic principles that I tried to follow have always applied and apply now.

First of all, the President has to be on top of the situation. Getting the facts, and all the facts, takes hard work, and very little can be done by others. You cannot make a decision if you do not know what the alternatives are. You cannot know what the alternatives are if you do not have all the facts.

Second, the President has to find the best men he can to be on his staff and in his Cabinet. I was fortunate to have such outstanding men willing to serve as Dean Acheson, Gen. George C. Marshall, and Robert A. Lovett; they were outstanding leaders and remarkably capable organizers.

Third, the President needs an organization that can and will give full effect to his decisions. This has been the most difficult thing to accomplish because of the many traditions and special interests. I believe that we made progress 15 years ago when I signed that unification bill and that we are making progress today. We need to go on making progress. We need to use every new technique available, every bit of new knowledge, so that in the end the President will always be prepared to face with confidence the many decisions that our position in the world and his position in the Nation require him to make.

It was with genuine pleasure that I note that the ex-President from Missouri has stated that "Now Mr. McNamara has set up a Defense Supply Agency—and it is high time we got it." I consider that this statement is extremely significant and timely since, as we know, there have been efforts by proponents of "three departments separately administered," to curtail if not to eliminate the

newly established Defense Supply Agency in spite of the fact that it has been endorsed by President Hoover, President Truman, and President Kennedy.

#### POSITION OF U.S.S.R. IN COLD WAR

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the natural concern that our citizens have over developments in the cold war, it is practical for us to evaluate the position of the Soviet Union. It is apparent that our foreign policy is based on confusion, vacillation, and lack of confidence in our own strength and vigor, whereas it should be based on the known weaknesses and problems of the Communist world.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, and president of the National Captive Nations Week Committee, is considered an outstanding international authority on the Soviet Union. I insert in the RECORD at this point his recent analysis of the Soviet Russian weaknesses and vulnerabilities, published in the September 10, 1962, issue of the American Security Council's Washington Report:

#### SOVIET RUSSIAN WEAKNESSES AND VULNERABILITIES

In analyzing Soviet Russia, it is necessary to distinguish at the outset between weakness and vulnerability. A weakness is a condition of defect and impairment which does not in itself constitute a vulnerability. For it to develop into this state, an external stimulus is required. There are many deep weaknesses in the totalitarian Soviet Russian empire, but so long as they remain untapped they are not, by definition, vulnerabilities. Policies of patched-up containment, evolution and wishful thinking on the coming breakup of the so-called Communist bloc serve only to guarantee that Soviet weaknesses shall not become vulnerabilities. The active external agent, the catalyst, is lacking.

The prodigious irony of the current situation is the fact that beneath the surface of most Soviet Russian accomplishments and points of strength rest their most profound weaknesses.

The real decision before this Nation today is not whether to push or not to push into space, to disarm or not to disarm, to negotiate or not to negotiate, to trade or not to trade with the Red empire. Instead, the basic and real decision is whether to meet or not to meet the full cold-war challenge of colonial Moscow. If we should resolve to engage the enemy in the total context of the cold war, it wouldn't and couldn't be a matter of fighting this war only on our side of the 50-yard line. The best defense is the offense, and it should be obvious that the defense of freedom is being battered from Laos to Cuba because our mere defensive and reactive posture is not the best defense.

A cold war offensive would not permit Moscow's imperialism to nibble away at us, for such an offensive necessitates the conversion of well-known weaknesses in the enemy's empire into vulnerabilities and the systematic exploitation of these vulnerabilities toward his eventual destruction.

There are five major areas for analysis: (1) The ideologico propaganda; (2) the empire; (3) the so-called economic race; (4) the military-space field; and (5) the party apparatus.

1. We have still to appreciate the central importance of propaganda in the cold war. The Soviet Russians have developed this basic art to make a relatively backward state appear as the equal of the American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

However, the weaknesses of Moscow's ideologico propaganda are deep and fundamental. After 20 years of indoctrination, millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Russians, and others deserted colonial Moscow in World War II; after 10 years of heavy propaganda Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution. There are many similar examples to prove the utter bankruptcy of Communist ideology when it is put into practice.

Nevertheless, Moscow continues to capitalize on this massive deception, chiefly because of our failure to develop these weaknesses into critical vulnerabilities. This requires a realization of the central importance of propaganda. The Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's media. There are many good opportunities for demolishing the image Moscow casts of its empire. For example, we could easily show the Russian perversion of theoretical Marxism, the emptiness of so-called Communist ideology, the emergence of the technocratic elite in the U.S.S.R., and the colonial exploitation of the captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union. These are only a few points to establish the Russian mythology of communism.

If we are to win the cold war, we must recognize and repeatedly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperio-colonial system of totalitarian rule.

2. The second general area of Moscow's obvious strength is its expanded empire. One of Moscow's paramount goals in the past 5 years has been to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its present empire, and our increasing indifference toward the captive nations has helped in this.

Those who today preach that the Soviet Russian empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us, that all that is required is a military buildup and trade with this empire, are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact, all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way. Of course, Moscow has its problems. Who doesn't? It had even greater problems at Stalin's death and during the Hungarian revolution, but it, nonetheless, continued to build up its composite power.

Yet, beneath the surface of this imperial power and strength lies the most profound weakness of the Soviet Union and of the entire structure of Moscow's imperial rule and power. This weakness is the immense latent power of the genuine patriotic nationalism of the captive peoples both within and outside the Soviet Union. It is this patriotic nationalism which is our most formidable weapon against Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, not the superficial disagreements between puppets and the prime power.

Khrushchev's sensitivity here is shown by his fury at the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. Except for the U-2 incident, no event in the past 10 years has had as violent an impact on Moscow as this resolution. Khrushchev and his puppets know, if we do not, the disastrous effects that a methodic implementation

of this resolution could have on their worldwide propaganda operations and on the nations within their empire.

3. In the economic area, it should be readily recognized that for cold war objectives the empire economy of the Soviet Union is strong, secure, and increasingly threatening. Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy, but being a totalitarian and essentially a war economy, the U.S.S.R. poses an increasing threat as \$12 to \$20 billion of additional output becomes annually available to it for cold and hot war purposes.

Weaknesses in the economy are many, but most fundamental are the differences in status and real income between the ruling elite and the underlying population, and also the rampant economic colonialism to which the captive non-Russian peoples are subjected. This could be transformed into a vulnerability by focusing worldwide attention and opinion on these weaknesses. It would provide important political leverage to the liberal Russian and nationalist non-Russian forces within the U.S.S.R.

4. The U.S.S.R. devotes top priority allocation of resources to the military-space field. Over 20 percent of the gross product in the U.S.S.R. goes to military pursuits. Their further development poses great dangers, particularly in significant breakthroughs capable of magnifying their military power. Today, Khrushchev threatens us and the world with "global missiles." He has been so effective in propagandizing the empire's military and space feats that in addition to naive and pacifist groups doing his work for him in the free nations, even our own leaders invoke from time to time the pangs of "nuclearitis" as an excuse for the absence of a well defined and developed cold war policy.

But the innovation of present military-space technology in no way alters the persistent weaknesses in the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. The ultimate weapon is still man and his morale, loyalties, and will. Moscow is well aware that in all three major wars in this century, the motley and multinational forces of the Russian empire, whether czarist or Soviet, disintegrated early.

Capitalization of this vital weakness into a vulnerability rests obviously on a broader program directed at the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Along with this is the necessity for a full and superior development of all our arms, nuclear and conventional. The only sure and safe way to preserve the gray peace and to move forward to cold war victory is by attaining and maintaining unquestioned superiority along the entire spectrum of military technology and weaponry.

5. The final area for analysis is the party. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet Russian strength, and the vehicle for the subverting conspiracy beyond it.

However, it has weaknesses that could be developed into fatal vulnerabilities. The perennial problem of succession, intraparty feuding, the pressures of national parties in Ukraine, Georgia, and elsewhere, and infiltration of party councils and machinery lend themselves to such a development. Here, as elsewhere, our offensive in the cold war would necessarily have to be organic, composite and totalistic. Pursuing one weakness as against others would be both foolish and wasteful. But involved in each of these major weaknesses is the basic problem of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

It is painful to observe how, today, we continue to miss our opportunities for eventual cold war victory. However, I am positive that given an aroused citizenry, the dominant facts of international life and the predominant weaknesses of the Soviet



Russian empire will lead us to the pursuit of an inescapable policy of emancipation and a cold war strategy designed for decisive victory.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

### COMMISSION ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to establish a Commission on Research and Development.

This bill is for the same purpose as a bill I introduced on April 17, 1962, H.R. 11377. The new bill can be said to be essentially the same but with perfecting language.

It differs from H.R. 11377 in two principal respects. First, the scope of the study contemplated is somewhat broader and more clearly stated.

Second, the composition of the membership of the Commission is somewhat different in that the six public members of the Commission will be appointed by the President from a panel of not less than 20 nor more than 25 persons experienced in scientific research and education or industrial research, engineering and development, recommended by the National Academy of Sciences.

Mr. Speaker, I have incorporated these changes in a new bill so that during the consideration of this legislation by the Science and Astronautics Committee these suggestions will be available for the study of the members.

Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 1962, the Senate passed S. 2771, introduced by Senator McCLELLAN, and that bill is now pending before the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House. I have urged that speedy action be taken by that committee on this legislation and hope that the committee will not postpone consideration any longer.

Mr. Speaker, this study should have been undertaken by such a body as is contemplated by this legislation a long time ago. Our expenditures in scientific research and development are mounting, and the problems which such expenditures raise both with respect to government programs and the scientific community are becoming graver each day. Mistakes can be frozen into the fabric of this activity which may well limit scientific progress so important to our national well-being and, indeed, our survival.

I hope the Congress will see fit to create this Commission before this session of Congress expires.

A copy of my new bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to establish a Commission on Research and Development

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that research and development activities conducted by or under the sponsorship of the various agencies of the Federal Government have a major impact upon the conduct of scientific and other scholarly research in the United States, and vitally affect the overall pattern and direction of future Federal programs and private activities. It is the purpose of this Act to provide for a thorough study of such programs for the purpose of (1) ascertaining the impact of such programs on institutions of higher education, including the impact on such institutions of the portion of the indirect costs of such institutions which are attributable to such program and which are borne by the institutions, (2) studying the implications for academic freedom and the proper role of universities in our society of Federal selection and control of research programs at such institutions, (3) studying questions involved in the ownership of patents, patent rights, and proprietary rights where such patents or rights are attributable to such programs, (4) assuring the conservation and efficient training and utilization of scientific and engineering manpower through elimination of overlapping and duplication of effort, and (5) evaluating the effectiveness of such programs and their efficiency and economy, and determining the extent to which such programs require administrative or organizational reforms. It is further the purpose of this Act to provide for the making of recommendations to the President and to the Congress of proposals for necessary improvements in federally financed programs and activities in the field of research and development.

### ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION; DUTIES

SEC. 2. (a) COMMISSION ESTABLISHED.—There is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the "Commission on Research and Development" (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) DUTIES OF COMMISSION.—In conformity with the findings and in furtherance of the purpose declared in section 1, the Commission shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all operations of the Federal Government in the field of research and development, whether conducted by Federal agencies directly or through contract, grants-in-aid, or otherwise. The Commission shall report the results of its investigation and study to the President and to the Congress, and shall make such recommendations with respect to the operations of the Federal Government in the field of research and development as it may deem desirable.

### MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of fourteen members as follows:

(1) Ten appointed by the President of the United States, four appointed from the executive branch of the Government and six appointed from private life from a panel of not less than twenty nor more than twenty-five persons experienced in scientific research and education or industrial research, engineering and development, recommended by the National Academy of Sciences;

(2) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President from different political parties; and

(3) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker from different political parties.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

### ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

### QUORUM

SEC. 5. Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

### COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary \$20,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

### STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

### CERTAIN LAWS INAPPLICABLE TO COMMISSION AND ITS STAFF

SEC. 8. The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

### EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

### POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) COMMITTEES.—The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

(b) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau,

agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

(d) **SUBPENA POWER.**—The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

#### EXPIRATION OF COMMISSION

**SEC. 11.** The Commission shall cease to exist on June 30, 1964.

### PROBLEMS OF THE LUMBER INDUSTRY

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I take the House floor again today to point up the serious situation in an industry wherein lumber mills are being forced out of business, thousands of people are thrown out of employment, and the economy of many communities is being seriously disrupted because of the policy adopted by the Forest Service, the Department of Agriculture and the administration in power.

The plight of the lumber industry has been a growing concern both economically and legislatively. Several hundred mills have been closed in the past 2 or 3 years, and other mills are closing almost daily. Several hundred thousand employees have been thrown out of work with its economic disruption both in the communities and States, as well as in the Nation.

U.S. lumber production in 1961 was down 4.2 billion board feet from the 13-year average. Softwood lumber, the major segment of the U.S. lumber production, was down 1.8 billion board feet from 1961 from the 13-year average. At the same time, softwood lumber imports from Canada were up from 1.4 billion board feet to 4 billion board feet in 1961.

Canada is supplying about 95 percent of the total U.S. imports of lumber. In 1961 alone there was an increase of 400 million board feet from Canada. Actually, in 1961, Canada supplied approximately 17 percent of the softwood lumber used in the United States. It became apparent that Canada could capture any share of the American consumption they desired by quoting prices from 3 to 8 percent below U.S. producers.

It also became apparent that this non-competitive situation was made possible by the fact that stumpage prices in the two countries are entirely noncompetitive. In 1960 Canadian stumpage of all

species averaged \$5.38, while the average stumpage cost in Western United States was \$20.02. There is also a Government-granted transportation advantage for the Canadian operators. Canada manipulated its current exchange, advantageous to their exporters into the United States, and there is other definite governmental assistance granted to the lumber industry exporting into the United States.

Because of serious concern over the situation as it was developing, Members of Congress joined with the industry on a nonpartisan basis pointing up the problems and the dangers, and finally on February 21 more than 50 representatives of the Nation's lumber industry and more than 45 Members of Congress and their administrative assistants met with Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and his staff to present the problem and recommend solutions to the Department of Agriculture.

They recommended four principal proposals to the Department pertaining primarily to allowable cut, appraisal methods, appeals procedure, and contract reviews.

Both Members of Congress and the industry generally carried on the fight for assistance to the industry on a nonpolitical, bipartisan basis. There were introduced more than a dozen House joint resolutions calling on the President to impose quotas for the importation of lumber. Bipartisan conferences were held, efforts were made on the House floor both by individuals and by groups, calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture to take some action within the management of the Forest Service, price-wise and otherwise, to at least assist in making the lumber industry more competitive with Canada and calling upon the President to use the powers granted to him to establish quotas against devastating imports.

In spite of this bipartisan effort on the part of Members of Congress from both parties and from all areas of the country when the President was ready to issue a statement on his proposed action, he called to the White House on July 26 only Democrat Members who were interested in the lumber problem, not one Republican was invited. He conferred with this group, obtained their approval of a six-point program which the administration indicated would heal the wounds of the lumber industry and which Members of Congress and the industry felt would very materially assist, if implemented with any degree of desire to actually provide assistance. It included both immediate and long-range action which, it was stated, would increase employment, improve efficiency and raise earnings.

The proposed steps as outlined by the President called for—

First. The initiation of negotiations with Canada concerning the amount of softwood lumber imported into the United States.

Second. The submission of a request to the Congress for additional funds for forest development roads and trails program to assure the prompt harvest of national forest timber.

Third. The amendment of the intercoastal shipping laws to permit use of foreign vessels when those conditions exist which indicate severe hardship to American shippers. This amendment will reduce the handicaps suffered by American producers in the intercoastal shipment of lumber.

Fourth. An immediate increase in allowable cuts which will make available 150 million board feet on the lands managed by the Department of the Interior.

Fifth. The establishment of a preference for American products in the purchase of lumber by the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration and other Federal departments and agencies. This could be particularly significant in connection with the various aspects of the AID program.

Sixth. Increased attention to loan applications filed with the Small Business Administration and the Area Redevelopment Administration by lumber mills in order to enable them to upgrade their production and better compete with imported lumber products.

In addition, the President indicated that he was directing that there be a continuing review of the problems of the industry by an interagency committee in order that developments and problems might be anticipated and recommendations made to meet and overcome any difficulties or handicaps the industry might face. The Secretary of Agriculture would be specifically instructed to report to him by October 15 on both firm and interim increases in national forest allowable cuts to assure a continuation of timber sales at or beyond the record levels achieved in the most recent quarter of 1962.

In spite of all the high-sounding ideas and phrases set forth in the President's statement, almost nothing has been done to implement any of the six points.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORBLAD. Is it not a fact that the administration simply is giving the lumber industry a lot of conversation and a lot of talk and accomplishing nothing?

Mr. BERRY. That is exactly right. As a matter of fact, he stated he would initiate negotiations with Canada on the subject of quotas. It was expected the administration would probably ask for voluntary quotas on the part of the Canadian industry.

During the week of August 27 a conference was held with officials of the Canadian Government and the industry. The American conferees came back and issued a press release saying that they had a conference.

The President's statement promised "the initiation of negotiations with Canada." If this statement meant that they would hold a conference with the Canadians regarding the importation of lumber into this country, then they have fulfilled their promise—they did hold a conference. Even their own press releases on that conference failed to mention any agreement on quotas, any limitation on shipments or anything beneficial to the domestic industry.



Canada raised its tariff on lumber. Canada devalued its dollar. Both of these steps were taken to improve the condition of the Canadian lumber industry. We had a conference.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman from South Dakota to yield to me so that I may offer my commendation to him for his concern with and understanding of the problems of the lumber industry and in addition to commend him for his consistent efforts to try to solve these problems.

As the gentleman has stated, representatives of the United States and Canadian Governments met on August 28 and 29 in Ottawa, Canada, to discuss present and future problems confronting the North American softwood industry, with respect to forest resources, growth rates, employment, and markets. During a 2-day meeting in which the discussions took place, a detailed examination was made of lumber trade between the United States and Canada; Canadian imports into the United States; and current economic problems confronting the U.S. softwood lumber industry.

First, let me say that I am pleased that the President recently recognized the serious problems caused by excessive Canadian imports of softwood, and I am pleased that the United States sent a negotiating team to the lumber negotiations in Canada.

Prior to the first negotiating session, however, it came to my attention that the American negotiators going to Ottawa would not be accompanied by technical advisers from the lumber industry. I immediately wrote to President Kennedy to express my hope that the American spokesmen would at least have handy to their call somewhere in the Province a few lumber industry experts to help advise the American negotiators because American communities dependent upon the forest industry have too much at stake to risk losing this battle. Indications were that the Canadian team would have at its disposal lumber industry experts from the Province, and it seemed to me to be only reasonable that we should match the Canadians in this respect.

In response to my letter to the President, Larry O'Brien, the President's special assistant, replied that there were no Canadian industry advisers present at the negotiations, which, he said, were attended only by high-level Government officials of both countries and their technical assistants. Mr. O'Brien also stated that members of the U.S. delegation already have met with domestic industry representatives who expressed their pleasure with the progress made to date and their satisfaction with arrangements made for the next meeting.

I do feel compelled to report, however, that, on the basis of private information I have received, it is apparent that Canadian industry representatives were in Ottawa, but not within the negotiating room. The Financial Post, Toronto, of September 1, clearly stated,

moreover, that Canadian lumber representatives were in Ottawa, and for only one purpose—to watch the negotiations.

Mr. O'Brien's observation that "domestic industry representatives expressed their satisfaction with arrangements made for the next meeting" was apparently premature because I was subsequently informed that domestic industry representatives had not been presented with details of arrangements for the next meeting.

I assume that in good faith our Government, in making arrangements for the second meeting, will invite the lumber industry to propose technically competent people who can serve our Government's negotiators in any way helpful to present the U.S. viewpoint. It is shocking to feel that our Government would not match the Canadians in every respect with every resource they will use. We certainly would not send a tennis team to meet their rugby team and expect to come home any less than massacred.

Again I would like to commend the gentleman for bringing the various problems of the lumber industry to the attention of this House. While much has been said, we do not think the words have been followed by anywhere near enough action to solve the problems with which we are faced.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington. Certainly her interest in this problem is well known and certainly she has done a great deal in attempting to bring about a solution. I hope future results will be better.

Now with regard to step No. 2, more money for access roads. More money has been appropriated for roads and trails, but there is no specification that this money must be spent for roads and trails in timbered areas—it is being planned and programed for recreational roads. The law does not force the Forest Service to use this money exclusively for opening up timber, and apparently the Department does not intend to use it for this purpose unless they are forced to do so.

With regard to step No. 3, providing for passage of legislation to permit the use of foreign vessels for domestic lumber shipping, as the Canadians do, providing the Secretary of Commerce finds the timber industry injured because of the rates charged by domestic shipping, nothing has been done. This, of course, would be helpful to a small segment of the industry. It would benefit that segment located in the Northwest, but only 10 percent of the total shipments going from the west coast to the east coast are shipped by intercoastal waters. Such a step is, however, very important to that segment of the industry in the Pacific Northwest, and this legislation should be passed and would be passed if the administration would only lend just tacit assistance.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield.

Mr. NORBLAD. To me it is discouraging that Congress has not taken up legislation amending the Jones Act to allow foreign bottoms to carry lumber from the west coast to the east coast.

The Canadians are taking a lot of that market.

Mr. BERRY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. NORBLAD. The Jones Act should be amended to permit this for the benefit of industry, especially in times of slack employment. Otherwise we will find it impossible to compete because they can carry it at a reduced rate as the Canadians do.

Mr. BERRY. I would like to commend the gentleman not only for introducing such legislation but for encouraging others in the introduction of similar legislation.

With regard to No. 4, wherein it was proposed an increase in the allowable cut of 150 million board feet of timber on lands managed by the Department of Interior, again nothing of value is being done. There has been no significant increase in the allowable cut. The base timber sale prices are still so high that the industry cannot bid on them. The fact is, they can make it available, but if the price is so high the industry cannot break even and make a small profit, they cannot and will not bid. How can it benefit the industry if the Department makes available timber, but it is not put up for sale, or when it is put up for sale, it is put up at a price the small operators cannot meet? While the large operator may be able to handle part of it, the small operator is being further put out of business.

With regard to No. 5, wherein he promised the establishment of a preference for American lumber by the Department of Defense and other Government agencies, again little, if anything, has been done. If the Defense Department has stepped up its use of lumber, the fact is not noticeable.

So far as AID is concerned, this Agency has completely nullified the President's promise by its special ruling. The Administrator of AID, when asked to require the use of American lumber in their South American and Central American development program, said that they were not in a position to specify any particular product. In spite of the fact that the President said they should do it, the Administrator for AID said they are "not in a position to specify."

With regard to step No. 6, suggesting increased attention to loan applications filed with SBA to help smaller mills upgrade their production in order to better compete with imported lumber, this recommendation has likewise fallen on deaf ears. Instead of making a special effort to save these small industries, a number of these small mills recently have been forced out of business.

Another point that should be mentioned in this connection is the fact that the trade bill, supported so strongly by the administration, carries provisions that would completely nullify any relief presently being requested by the lumber industry before the Tariff Commission. This legislation is still being considered by the other body and could be corrected if the administration really meant what it said about wanting to help the lumber industry.

The situation is serious and getting worse. No help has been forthcoming from this administration, and many of us have grave doubts that anything more than lipservice will be provided.

Whether its actions demonstrate the policies of the State Department to help every other nation at the expense of the domestic industries, or whether it actually is antibusiness is difficult to say. One thing is certain. The lumber industry must have relief and it must have that relief now. Relief would not be difficult to grant, both through quotas on imports, reducing stumpage costs to a competitive figure, and by relaxing the regulations of the Department for unnecessary road requirements, erosion control requirements, and other requirements which add so much to the cost of operation and place the domestic mills completely out of competition with the Canadian producer.

Until some of these things are straightened out, we can only assume that the administration is not interested in assisting this important segment of our economy.

Certainly it is one of the biggest charges that our industry must take into account, and would be helpful to a large segment of the industry.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. I wonder if the gentleman would comment on legislation which I have introduced that provides on FHA-mortgaged homes the lumber going into those houses must be American lumber, the same as they do on defense projects and have for many years?

Mr. BERRY. It should be passed, and I wish there were some way of getting this legislation out for consideration. If the administration is interested in following up on the recommendations and the promises it made to the lumber industry and the people of America, certainly this legislation should come out.

Mr. NORBLAD. I might say to the gentleman I have tried to get a report on that legislation but the administration has failed to give me any report. The FHA mortgages use about half of this lumber, and I think it would go a long way in helping the American lumber industry.

Mr. BERRY. It would be a big step in the solution of this problem.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman from South Dakota to yield to me in order that I may commend him for the unfailing concern that he has demonstrated in behalf of the lumber industry. I am glad that the gentleman continues to remind the membership of Congress of the adverse effects on the American lumber industry of imports from Canada. Mr. Speaker, I share the interest of my colleague in seeking a solution to this grave problem to the American mills and American manpower whose livelihood is linked with timber.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said, representatives of the United States and Canadian Governments met recently in Ottawa, Canada, to discuss the mutual problem of the North American softwood industry. In this 2-day discussion the subject was examined from all points of view, and as I understand, no agreement was reached except to the extent that both nations were found to have a mutual interest in finding a solution.

Frankly, I do not expect our Canadian friends to make any concessions that would resolve our problem. Perhaps some areas of agreement can be found. Of course, if the trend continues and more American lumber mills are dismantled and moved to Canada or closed down, increasing the unemployment in the United States in logging operations and in our mills it could result in retaliation and undesirable action on our part. As I see it, Canadian Government officials are far more responsive to Canada's businessmen than our State Department officials are to the needs of our American industry. I would have liked to have had more private industry representatives participate in the Canadian-American talks.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful if not optimistic that further discussion, when resumed between Canada and ourselves, will accomplish some results. Meanwhile, there are other steps which must be taken to help American producers hang on to what remains to them of the softwood market.

I would like to see legislation passed to exclude lumber from shipping conference agreements. This would allow for competitive conditions in freight rates for water shipments.

Certainly, it is to be hoped that there will be no relaxation in efforts of organizations such as the National Lumber Manufacturers Association who have sought various means and through various channels to obtain relief with respect to policies and actions of the Forestry Department. There must be more liberal timber-cut policies on Government land. And the Interstate Commerce Commission and western railroads can help with relief from discriminatory regulations.

Ultimately, of course, as I see it, a big part of the answer can only be found in the escape clause in connection with the American forest products industries' current petition before the Tariff Commission following public hearings which are scheduled to begin shortly.

The President made several suggestions for relief of the lumber situation. Just how politically expedient they were or how aggressive the administration will be in following them up with concrete proposals remains to be seen. At least we know the President is aware of our problem. The textile industry obtained help. The voices of other distressed industries have been heard and heeded. Unfortunately it does not appear that the President will invoke any temporary quota pending a Tariff Commission finding.

Unemployment and shutdowns in Northwest lumber mills should get immediate attention.

Mr. Speaker, I again commend our colleague from South Dakota for his excellent remarks today. Despite promises and high-level discussions the future of lumber appears dismal indeed. I assure the gentleman that I will continue to work with him and other Members of Congress from both ends of the Capitol and both sides of the aisle to try and obtain a permanent solution. Until that time, the executive branch, if it sees fit, can do a great deal.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the able gentleman from South Dakota and thank him for yielding to me.

I want to again commend the gentleman for the statement he has made today, and I share his views.

Mr. BERRY. I certainly thank the gentleman from Washington for his comments. I appreciate the work the gentleman from Washington has done and has been doing in bringing the plight of the lumber industry to the attention of the Congress and the American people generally.

Until some of these things are straightened out, we can only assume, I believe, that the administration is not interested in assisting this important segment of our economy.

#### AIR POLLUTION

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have again today called on the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to review once again the provisions of three bills pending in the committee to deal with the vital matter of air pollution. I refer to H.R. 10615 which I introduced and H.R. 10519 and H.R. 11524, introduced by the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] and our respected colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

I understand that the committee has recommended that the current act be extended and that action on these proposals be held over. I realize the interstate and intrastate complexities of the problem, but believe that they can be adequately resolved without holding up the legislation for another session. The enactment of this legislation, as recommended earlier by the administration, would not in my opinion handicap further study that the committee feels the subject warrants. To the contrary, I feel once enacted into law, great strides can be made in this field and the necessary compacts with the States can be effectively negotiated.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, I call on my distinguished colleagues, those privileged to serve on this committee, and its able, most respected chairman, to reevaluate this problem with a view of reporting a meaningful bill, beyond merely extending the present act, before the current session adjourns. I trust that the fullest consideration will be given to this appeal.



## CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a complete copy of a letter dated August 3, 1962, signed by the President of the United States. This letter was sent to the chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees, the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, and chairmen of the Senate and House Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittees:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Legislation and appropriations are pending before the Congress on civil defense programs which would greatly increase the capacity of this country to survive and recover after a nuclear blow. Your committee has jurisdiction over this legislation (these appropriations). I wish again to state my view that, in these times, the Federal Government has an inescapable responsibility to take practical and sensible measures to minimize loss of life in the event of nuclear attack, to continue the essential functions of the Government, and to provide a base for our survival and recovery as a nation. These matters are an integral part of a balanced defense program for the security of our Nation.

You know from your own experience how the sense of urgency with which we view these matters fluctuates. When a crisis is near, we pay attention to them; when it seems distant, they recede from the forefront of our concern. It is important that we overcome our natural tendency to put off making preparations for a contingency which is both awful and unlikely.

Last year I sent to the Congress a program embodying my views of what is a sensible and practical program, which focused on protecting as many of our people as possible against lethal fallout radiation. The Secretary of Defense and my other senior advisers on this subject had intensively reviewed what is known and what is not known about the possible effects of nuclear warfare. The conclusion was clear that, for the foreseeable future, under a wide range of attack assumptions, large numbers of lives could be saved by adequate fallout shelter space. Postponement of practical measures to shield our people from fallout radiation cannot be justified by the inevitable imponderables and the continuing need for a greater research effort. The Department of Defense is continuously examining present and future weapons systems and studying the effects of a wide range of hypothetical nuclear attacks. Nothing in the studies that have been made since last year's decisions justifies change of the program which we have proposed.

The Defense Department survey, which was the first step in our new program, reveals that we already have enough shelter space for 60 million people which needs only to be marked and provisioned. Funds made available for fiscal year 1962 have financed completion of the survey and procurement of over half of the necessary provisions. Thus we are beyond debating whether to create public shelter systems; we have now done it as a result of the action taken by Congress at my request last summer. When we complete this task, the chances of survival of tens of millions of Americans will be improved at a cost of \$3 to \$4 for each person. We may well take satisfaction in this achievement.

Communities planning to create an effective shelter program founded on space identified in the national survey must be able to act in reliance on the Federal Government to carry out announced plans to deliver shelter supplies, improve the warning system, equip a radiological monitoring net, protect emergency broadcasting stations, and provide training materials and instructor training to meet the need for specialized skills in each shelter. The Defense Department is dependent upon the pending \$235 million appropriation request to carry out the Federal Government's share in this undertaking.

Municipal governments and building owners around the country are now faced with the difficult task of working out the details of making effective use of the surveyed shelter space. This is not an easy thing to do. It is gratifying to all of us to see so many hard-pressed mayors, county commissioners, building owners, school superintendents, businessmen and other community leaders stepping up to this job. This will be our country's first experience with the practical problems of sheltering large numbers of people. I anticipate far better understanding of what can be done to meet the problems presented by the risks of nuclear attack after Federal, State and local government programs are translated into something visible and immediately useful in the months ahead.

I particularly wish to call attention to the importance of continuing last year's program for adding low-cost fallout shelter space to suitable buildings owned or leased by the Federal Government. Successful completion of the first phase of the new civil defense program depends on a wide range of hypothetical nuclear attacks. Nothing in the studies that have been made since last year's decisions justifies change of the program which we have proposed.

The Defense Department survey, which was the first step in our new program, reveals that we already have enough shelter space for 60 million people which needs only to be marked and provisioned. Funds made available for fiscal year 1962 have financed completion of the survey and procurement of over half of the necessary provisions. Thus we are beyond debating whether to create public shelter systems; we have now done it as a result of the action taken by Congress at my request last summer. When we complete this task, the chances of survival of tens of millions of Americans will be improved at a cost of \$3 to \$4 for each person. We may well take satisfaction in this achievement.

Communities planning to create an effective shelter program founded on space identified in the national survey must be able to act in reliance on the Federal Government to carry out announced plans to deliver shelter supplies, improve the warning system, equip a radiological monitoring net, protect emergency broadcasting stations, and provide training materials and instructor training to meet the need for specialized skills in each shelter. The Defense Department is dependent upon the pending \$235 million appropriation request to carry out the Federal Government's share in this undertaking.

Municipal governments and building owners around the country are now faced with the difficult task of working out the details of making effective use of the surveyed shelter space. This is not an easy thing to do. It is gratifying to all of us to see so many hard-pressed mayors, county commissioners, building owners, school superintendents, businessmen and other community leaders stepping up to this job. This will be our country's first experience with the practical problems of sheltering large numbers of people. I anticipate far better understanding of what can be done to meet the problems presented by the risks of nuclear attack after Federal, State and local

government programs are translated into something visible and immediately useful in the months ahead.

I particularly wish to call attention to the importance of continuing last year's program for adding low-cost fallout shelter space to suitable buildings owned or leased by the Federal Government. Successful completion of the first phase of the new civil defense program depends on public-spirited decisions by building owners to allow their property to be used for the protection of people working or living nearby. Failure of Federal, State, and local governments to provide shelter space in public buildings makes it difficult to communicate to our citizens the priority which this type of protection must command. Many Americans in public and private life have been and will soon be actively participating in the new civil defense program in reliance on Federal leadership and support.

The second phase of the new civil defense program will provide financial help to schools, hospitals and similar nonprofit institutions electing to include fallout shelter space needed in their buildings. It requires legislation which is pending before the two Armed Services Committees and, therefore, is not effectively before the Appropriations Subcommittees.

A decision to put public money into shelters in privately owned buildings is a difficult one which deserves deliberate and careful scrutiny by the appropriate committees of Congress. I had hoped that hearings for this purpose would have taken place earlier in this session when there was time and an opportunity to give the matter the necessary attention. At this late juncture, I can appreciate the preference of the chairmen of the Armed Services Committees to defer these important hearings until early in the next Congress when they can be given the time and attention of those concerned. However, local planning to meet requirements for new shelter space, which is closely related to plans to use existing shelter, is likely to be delayed pending clarification of the proposed Federal financing for shelter space in schools, hospitals, and other community institutions. Accordingly, I am requesting that these hearings be held early enough to enable a supplemental request for enough fiscal year 1963 funds to keep pace with those communities and eligible institutions with plans for creating new fallout shelter spaces.

I am sending similar letters to the chairmen of other congressional committees with responsibilities in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Now, Mr. Speaker, following these remarks, I desire to advise the House that following the disposition of the U.N. bond bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], will call up the conference report on the atomic energy bill.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), from 4 p.m., today, and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. WHALLEY (at the request of Mr. FENTON), on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mrs. MAY), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENGL (at the request of Mrs. MAY), for 30 minutes, on Monday September 17, 1962.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HALL, while in the Committee of the Whole today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. CHURCH (at the request of Mrs. MAY) to include extraneous matter in her remarks today while in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. PILLION.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOYKIN

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. KITCHIN.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 298. An act to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the cost of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States;

H.R. 2125. An act for the relief of Soon Tal Lim;

H.R. 3125. An act for the relief of Joao de Freitas Ferreira de Vasconcelos;

H.R. 3619. An act for the relief of Gennaro Prudente;

H.R. 3719. An act for the relief of Pagona Pascopoulos;

H.R. 6653. An act for the relief of Maurizio Placidi;

H.R. 7582. An act for the relief of Dario Taquechel;

H.R. 9728. An act to amend the Cooperative Forest Management;

H.R. 10160. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Lendian;

H.R. 11914. An act for the relief of Charles Gambino; and

H.R. 12459. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Coast Guard.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 3064. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; and

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes, p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 14, 1962, at 11 o'clock a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2523. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the determination made by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (OCDM), succeeded by the Office of Emergency Planning (OEP), Executive Office of the President, of the quantity and quality of copper needed in the strategic and critical materials stockpile; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2524. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the compilation and printing of 29,350 copies of a wall map of the United States"; to the Committee on House Administration.

2525. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 5, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach and vicinity, North Carolina, authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 555); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with four illustrations.

2526. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 6, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, La., and Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 11, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 556); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with five illustrations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 11949. A bill to repeal section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of supervisors, enumerators, and other employees of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 2359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 11950. A bill to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968; without amendment (Rept. No. 2360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2795. An act to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that any such agency

is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2361). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2977. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2362). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12417. A bill to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12690. A bill to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the Inter-American Development Bank; without amendment (Rept. No. 2364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1651. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to delegate the function of approving contracts not exceeding \$100,000; with amendment (Rept. No. 2365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. S. 2511. An act to provide for the production and distribution of educational and training films for use by deaf persons, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 13123. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act relating to the hunting of migratory game birds on or over baited areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 13124. A bill to provide for import fees on cotton products during periods the United States is subsidizing the export of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 13125. A bill to permit the sale or delivery in interstate commerce of certain credit cards only if there is in effect liability insurance to protect holders of such cards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 13126. A bill to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty compensation for postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct, for income tax purposes, the expenses incurred by him in traveling to and from work on public conveyances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 13128. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 13129. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency, and for other purposes;



to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 13130. A bill to establish a Commission on Research and Development; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. KITOHIN:

H.J. Res. 883. Joint resolution to limit the importation of cotton products to the amount thereof imported in 1961; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 525. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense and judgment of the Congress with respect to Canal Zone sovereignty; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. Con. Res. 526. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States will not surrender its jurisdiction or control over the Canal Zone or the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Con. Res. 527. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Con. Res. 528. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 529. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 530. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 531. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Con. Res. 532. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Con. Res. 533. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 534. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 535. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 536. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H. Con. Res. 537. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 538. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 13131. A bill for the relief of Maria Mangano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13132. A bill for the relief of Richard I. Seddon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 13133. A bill for the relief of Emilia D'Addario Santorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 13134. A bill for the relief of Leopold Kellner and Benjamin Kellner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13135. A bill for the relief of Michele Bongiardina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13136. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luisa Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 13137. A bill for the relief of Clifford Duplechain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.J. Res. 884. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### A Tribute to the Honorable Victor L. Anfuso

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HERBERT ZELENGO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ZELENGO. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the 87th Congress, the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO will retire as a Member of the House of Representatives. This dedicated American has faithfully and effectively served people of the United States and the cause of democracy and brotherhood throughout the world. He has now heeded the call to further dedication in other areas of public service in his own State of New York.

I take this opportunity to pay personal tribute to him as a public servant. Throughout the many years of his service, his achievements and character have earned for him the respect and commendation not only of the public officials of this country but of those of many other countries of the world. He was a patient and wise mentor to me during my years in the House of Representatives. His wisdom and counsel have en-

abled me to perform my duties in the best interests of all of the people. I know that this is true also in the case of many of my other colleagues.

It is appropriate at this time to set forth the distinguished biographical and public record of Representative ANFUSO as an example to future generations of Americans for their inspiration.

Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO was born in Sicily, Italy, March 10, 1905. He came to America with his mother, two older brothers, and two sisters in 1914. They settled in the Williamsburgh section of Brooklyn and have lived there ever since. He was educated in New York City's public schools and Commercial High School, studied law at St. Lawrence University Law School—now Brooklyn Law School—from which he received an LL.B. degree in 1927. He was admitted to the New York State bar in 1928 and has been engaged in private law practice since then, specializing in civil and criminal law.

During the early 1930's Mr. ANFUSO formed the Citizens Welfare Association to help people in Brooklyn who were hardest hit by the economic depression. In 1936 he organized the Italian Board of Guardians, now affiliated with the Catholic Charities in Brooklyn, to aid delinquent children and children from broken homes. He served as president of the organization for four terms.

From 1941 to 1943 Mr. ANFUSO served on Selective Service Board No. 221 and later as a member of Selective Service Appeal Board No. 26 by appointment of the Governor of New York. In 1946 he received the Selective Service Medal. In 1943 he served under Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan with the Office of Strategic Services—OSS—in the Mediterranean Theater. He was later awarded the Certificate of Merit by the Regular Veterans Association "for distinguished achievement and meritorious service." Upon his return from Europe in 1945 he became Special Assistant to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

In 1946 Mr. ANFUSO was appointed by Pope Pius XII as Knight Commander of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre for his "humanitarian work on behalf of youth." Two years later, during the crucial elections in Italy in 1948, he drafted and mailed over 250,000 letters to the Italian people urging them to vote against the Communist candidates and to help keep Italy a free nation. For this effort, he was described by the New York Times as "the one-man crusader."

Mr. ANFUSO was elected a Member of the 82d Congress in November 1950, and served on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. He was instrumental in obtaining a much needed salary increase for postal workers in 1951. He

sponsored legislation to create a Bureau of Crime Prevention in the Department of Justice to curb juvenile delinquency.

Due to reapportionment of congressional districts in 1952 and the elimination of a district in Brooklyn, he was forced to withdraw after serving one term in Congress. He was later appointed by Mayor Wagner as a city magistrate and served until August 1954, when he resigned to become a candidate for Congress again. He was elected to the 84th Congress on November 2, 1954, and took his oath of office on January 5, 1955.

Upon his return to Congress, Mr. Anfuso asked that he be appointed a member of the House Agriculture Committee, in order that he could be the spokesman for big city consumers. He has been serving on this committee since then and has become known as a forthright representative of the consumer. At his instigation, a Consumers Study Subcommittee was set up in March 1957, with Mr. Anfuso as chairman, to study the high cost of living and seek ways to prevent further rises.

He was appointed by Speaker Rayburn as a member of the U.S. congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris in 1955. In 1956 he served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization Conference in Rome. In 1957 he undertook a special mission for the House Agriculture Committee to study stockpiling and disposal of U.S. food surpluses in Europe and the Middle East. In the same year he made a tour of New York State to study farmer-consumer problems, and submitted an extensive report to Congress on his findings.

Mr. Anfuso was reelected to Congress for a third term on November 6, 1956, and to a fourth term on November 4, 1958.

During his years in the House of Representatives, he was the author and sponsor of forward-looking and progressive legislation which enhanced the democratic ideal and benefited all of the people of the world.

Mr. Anfuso supported aid to the people of Poland through the sale of surplus food in the belief that strengthening Poland in this way would make her less dependent on Russia. For this effort he was lauded by Polish groups in the United States. Mr. Anfuso urged greater economic aid to Israel, as well as military assistance to assure Israel's security and continued existence.

In recent years Mr. Anfuso was the recipient of many awards, including the Liberty Award from Governor Harriman on behalf of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee for championing the cause of minority and nationality groups; the American Legion award for Americanism activities; the Commander of the Order of Merit from the Italian Government for his efforts in behalf of the people of Italy; the Humanity Award from the Order Brith Abraham for 30 years activity in behalf of "human welfare, world peace, and justice."

Mr. Anfuso is a member of the American Bar Association, New York State bar, and Brooklyn bar. He has been admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court. He is active in civic, religious, philanthropic, and political organizations. He was a delegate to several Democratic State conventions and to all Democratic National Conventions since 1948.

In January 1959, he was appointed a ranking member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and also a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was subsequently made chairman of the Subcommittee on International Cooperation and Security, and in the latter capacity led the U.S. delegation to the International Astronautical Federation Conference in London in September 1959. He was also appointed congressional adviser to the U.S. representative on the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. In November 1960, he was again a member of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in Paris.

On November 8, 1960, Mr. Anfuso was reelected to his fifth term in Congress. He is married to the former Frances Stallone of Brooklyn since 1930 and they have five children, three sons and two daughters.

To him and to his loved ones I extend my best wishes for a healthy and happy life.

### Town of Wales, Mass., Bicentennial— 1762–1962

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful town of Wales, Mass., in my congressional district, celebrated its bicentennial, 1762–1962, from August 11 through August 26. I had the distinct pleasure of speaking to the townspeople on the opening day of the 2-week-long observance. I will insert my speech at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the names of the town officers, and the members of the bicentennial committee:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN BOLAND DELIVERED AT WALES, MASS., BICENTENNIAL

I am grateful for the invitation of the bicentennial committee for inviting me to be a part of this celebration.

This is a historic event that occurs but seldom in the annals of this community.

Fortunately, no words of mine are necessary to embellish the significance of the occasion. The program that has been arranged for the next 2 weeks gives greater vitality and spirit to the meaningfulness of this celebration than wordy proclamations of mine.

But, believe me, I did seize the opportunity to come here for it brings back fond memories of years ago as a Springfield Boys' Club camper that hiked the magnificent and

challenging woods that surround this town—to explore the abandoned lead mines and trails of yesteryear and to plunge into the invigorating and sparkling blue waters of Lake George.

No one who has done these things and glanced at the history of this town could ignore the significance of this bicentennial. We see this town today as a peaceful, quiet, charming, picturesque and beautiful place. It is difficult to picture it as a rather thriving, humming community of yesteryear. But it was. Craftsmen in currying, tanning, shoe building, experts in weaving cloths—wools, cottons and satins—all of these people added to the luster of the 1800's. And these were the people who followed the hardy pioneers of 1726 and the founders of this town in 1762.

And one could not read the information contained in the little yellow bicentennial history pamphlet without catching the spirit of America—without recognizing the basis upon which our national existence was built.

For the people who came to this place 200 years ago came to build a better life for themselves and their families. The hardships they endured and the sacrifices they made are difficult to realize by us in this year of 1962. For the year of 1762 was fraught with dangers and totally without conveniences. It was their own indomitable will—their pulling together with their neighbors—their faith in the Almighty and their lives revolving around their church—it was all of this that helped them to succeed and to survive. It was indeed this spirit that was sewed into the fabric of our system that has enabled this Nation to grow and prosper.

We have a duty in this day and age to preserve what has been handed down to us by those who walked this ground 200 and more years ago.

We can best perform this obligation by doing the best we can in the job that is ours—by understanding the meaning and significance of the kind of government under which we live.

As a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, so too, a nation is only as strong as smallest and weakest adjunct of government. It is the decay at the bottom that weakens the structure to a point of collapse. This Nation needs to be strong at all levels of government—good morally, spiritually—imbued with the finest realization of how much good citizens mean to the continued existence of our country—the overriding importance of a well-educated and informed people.

And so it is well to pause and reflect during the period of this bicentennial celebration of the heritage that has been draped around this good little town and to ask ourselves if we have kept faith with those who pledged their lives, their fortunes and their honor to build this town 200 years ago.

I congratulate the committee, the people of Wales—present the town with a flag—high honor and personal privilege, to bring to this gathering and to the town of Wales the congratulations, best wishes and greetings of the President of the United States.

#### TOWN OFFICERS

Selectmen and board of health: Wallace H. Adam, Robert Archambault, Ithamar B. Davis, Jr., chairman.

Moderator: Holywell Dreyer.

Town clerk: Agnita Baker.

Town treasurer: Lois Carrier.

Tax collector: Agnita Baker.

Town accountant: Sylvia Worth.

Assessors: Walter Worth, Ithamar B. Davis, Jr., and Robert McKay.

Cemetery commissioners: Samuel Dickinson, Jr., Guy Johnson, and Albertie Dunham.

School committee: Holywell Dreyer, Helen Adam, Peter Pernoski.



Tree warden: Guy Johnson.  
Library trustees: Jules Slepian, Mary Bushey, John Blakely.  
Constables: Robert McKay, Donald Morgan, Myron Heck.

#### BICENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

David S. Terrill, chairman; Ray Allen, town parade; Mrs. Donald Morgan and Mrs. Charles Reynolds, queen; William Bowden, beards; Mrs. George Brelsford, publicity; Mrs. Walter Worth, decorations; Mrs. Clarence Brown, Jr., block dance; George Gregoire, old home day; Mrs. I. B. Davis and Mrs. Albert Green, town history; Mrs. Roland Poirier and Mrs. Cutler Heck, fashion show; Joseph Poirier, etchings; Mrs. Rena Bowden, bi-centennial ball; Walter Worth and Roland Poirier, barbecue; Peter Pernoski, tickets for ball; Mrs. Mary Bushey, field day; Mrs. Roland Poirier, square dance; and, Mr. and Mrs. H. Sebolt, tickets for barbecue and square dance.

### Corrections Made in Bills Prior to Final Approval

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK**  
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Thursday, September 13, 1962*

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, August 31, I asked unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to request the Senate to return to the House the bill S. 2965, with the House amendments thereto, and that when said bill and amendments were returned, the Clerk be authorized and directed to make a correction in the engrossed copy of the House amendments as follows:

On page 6, lines 12 and 19, strike out "section 9" and insert "section 3".

The request was made to correct an inadvertent error in the bill—the Public Works Acceleration Act—which passed the House on August 29.

The RECORD will show that an objection was made to the unanimous-consent request, and at this time I want to point out that this was not an unusual request as evidenced by the following instances where Congress has, by concurrent resolution, made corrections in bills prior to final approval with no objection by the House or Senate, or by both, as the case may be:

#### EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Senate Concurrent Resolution 51: Small Business Investment Act amendments. To rescind Speaker's action in signing S. 902 in order to make technical correction (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 15, p. 19995, Senate; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 15, p. 20239, House). No objection in Senate or House.

House Concurrent Resolution 399: Civil Service supergrades. To make corrections in H.R. 7377 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 16, p. 20898, House; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 16, p. 21032, Senate). No objection in House or Senate.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 78: Transit fares for school children in District of Columbia. Requests return of S. 1745 to make correction (word left out) (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1962, p. 10121, Senate; CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD, June 19, 1962, p. 10945, House). No objection in House or Senate.

House Concurrent Resolution 493: Regulation of imports and agricultural commodities and products. To correct error in spelling in enrollment of the bill (H.R. 10788) (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1962, p. 10501, House; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1962, p. 10585, Senate). No objection in House or Senate.

House Concurrent Resolution 506: Work Hours Act. To correct error in enrollment of H.R. 10786 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 26, 1962, p. 14820, House; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 1, 1962, p. 15216, Senate). No objection in House or Senate.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 83: District of Columbia Hospital Center. Requests return of S. 3350 to make correction in bill (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 5, 1962, p. 12742, Senate). No objection.

#### EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

Senate Concurrent Resolution 109: Norman, Okla., project. To make corrections in engrossed copy of S. 1892 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 9, p. 11905, Senate). No objection.

House Concurrent Resolution 706: Hawaii, amending laws. To make corrections in enrolling H.R. 11602 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 11, p. 15248, House). No objection.

#### EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

Senate Concurrent Resolution 75: Rio Grande rehabilitation project. To make corrections in enrollment of S. 2120 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 5, p. 5740, Senate; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 5, p. 5840, House). No objection in Senate or House.

House Concurrent Resolution 372: Albeni Falls Reservoir, Idaho. To correct an error in the enrollment of H.R. 13209 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 13, p. 16566, House; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 13, p. 16625, Senate). No objection in House or Senate.

House Concurrent Resolution 380: District of Columbia teachers' salaries. To correct errors in the enrolling of H.R. 13132 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 14, pp. 18559-18560, House; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 14, pp. 18617-18618, Senate). No objection in House or Senate.

### Health Care: The Issue Becomes Clearer

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS**  
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Thursday, September 13, 1962*

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the very unfortunate aspects of the debate which has been conducted in the Halls of Congress, on national television, in the daily press, and elsewhere on the subject of the administration's limited hospital care proposal financed by social security is the fact that the real issues and arguments have been so overlaid with a veneer of emotionalism and propaganda—and both sides are to blame for this, I must add—that they have been almost ignored. The real issues in this matter have, however, come more and more to the fore and, I believe, if the President lives up to his pledge to make the health care controversy the major campaign issue in this

election year, we will find that this helps to strip the matter to its bare factual bones.

Nation's Business, in its September 1962 issue, has done an excellent job in trying to weed out distortion and present the facts of the matter. I believe that this is a real step in the right direction and I hope that other publications will provide similar services as this matter comes more and more under discussion in the political campaign which now has started. Along with this article, "Politics Distort Health Care Facts," the magazine printed an interview with Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma. Senator KERR is a leading figure in the Congress in this controversy and I believe his words supplement the matter presented by Nation's Business to help give a better understanding of our health care situation. I am placing the Nation's Business article and the interview with Senator KERR in the RECORD to help further real understanding of this issue.

The article and interview follow:  
POLITICS DISTORTS HEALTH CARE FACTS—  
FAST-GROWING PROGRAMS PAYING MEDICAL  
COSTS OF THE NEEDY AGED

The heated domestic political issue of costly health care for the aged is actually based on a shrinking problem.

The Kennedy administration's pleas for a new law to buy hospital and nursing home care for the aged with social security taxes have failed to win over Congress. The President has promised to take the issue to the people as a key feature of the fall congressional election campaigns.

Meanwhile legislation is pending in Congress to provide more help for the elderly through private financing. A bill sponsored by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, would allow employers to take tax deductions for contributions they make to employee pension plans that include health care protection features.

The law currently permits tax deductions of contributions to employee pension funds to provide retirement income. But the Curtis measure would extend this to let employers claim deductions for contributions they make to health plans for employees after they retire. Millions of elderly could be covered in the future.

Moreover, the existing programs of medical care for the aged are rapidly paring the size of the problem.

The much maligned State-operated medical aid for the aged program, known as the Kerr-Mills law, is the major source of help for elderly with limited resources. It is now operating in one form or other in nearly all the States. Private health insurance protection for the aged is spreading at such a rate that 12 percent more of the aged are now covered than in 1960.

The political alarm about the condition and finances of the Nation's 17 million persons 65 and over has largely drowned out word of the progress in meeting the elderly's health needs.

Little known are these facts:

About 65 percent of the elderly now are able to get a wide array of medical services under State medical assistance plans without going on relief.

Another 15 percent of the elderly now get medical help regularly through old-age public assistance, commonly known as relief.

Some 55 percent of the elderly now have health insurance.

Hospital-surgical insurance for the aged is now available for as little as \$78 a year on a group basis and from \$66 to \$99 a year on an individual basis for a man 65, for example.

The number of recipients of medical care under new State plans has risen rapidly in recent months, by as much as 70 percent in Illinois and 269 percent in Pennsylvania.

About 10 percent of the heads of families 65 or older earn \$10,000 or more a year.

Over 10 percent of the aged live with younger relatives; half of those with small assets do.

Around 15 percent of aged men are World War I veterans and can get free care in VA hospitals if they are needy.

Although Congress enacted the Kerr-Mills medical program in 1960, the pressure has been on to pass a health care program under the social security system to provide limited care to older persons whether they are able to pay for it or not.

Critics have attacked the Kerr-Mills law with four major charges. They say it is not meeting the need because most of the benefits are going to only a few States, that some States have not adopted it, that it requires recipients to make known their financial affairs, and that benefits are unequal among the States.

From the start of Government old-age assistance or relief programs in 1935, the cost of medical care could be paid by the monthly cash payments to the needy.

In recent years as the older population has increased, more aid has been given.

In 1950, Congress amended the law to permit payments for medical care directly to suppliers. In 1958 payments were increased. In 1960 a double-barreled program of assistance was provided in the Kerr-Mills law. First, medical care payments under old-age assistance were raised. Second, a new form of aid was provided to help persons not on relief who have enough resources to meet ordinary living expenses but who can't pay unusually high medical bills.

Some 31 States have adopted plans to implement the most important part of the Kerr-Mills program, known as the medical assistance for the aged (MAA) program, for those not on relief but with limited resources.

All except one of the States have put into operation increases in medical payments for aged under relief, which is the other part of the 1960 law.

Critics of Kerr-Mills have complained that almost 90 percent of the MAA money is going to only 4 States: New York, Michigan, California and Massachusetts.

This is true. It is also true that about 25 percent of the aged live in these 4 States. Even more important is the fact that these were among the first States to adopt the program. Naturally most of the money spent so far has gone into these areas.

Critics also have charged that the program is a failure because many States have not adopted it.

Several States have not yet put the MAA portion of Kerr-Mills into effect. But adoption of the program has certainly not lagged as compared with any recent similar program. For example, in 1950 Congress passed a program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled. It was intended to provide payments for needy persons over 18 who had severe disabilities or handicaps. Payments are made on a matching basis, similar to the Kerr-Mills program. By mid-1951, about 18 months after the program began, some 27 States had it in operation. The same number of States and territories had adopted the Kerr-Mills MAA program after the first 18 months.

By 1961, 47 States and three territories had adopted the aid to the permanently and totally disabled program. In the program's first decade of operation, the number of persons aided had increased fourfold. The Kerr-Mills MAA program, however, can be judged a success even if all the States don't adopt it. Several States have extensive programs of medical care for needy aged similar to help given by Kerr-Mills. For example,

Colorado has not adopted MAA because the State has had an elaborate program of medical care for the aged for the past 4 years. Some \$10 million a year is being spent for health costs of needy elderly there.

In Texas, a medical program was started at the beginning of 1962 which provides hospital and surgical-medical services through a contract between the State and Blue Cross-Blue Shield. Direct payments from the State are made for nursing home care. It has been called a model program for elderly on relief.

Three other States not among the 31 that have approved MAA have expanded their relief programs so as to include residents not now on relief rolls, but whose financial situations are such that they need public help.

So the insistence that the success of MAA will be proven only when it is adopted in all States is unrealistic.

Another major criticism of Kerr-Mills is that there is a test as to financial need of recipients. This is held to be undignified and at odds with the American way. The argument is made that the administration's proposal to give health care to the aged under the social security system assures beneficiaries of this help without the indignities of a "means test."

Proponents of the social security approach overlook the fact that a form of "means test" is applied to persons drawing social security checks in their retirement.

Even though a retiree may have paid his social security taxes for 30 years, he starts losing benefits if his earned income is over \$1,200 a year. And his social security retirement checks stop altogether if he earns as much as \$3,000 a year and is under 72 years of age. Those who favor giving medical care to all the 12 million aged eligible to receive social security benefits overlook the fact that many of these persons are well-fixed enough to pay their own hospital bills. The social security taxes on unskilled factory workers, domestics, or other low-pay people, as well as their employers, would be used to pay health costs for some who don't need Government subsidies.

Another major charge against the Kerr-Mills MAA program is that the program is inequitable and has limitations in different States.

The fact that the programs differ in the different States is seen by some as an advantage, not a disadvantage. For example, the program in Hawaii provides for air transportation to obtain necessary care which is available only in another county. Many States wouldn't need to fly patients great distances to get medical care. But patients in the island State of Hawaii might often need just such service.

In New Hampshire, eye care is excluded from the scope of MAA because it is available through the sight conservation division of the State department of public welfare.

In North Dakota, the aged can get help under MAA depending on their income and assets. In this sparsely populated State a homestead of 2 acres in town is exempt and a rural homestead of 160 acres is exempt in figuring whether the applicant for aid has assets limited enough to qualify for aid.

Kerr-Mills plans in some States require needy persons to make cash contributions toward the cost of care. This is looked upon with grave concern by some proponents of the social security approach. However, the social security proposal would also require any beneficiary of health care to pay \$10 a day for the first 9 days toward the cost of hospital treatment.

It is also pointed out that some States do not provide dental care, some don't pay for drugs prescribed by the patient's doctor, a few do not pay for visits in a doctor's office or for house calls. The social security legislation proposed by the administration would pay for none of these.

AN INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR, DEMOCRAT, OF OKLAHOMA, A LEADER IN THE HEALTH CARE FIGHT

Question. Senator KERR, what are the advantages of the existing Kerr-Mills medical care program over proposed health care under social security?

Answer. In the first place, the Kerr-Mills program provides greater benefits to those over 65 years who need those benefits. The benefits include doctors, surgeons, hospitalization, nurses and nursing care, medicines and drugs, dentists and dental benefits—even false teeth. Each State can provide what is needed by the people within the State. The administration's social security approach for aged care would provide mainly hospital and nursing home payments.

In the second place, the Kerr-Mills program is administered on a basis where both the doctors and the patients have the freedom of choice, the patient being able to choose the doctor wanted or the hospital wanted, the doctor being free to make his service available in accordance with what kind of medicine he practices.

Next, the Kerr-Mills program, being available to all over 65 who need it and cannot provide it for themselves, is paid for out of the general revenue fund, by taxes received from everybody, rather than being paid for by a limited group, primarily the self-employed and the employed workers and their employers.

Question. From a cost standpoint how does the Kerr-Mills program compare with the social security approach?

Answer. The Kerr-Mills plan if fully implemented in all of the States would cost much less than the Anderson-Javits proposal, which is the latest administration version.

The Anderson-Javits amendment had a tax beginning in 1963, a payroll tax that would have collected \$810 million. Beginning January 1, 1964 the Anderson-Javits amendment would have increased the social security tax \$2.2 billion a year. All evidence is that if it were fully implemented that would have been inadequate to pay for it.

Now, the estimate for the Kerr-Mills plan for fiscal 1964 is less than \$500 million.

Question. Some States have not yet adopted or implemented the Kerr-Mills program. Why are they holding back?

Answer. Many States have anticipated that a social security tax-supported medical care program would be initiated and figured they would wait until that happened. Now, what those people don't realize is that amendments thus far offered for a social security tax-supported health program do not provide more than one-fourth of the medical or surgical or health requirements for the aged who need medical care that is provided under Kerr-Mills.

Then, some States have not done so, because their legislatures have not yet provided the funds for the State to put up its part of the money. However, when more people realize that the Kerr-Mills program is available to the States on a matching basis, in my judgment, more and more States will implement the Kerr-Mills plan, especially now that it's apparent that the other program will not be put into effect in the next 2 years. The social security plan could not be put into effect until 1965, even if it should be passed in 1963, which I gravely doubt.

Question. Do you think that medical care for the aged under social security is a proper partisan issue for the 1962 election?

Answer. I do not, for the simple reason that the Anderson-Javits amendment was defeated by the vote of 31 Republicans and 21 Democrats. It was supported by 43 Democrats and 5 Republicans. I think in the final analysis it will resolve itself into a personal issue in the various States, and within both parties, not between the two parties.



## Plebiscite for West Berlin—Political Countermove Against Khrushchev's Miscalculations

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev's "war of nerves" campaign for the seizure of West Berlin is a critical phase of the Communist international politicomilitary war against us.

In Berlin, as everywhere else, our vacillating defensive policies and their resulting concessions not only fail to stop the Communist advances on all fronts; they actually invite more and more reckless Communist "miscalculated risks."

The United States is in dire need of a complete reorientation of its foreign policies. If we are to survive, we must seize the political initiative in this world civil war.

A plebiscite for West Berlin would serve to publicly expose the fraudulency of Khrushchev's proposal to make West Berlin a free city.

If Khrushchev is not totally committed to wage a nuclear war for West Berlin, the plebiscite would provide him with a face-saving opportunity to withdraw from his miscalculations for the seizure of West Berlin.

I am indebted to Mr. Joseph G. Whelan, and the Legislative Reference Service, of the Library of Congress, for the excellent background material furnished me on this subject.

The following article is an excellent summary of my address to this House on September 11. It was written by Mr. Frank Fortune, a most able writer and analyst for one of the Nation's finest newspapers, the Buffalo Evening News.

The article follows:

**POLITICAL OFFENSIVE TO HOLD WEST BERLIN IS SOUGHT BY PILLION**  
(By Frank Fortune)

WASHINGTON, September 11.—Representative PILLION, Hamburg Republican, today told the House that a political offensive is needed to block the Communist drive to take over West Berlin.

He rejected as a "puny gesture" President Kennedy's call for authority to activate 150,000 reservists if it becomes necessary.

Mr. PILLION warned that "this callup will only serve to further lull this country into a false sense of security and peace—the callup is complete proof of the vacuous policies that emanate from our State Department."

"It is another defensive posture that is both self-deceptive and self-defeating."

In his House speech, Representative PILLION renewed his call for an immediate plebiscite in West Berlin.

#### WANTS CLEAR STAND TAKEN

Besides the plebiscite, Mr. PILLION said that initial steps in the political offensive also should include—

"A reassertion by the President that we intend to keep open all communication lines between West Germany and West Berlin."

"A new note from the President to Russian Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev reasserting our determination to use all necessary means

to protect the freedom of the people of West Berlin."

As for the plebiscite, Mr. PILLION said he is confident that in free voting, between 90 percent and 95 percent of the people of West Berlin "would vote to retain the status quo and maintain the city's association with the West German Government," rejecting Khrushchev's proposals to turn West Berlin into a free city.

#### CALLS POLICY DEFENSIVE

Representative PILLION said "it is clearly evident that the tempo of the Communist-conducted world civil war is being accelerated on all fronts."

"Our inhibited, our limited, and our defensive political strategy is not halting the Communist advances anywhere," he said. "Our country's margin for survival is being reduced day by day. \* \* \*

"The seizure of West Berlin is not Khrushchev's final objective. It is another tactical, immediate objective. His strategic, long-range objective is the destruction of our NATO alliance."

As for President Kennedy's new request for authority to call up reservists, Representative PILLION said:

"It is a whistle in the darkness of our own cemetery."

#### RECALLS EARLIER CALLUP

"I would like to recall to the Members of the House that on August 1, last year, this Congress authorized the callup of 250,000 reservists; 150,000 of these were called up."

"A special subcommittee of this House found that last year's callup was short-sighted, badly managed, deficient and totally inadequate."

Representative PILLION declared that the 1961 callup had failed to prevent Communist successes in Laos, South Vietnam and Korea, nor the completion of the "Communist Berlin 'wall of shame.'"

"The callup of 150,000 men will not delay, by even 1 day, the construction of the nuclear missile silos and bases in Cuba," he said.

## Springfield Chapter, Aiding Leukemia Stricken American Children, Raised \$20,000 To Maintain St. Jude Research Hospital; Entertainer Danny Thomas Thanks Teenage Volunteers for Efforts in His Life Dedicated Cause

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, more than 500 teenage volunteer workers who raised more than \$12,000 for ALSAC of Springfield, Mass., earlier this year were told by entertainer Danny Thomas during an August 31 reception at Springfield's Technical High School auditorium that America is not overrun by juvenile delinquents. Mr. Thomas, who describes himself as a "philosophizing bum," thanked the volunteers for their contribution for Aiding Leukemia Stricken American Children—ALSAC—and said they had raised more money per capita in Springfield than any other chapter in the United States.

The popular comedian has been traveling throughout the country to raise funds

for St. Jude Research Hospital in Memphis, Tenn. Both the St. Jude Hospital project and ALSAC have grown out of a vow that Thomas made 20 years ago, when penniless and jobless, to St. Jude Thaddeus, the patron saint of the hopeless. Largely through his efforts, \$2 million had been raised by 1957 to construct the hospital to combat leukemia in children. ALSAC was formed to provide permanent maintenance for the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure to be with Danny Thomas that night when we spoke at a fundraising dinner for ALSAC. Mr. Joseph Demos, the Springfield chapter chairman, was toastmaster. He is to be commended for the very fine fundraising drive put on by his chapter and the teenage volunteers who so generously cooperated in this great cause. At this time I include with my remarks the following excerpt from the Springfield Union's news account in the September 1 edition of Danny Thomas' appearance:

Thomas told the teenagers that "there is no more juvenile delinquency today than there was when I was a teenager. Your age is an awkward one and too many of you are taking the blame for a few juvenile delinquents," he said.

After telling jokes he sang two songs and signed autographs in the corridors where he was mobbed by admiring teenagers.

#### FOUR HUNDRED AT DINNER

In the evening about 400 guests attended a \$25-a-plate dinner in the Sheraton-Kimball Hotel where Thomas and his charity were praised by such dignitaries as Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Springfield Roman Catholic Diocese; Rev. Harry Struckenbrook, president, Greater Springfield Council of Churches; Representative Edward P. Boland; Mayor Charles V. Ryan, Jr.; Judge Abraham I. Smith; Rev. Stephen Papadoullas and others.

A telegram from President Kennedy lauding the work of ALSAC and Thomas was read before Danny went into one of his famous afterdinner monologs.

Some excerpts of his famous wit: "Behind every famous man is a woman who thinks he's an idiot." "People accuse me of voting for the President because he's a Catholic. It's not true. I voted for him because I'm a Catholic."

#### CRACKS JOKES

His penetrating humor included jokes on Israel, Lebanon, and an imitation of Representative BOLAND.

In a more serious vein, he said that in the early days of ALSAC persons accused him of "coming into their territories and stealing their money. It's not true and never was. ALSAC benefits all, for some day there will be a cure for leukemia and other catastrophic diseases that will be shared in with the world."

Children are admitted free to St. Jude Hospital regardless of race, creed, or residency, he said.

"St. Jude Hospital was designed by a Negro, built by a Jew, and is staffed by Protestants," he said.

#### TOTAL OF \$20,000 COLLECTED

He announced that money from the dinner will bring the total amount of money collected this year in this city to more than \$20,000.

In a special interview with the Union, the cigar-smoking veteran of show business said he first got the idea for the hospital in 1955. He said he consulted with a group of scientists who decided that the one catastrophic disease they should center on should be leukemia. Since that time he has spent

all his free time on the project, he said. "I'm like the businessman who can't get away from his business as far as ALSAC and St. Jude Hospital are concerned. It's with me all the time," he said.

#### FRIENDLY CITY

Of the 250 ALSAC chapters in the country, he said that the Springfield chapter was one of the best. "This is a fine and friendly city. Walking down Main Street I received more 'Hi Danny's' than I thought possible," he said. "Guess much of it is due to television. You see, television is a friendly medium. It allows you to enter the privacy of many, many homes," he said.

He said his program, "The Danny Thomas Show," seems to have a good affect on teenagers. "The family problems in the show are as old as man, and have to be solved by the entire family. I don't think that father always knows best," he said.

Thomas, who was presented with two plaques of merit and appreciation by Michael P. Pagos, executive director, on behalf of the Springfield Boys Club, said that the first seminar of scientists from all over the world will be held at St. Jude Hospital in November in order that they may be able to discuss catastrophic diseases and the progress the hospital has made in combating them.

Among the many contributors to the ALSAC at the banquet were five girls from Holyoke who recently wrote and performed a play in Holyoke that raised more than \$100 for the fund.

Joseph Demos of this city, local chapter chairman, acted as toastmaster. He was assisted in arrangements by Dr. and Mrs. Alfred J. Ferris, and Dr. and Mrs. Emil M. Ferris.

Mr. Speaker, I also include with my remarks the story of how Danny Thomas made a vow to St. Jude to build him a shrine if he would help him find his place in life, followed by my remarks at the fundraising dinner, and the program listing honored guests, the patrons and patronesses who worked to make the fundraising a huge success:

#### A PRAYER, A PICTURE, AND PEOPLE

(ALSAC, of Springfield, Mass., presents Danny Thomas for the St. Jude Research Hospital, Sheraton-Kimball Hotel Friday, August 31, 1962)

Twenty years ago Danny Thomas was a struggling, unknown entertainer when he made a vow to St. Jude Thaddeus to build him a shrine if he would help him find his place in life. St. Jude, 1 of the 12 apostles was a forgotten saint for many years because of the similarity of his name to the betrayer, Judas Iscariot, and he became the patron saint of the helpless and hopeless.

Danny Thomas never forgot his vow. He devoted countless hours of his great energy, gave freely of his talent and funds to start a great hospital for research in leukemia and kindred catastrophic diseases of childhood.

The history of St. Jude Hospital really began on February 2, 1962, the date of its dedication, but the research hospital already had an exciting past and promises a future of seeking cures for diseases of children.

On his knees in that church 20 years ago, Danny Thomas had no idea of building a huge research hospital. It was the late Cardinal Stritch who suggested that he build a hospital for underprivileged children. Armed with only a drawing of the non-existent hospital he soon learned that blueprints and construction money were not enough to build a free hospital; somebody has to pay to operate the place, however noble its aims.

The ALSAC (Aiding Leukemia Stricken American Children) organization was

formed in 1957 to support and maintain St. Jude Hospital. Good Americans decided to share this work, so that today in over 200 chapters they work and give for ALSAC on a completely voluntary basis. Because of this dedication over 90 cents of every dollar contributed goes for research at St. Jude.

St. Jude Research Hospital is a \$5 million institution, with a maximum capacity of 100 beds. Since it is primarily a research center, the major areas are devoted to laboratories and research units. The entire institution is dedicated to the care of children stricken with catastrophic diseases and to research aimed at developing superior methods of treatment. Patients are limited to those with diseases involving the blood and blood-forming organs with particular emphasis on leukemia. Hemorrhagic diseases, aplastic anemia and hereditary diseases are also included.

The hospital is operated by a full-time paid staff and is not dependent on volunteer professional services. Physicians employed devote their entire time to the care of patients and to basic and clinical research, and do not engage in private practice. Graduate fellows and hematology residents carry part of the clinical load. Nursing services and day-to-day administration of the hospital are carried out by the Sisters of St. Francis.

Children will be admitted to St. Jude without regard to race, creed or residency. In general, patients who have diagnostic problems, or the type of disease being treated will be admitted. The cost of diagnostic service and hospitalization will be borne by ALSAC and patients will not be charged for care, drugs or any services. Children in St. Jude will receive superior medical care at no cost.

This is what can be done with a picture, prayers, and people—not just a hospital, but a research center with beds, staffed and equipped to give the finest of care to children suffering from leukemia and allied blood diseases—free to all.

#### HONORED GUESTS

Danny Thomas, president of ALSAC.  
Michael F. Tamer, national executive director of ALSAC.

Hon. Charles V. Ryan, Jr., mayor of Springfield.

Hon. Edward P. Boland, Congressman.  
His Excellency Christopher J. Weldon, D.D., bishop of Springfield.

Rev. Harry Stuckenbruck, president, Greater Springfield Council of Churches.

Hon. Abraham I. Smith, judge of probate.  
Rev. Stephen Papadoulas, pastor, St. George Greek Orthodox Church.

Rev. Roland Abijaude, St. Anthony's Maronite Parish.

#### PATRONS AND PATRONESSES

Mr. George Abdow, Miss Phyllis Abdow, Dr. and Mrs. Alfred Aborjally, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Abrahams, Mr. Edward H. Allen, Mrs. Paul Alonzo, Mr. and Mrs. Cosmo Ansara, Miss Nancy Ansara, Mr. Peter Ansara.

Mr. and Mrs. Francis Balicki, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Barkett, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Black, Mr. Stephen Bodolay, Mr. and Mrs. Angelo Bressani, Mr. and Mrs. Philip Bshara.

Dr. and Mrs. Sante M. Caldarola, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph C. Campbell, Mr. and Mrs. Norman Card, Miss Janet Caserio, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Cataldo, Mr. and Mrs. David Chase, Mrs. Edward Ciccarelli, Mr. Donald Cohon, Dr. and Mrs. William E. Coons, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Coughlin, Mrs. Annie Couri, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Couri, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Craft, Jr.

Mr. and Mrs. James E. Davis, Mr. Louis Del Padre, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Demos, Mr. Louis Demos, Mrs. Michael Demos, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Dion, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Doubitz, Miss Diana Dowaliby, Mrs. John A. Dowaliby, Mr. and Mrs. Laurence Duclos.

Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Elkas, Mrs. Edward Ellis, Dr. George R. Ellis, Miss Hilda Ellis.

Dr. and Mrs. Alfred J. Ferris, Dr. and Mrs. Basil M. Ferris, Dr. and Mrs. Emil M. Ferris, Mr. and Mrs. Francis M. Ferris, Miss Laurice Ferris, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Ferris, Mrs. Michael Ferris, Miss Theda Ferris, Mr. and Mrs. William Ferris, Mr. and Mrs. William Foley, Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Fournier, Dr. and Mrs. George Franklin.

Dr. Bronislaus A. Galuszka, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Gampel, Mr. and Mrs. Ned Gareeb, Mr. Frank Gatti, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Ghareeb, Mr. George Ghareeb, Mrs. Hykel Ghareeb, Mr. Joseph K. Ghareeb, Mr. and Mrs. Philip Ghareeb, Mr. Anthony Glanetti, Mr. John Giokas, Mr. and Mrs. Jerome Good, Mrs. Henry Goodnough, Mr. Jack Grace, Miss Barbara Grenier, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Grosso.

Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Habin, Mr. and Mrs. Eli Haddad, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Hafey, Mr. Charles Hapcook, Mrs. George Hapcook, Mr. and Mrs. Manser Hapcook, Mrs. Raymond Hapcook, Mr. and Mrs. William J. Hartt, Mr. Laurence Hashim, Mrs. Fred Hemsworth, Mr. and Mrs. Sol Herskowitz, Mr. and Mrs. Moses Hyder, Mr. Robert Hyder.

Mr. and Mrs. George Joseph, Mr. Joe Joseph, Mr. and Mrs. Philip Joseph.

Mrs. George Karam, Miss Marlene Karam, Mr. and Mrs. Milton M. Katz, Mr. and Mrs. William Kavaney, Miss Eve Kawie, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Kawie, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Kawie, Rev. Francis J. Keane, Mrs. Donald Keefe, Miss Linda Kinnenan, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph J. Kosiorek, Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Kresock.

Dr. and Mrs. William Licht, Mr. and Mrs. William Lynch.

Mr. Alex Makol, Mr. Frank Makol, Mr. Edward Margolis, Mrs. Sheila Mariani, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Marieb, Mr. Taffy Marieb, Mr. and Mrs. Harry E. Marrewa, Mr. and Mrs. John H. McCarthy, Miss Sheila McCarthy, Mr. and Mrs. Timothy McCarthy, Dr. Paul J. McKenna, Miss Roberta Menard, Dr. and Mrs. Irving Meyer, Miss Abbey Michaels, Mr. James Michaels, Miss Marilyn Monahan.

Miss Elsie Nammoun, Mr. and Mrs. George J. Nassar, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Edward Nassif, Mr. and Mrs. Philip Nassif, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Norman, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Paul Norman.

Rev. Raymond W. O'Brien, Miss Dorothy Ollari, Mr. and Mrs. Robert J. O'Neill, Mr. and Mrs. John Ostrowski, Dr. and Mrs. Walter J. Pacosa, Dr. Helen Papaionau, Mrs. John Papaionau, Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Phaneuf, Dr. Henry W. Polchlopek, Rev. and Mrs. W. K. Price, Mr. Edward J. Pryzbysla, Mr. Angelo Puppulo, Mr. and Mrs. Michael Puppulo.

Miss Joanne Ramah, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Ramah, Miss Martha Ramondetta, Miss Mary Ann Ramondetta, Mr. and Mrs. E. L. Raverta, Mr. and Mrs. C. A. Richmond, Mr. and Mrs. Normand Rouillard.

Mrs. Michael Salem, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Salem, Miss Elizabeth Saliba, Mrs. Mandabell Saloomey, Mrs. James Schoenenberger, Miss Jane Schoenenberger, Dr. and Mrs. Irving Selsby, Mr. Fred Semanie, Mr. James Semanie, Mrs. Domit Shaer, Miss Jamelie Shaer, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Shaer, Miss Mary Shaer, Mr. and Mrs. Irving Shapiro, Mrs. Bruno Sileski, Mr. Keith Silver, Mrs. Sarah Spano, Mr. John Satchowicz, Mr. and Mrs. David J. Stevens, Dr. and Mrs. Joseph R. Stirlacci, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Steinberg, Mrs. Esther C. Stone, Mr. and Mrs. George W. Sullivan, Mr. and Mrs. Ben Swirsky, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Szlachetka.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Venti, Mr. and Mrs. Norman Vester, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Norman Vester, Sr., Mr. Joseph Wibbey, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest B. White, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Wright.

Also Dr. and Mrs. Bruce B. Alicandri, Mr. and Mrs. Ignatius J. Andreis, Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Angelica, Mr. Michael X. Andrews, Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Breck, Mr. and Mrs. Daniel J. Bresnahan, Dr. and Mrs. John C. Bryson, Mr. A. Calderigi, Casty-Faneuil Associates, Mr. Alvin Chase, Dr. David O.



Cohen, Mrs. Louis Consiglio, Mr. Joseph Czaja, Dr. and Mrs. William M. Davis, Mr. Joseph J. Davitt, Mr. Edward L. Donnellan, Mr. Isaac L. Eskenasy, Mr. Irving Fein, Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Hyder, Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Jasinski, Mr. Abraham Kamberg, Dr. Robert L. Kantor, Dr. and Mrs. Aldo J. Leani, Mr. and Mrs. Robert R. Lepak, Dr. and Mrs. F. A. Mahoney, Menzel and Menzel, Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Miller, Dr. and Mrs. Robert Moriarty, Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Moynahan, Dr. and Mrs. Meran Nakashian, Mr. John J. O'Neill, Dr. and Mrs. John Frybylo, Student Prince and Fort Restaurant, Daniel M. Keyes, Jr.

## COMMITTEES

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Demos, Cochairmen.  
Tickets: Dr. and Mrs. Alfred J. Ferris, co-chairmen; Dr. and Mrs. Emil M. Ferris, co-chairmen; Mr. Manser Hapcook, Miss Jamelle Shaer, Mr. Joseph Kawie, Mr. George Joseph, Dr. Basil Ferris, Mr. David Stevens, Mr. Edward Barkett, Mr. Louis Demos, Mr. Joseph Ghareeb, Mr. Joseph Ramah, Mr. Philip Nassif, Mr. Sam Salem.

Marchers reception: Mrs. Philip Nassif, co-chairman; Mr. and Mrs. Manser Hapcook, cochairmen; Miss Joanne Ramah, Mr. Joseph Ghareeb, Mr. Joseph Whibbey.

Public relations: Mr. Eli Haddad.  
Reservations: Mr. and Mrs. Francis M. Ferris, cochairmen; Mr. and Mrs. Philip Ghareeb.  
Invited guests: Mr. Cosmo Ansara, Mr. George Ghareeb.

Hostess committee: Mrs. Joseph Demos, chairman; Mrs. David Stevens, Mrs. Andrew Elkas, Mrs. Eli Haddad, Mrs. Philip Bshara, Mrs. William Kavaney.

Treasurer: Miss Jamelle Shaer.  
Entertainment: Mr. Alex Makol, Mr. Frank Makol.

Decorations: Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Phaneuf, Mrs. Joseph Kawie.

Program: Mr. Joseph Demos, Mrs. Clifford Phaneuf, Mr. Peter Couri.

Sound: Mr. Andrew Elkas.

## EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN BOLAND

This is not the best time of the season for any kind of a gathering. Labor Day weekend.

Neither is it for Danny Thomas. But, knowing as he does that leukemia is no respecter of time or people, he gives up the rest and solace and quiet of this pleasurable time to carry on the magnificent work to which he is devoted. So, this is one of the reasons why I wanted to be a part of this wonderful world of Danny Thomas.

And what a world it has been from a horse farm in Deerfield, Mich., where his daughter Marlo says, "Daddy was not only born on the farm—the veterinarian, delivered by—from Deerfield to Toledo—Good old Toledo—to Detroit to the dizzying heights of Hollywood—from saloon entertainer to the gayest, richest, and most expensive spots of the entertainment world into radio and movies and television. What a wonderful world indeed, it has been and is.

He has worn the crown of success and fortune and accepted the honors—as many as ever have been conferred upon a working actor—because he never forgot from whence he sprung.

You will find it wrapped up in his own words: "My purpose in life is to propagate the philosophy of man's faith in man—based upon my own belief that, unless man re-establishes faith in his fellow beings, he can never establish faith in God.

"In order that others to follow may be inspired to do likewise, I have to leave something. I'm not so unforgettable I can do it only with words. I must leave something that men can touch, feel and see. That will be the St. Jude Hospital. Me? I'm a philosophizing bum."

And from this philosophy, he has built masterpieces—his own magnificent, devoted

family, his monument to the patron of the hopeless, St. Jude's Hospital.

I'm delighted to be in your presence and to join with this gathering to make the wonderful world of Danny Thomas, a little more wonderful for the untold numbers that will enter the doors of an institution that was built on faith—the faith of a wonderful guy.

## Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Death of Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

## HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, we pause in our legislative activities today to pay tribute to the memory of the founder of the Czechoslovakian Republic. Thomas Masaryk, statesman and philosopher, died on September 14, 1937, 25 years ago today. No Eastern European statesman has ever embodied the liberal democratic tradition more effectively. The leader of a small political party, Masaryk succeeded in conveying the ancient tradition of liberty, equality, and equal justice under law, not only to the Czechs and Slovaks, but also to neighboring peoples.

Masaryk was born in 1850 near the Moravian border, the son of a coachman who was employed on one of the Austrian imperial estates. Working as a locksmith's apprentice at the age of 14, the young Masaryk later struggled as a poor student. By the age of 32 he had made a major contribution to the field of sociology, and was appointed a professor at the University of Prague. While his sociological work led him to a critical study of Marxism, Masaryk embarked on a political career, crusading for the improvement of the Czechoslovak people. Masaryk was no narrow nationalist; he was deeply imbued with the liberal tradition of Western thought, and all his life advocated "European and world politics." He viewed the complex nationality problems of central Europe from a broad perspective. Freedom, in Masaryk's conception, must always be based on friendship with neighboring peoples, never on hatred.

This outlook did not keep him from vigorous activity in defense of the subjected Czechoslovak people. During the first decade of the 20th century Masaryk, then a representative in the Austrian Parliament, fearlessly criticized Austria's aggressive policy in the Balkans. During World War I he further revealed the corrupt and feudalistic character of the Austria-Hungarian Empire to the whole world, through his writings, and campaigned in Western Europe, Russia, and the United States for Czechoslovak liberation from Hapsburg rule. Partly as a result of Masaryk's visit to this country, the United States on May 29, 1918, officially declared its sympathy with the cause of Czechoslovak independence, and the Allied Governments associated themselves with this declaration. The Czech-

oslovak National Council, of which Masaryk was president and Eduard Benes was secretary, was granted American recognition as the de facto government of the coming Czechoslovak state.

A few months later Thomas Masaryk was elected the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic. He was reelected to the same position three times before his retirement in 1935. After seeing his beloved pupil, Eduard Benes, elected to succeed him, Masaryk died on September 14, 1937, and was mourned by the entire Czechoslovak nation. Throughout his life, Masaryk worked for the liberation of man and for a community of nations based on law. The heritage which he has left the Czechoslovak people, presently suffering under the yoke of a foreign dictator, is a great one, deserving the devotion of freedom-loving people of all nations.

## FAA Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

## HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, some years ago I heard a rather crass definition of politics when someone described it as "the science of who gets what from whom."

This is hardly an ennobling sentiment. Those of us who participate in the political judgments of this country would like to argue that our efforts hardly have the exactness of a science and that they are certainly motivated by loftier sentiments than who gets what from whom.

I mention this because I want to discuss a matter that has occupied the attention of several distinguished Members in recent weeks, namely the merits and demerits of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, Mr. Najeeb Halaq. But first I must disavow and disclaim any desire to take anything from one group of people and give it to another.

The people in the district I represent are not trying to take an FAA facility from the people in another district. Of course, they would like, if possible, to keep the air traffic control center they now have rather than see it move to another district a few miles away. They are not trying to gain a big regional airport that would route another city's traffic to their own. They have not even made a fuss about standing at the bottom of the list when airport appropriations were recently handed out. And I do not know of any of them that are trying to get nonscheduled airline certificates issued or revoked.

In short, the people in my district are not trying to gain a favor from FAA or its Administrator. Yet, they have a quarrel with the Administrator. And I have a quarrel.

Our quarrel is that this man's deficiencies do not dwindle in significance

when weighed against his contributions. We do not want to detract from his accomplishments in earning a pilot's license at 17; we do not want to minimize his abilities as a test pilot or a parachutist; we do not pass judgment on him as a lawyer or a corporation official, nor do we say he rendered no service as one of President Eisenhower's appointees to the group which recommended creation of FAA. We do not doubt that he is eager and on the go, and we think it was proper that he fine himself \$50 when his eagerness to move ahead of other planes waiting on the flight apron caused him to collide with another plane.

We agree with the able Member who listed such things as these to his credit. And we certainly agree that Mr. Halaby never hesitates to speak up for what he believes. However, I would hope that all my constituents do not share the view Mr. Halaby expressed when he said I was simply a freshman acting like a freshman. But even such frankness as this serves a purpose, for it gives an insight into the man's attitudes when he is opposed.

We in the 20th District of Texas oppose this man, not for any of the things I have mentioned, but as Administrator of this Agency. In the past weeks I have examined many aspects of FAA's operations that are under this Administrator. Other Members of this House have taken him to task for matters within their knowledge. One of our distinguished and senior colleagues has called on the President to discharge this Administrator.

It is apparent that no one of us here has full knowledge of all that is to his credit or his discredit. We can only speak from our own knowledge independently arrived at.

Therefore, it is good and it is timely that my esteemed colleague from Texas, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Activities, has scheduled next Monday an inquiry into the activities of the Federal Aviation Agency for the purpose of determining its economy and efficiency. This is good, and I welcome it.

Much that has been said, and to which I have contributed, concerns facts that are involved, obscure, and technical. It is well that a regular committee of this House will now take such facts under consideration. No group up to now has done so. The Subcommittee on Appropriations announced that it was not the experts to do this, that the experts in this field were within FAA itself. The Comptroller General of the United States advised me that he could express no opinion on the reasonableness of economic data from this Agency. Therefore, it is good to know that a regularly constituted body of this House will make this inquiry.

This inquiry must surely examine one central question of conflict that bears directly on both the efficiency and economy of the Agency and the abilities of its Administrator. That question is: How many air route traffic control centers are being planned within the contiguous United States?

Mr. Halaby says 21. The experts in his Agency recommend 15. Why should

this Congress appropriate funds for new centers, for dismantling centers, for consolidating centers until Mr. Halaby and his own career experts resolve their difference? Not only the number but their location and the configuration of their boundaries must be settled before anyone can determine if it is efficient or economical to close down, move, or build these ARTC centers. This is so elemental, I can assure you the voters of America can understand the necessity of answering this question even though many here would rather it not even be asked.

I urge the subcommittee to put the question.

### Cotton Import Bills

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, because of my deep concern with the welfare of the cotton textile industry which is so vital to the economy of my own district and to the national prosperity, I have introduced today two measures which, if enacted, could mean continued survival and growth of a basic manufacturing enterprise, and the stability of numberless jobs of textile workers.

The first of these bills seeks to limit the imports of cotton textiles to the volume imported in 1961—the base year of the short-term Geneva agreement by the major textile-producing nations. The other is a joint resolution which would equalize the competitive positions of foreign and domestic manufacturers of cotton textiles by imposing an import duty so long as we maintain a cotton export subsidy.

To extend statutory protection to our textile industry and its workers is particularly urgent at this time because of the shocking and unexpected unfavorable decision by the U.S. Tariff Commission on the equalizing fee for cotton imports. Too, one of the principal international agreements for the limitation of foreign textiles into the United States expires September 30. It is to be hoped that a new 5-year agreement will be reached before the end of this month, but there is no certainty that it will be done, I am informed.

But even if a new Geneva agreement for a longer term than the present 1-year agreement is reached, the textile industry of this country needs the stabilizing influence which statutory protection would bring. It would certainly encourage modernization and expansion, and it would act as an insurance against fluctuating rates of imports of foreign textiles. The President has assured the industry that he intends to keep the import rate at 6 percent, but it has been at 8 percent during the term of the present agreement.

The American textile industry is and will be at a great disadvantage as long as it must pay high support prices for American raw cotton which foreign

manufacturers can obtain for 8½ cents a pound less. This price advantage, coupled with lower wages and often lower taxes, provides a ruinous competitive position for our domestic industry.

This session of Congress approaches adjournment, and if there is no protection available against a flood of cheaply produced foreign cotton products, our own industry faces a highly inequitable and dangerous position in its home market.

The textile mills of the Far East, Europe, and the Middle East are among the world's most modern. In many if not most instances, this modernization has been made possible through American aid. To now deny the American textile industry a measure of protection while it modernizes to meet outside competition would be, in my opinion, exceedingly shortsighted and economically disastrous.

There is, as you know, now a case before the Office of Emergency Planning, in which it is sought to have the textile industry declared vital and necessary to the national security. If such a finding is made, the President would then have the authority to take measures to protect the domestic textile industry just as the mandatory oil imports program is operating to protect, to some extent, the domestic petroleum industry. I have no assurance, of course, when and if the Office of Emergency Planning will make such a finding. Meantime there is little outside of the prospective international agreements which offer the prospect of a reasonable amount of protection.

If statutory protection for the textile industry is not provided by this Congress, it might well be 2 years before such legislation could be made effective. Such a period would prove catastrophic to our domestic textile manufacturers if the flow of foreign cotton products is not otherwise stemmed.

There have been other important segments of American industry which have been threatened by ruinous foreign competition arising from inequities in production costs and failure to impose reasonable and adequate limitations on imports. Some of those industries have not survived.

I think none would seriously debate that the great textile industry is vital to the economic health and the security of the United States. The time to insure its continued existence and to aid toward permanent health and growth is now.

### How To Save Your Life on the Most Dangerous Weekend of the Year

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD another timely and wonderful article by our great U.S. Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges. I had



the pleasure of putting another one of his great articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which goes to every part of our beloved Nation, and have had so many wonderful letters from every end of the country congratulating us on what Secretary Hodges had to say in his article.

It seems to me that this article is even greater than the last one, and I believe all of us appreciate the great work that Secretary Hodges has done, is doing, and will continue to do in the Cabinet of President Kennedy. Secretary Hodges is just a genius in so many ways. He has brains and ability and such an understanding heart, and you will always find him, in my judgment, doing the things that will help all mankind. This article was a timely warning and we know now, since the Labor Day has passed and we have the record, that it was the most dangerous weekend of the year.

God bless Luther Hodges and give him strength to carry on the great work he is doing for this great Nation as Secretary of Commerce.

The article follows:

#### HOW TO SAVE YOUR LIFE ON THE MOST DANGEROUS WEEKEND OF THE YEAR

(By Luther H. Hodges)

I am addressing this article to you, Mr. and Mrs. Motorist, in the hope that you will not be among the thousands killed or injured next weekend.

All signs point to the fact that Labor Day 1962 could be the worst holiday for traffic deaths in the history of the United States. That's the grim assessment of our U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, which recently completed a study of accident records. Over the years, it was discovered, Labor Day weekend has been the most dangerous holiday of all.

This year's Labor Day is even more ominous because it will be the only long holiday weekend in 1962. Every other major holiday falls in midweek. That means thousands of Americans—perhaps you too—have been waiting all summer for Labor Day to hit the highways.

As Chairman of President Kennedy's new Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board, I've been directed to throw the full weight of the Government's scientific and engineering resources into reducing the staggering annual totals of auto deaths.

#### DRIVER REGISTER STARTED

We're working, for example, to build into the great new Interstate Highway System lifesaving features that will prevent 2,000 deaths in 1962 alone. And we've started a driver register, a permanent list of drivers whose licenses have been revoked. If a violator tries to get a license in another State, authorities can ask us for his record and act accordingly.

We're sure these new programs will help. But in the last analysis, safety is still your job. You and your fellow motorists are the only ones who can reduce the number of Americans killed and injured next weekend—now predicted at 60,000.

To help you help yourself, we have selected the following 10 watchwords for safety from the research findings of the Bureau of Public Roads. These are the most important things to do. Read them; check yourself against them. Then use them on the road this weekend.

Before you start:

1. Safety-check your car. At the very least, make sure your tires, brakes, and lights are fully serviceable. I've put safety belts in my own car, and advise everyone to do so.

2. Plan your trip. Get good maps and information; lay out your trip thoughtfully. Estimate realistically how far you can go each day by staying within the speed limits. Plan to drive not more than 8 hours a day; if that is impossible, include plenty of rest stops.

3. Safety-check yourself. Too often drivers take better care of the car than themselves. They'll run themselves ragged trying to clear everything up at the office and at home, staying up much too late the night before leaving.

While en route:

4. Stay alert. Some tips: eat lightly so you don't become drowsy. Abstain completely from alcohol at least until you've stopped driving for the day. Stop periodically to stretch your legs.

5. Obey the speed laws. Serious accidents increase drastically at speeds above 65 miles per hour. High speeds pay off poorly for the risk involved. On the New Jersey Turnpike, for example, you can observe the legal limit of 60 and travel its length in 118 minutes. If you gamble and go 70 the most you'll save is just 17 minutes.

6. Use judgment. The law sets limits, but within those limits you have to use common sense. On a good, dry, 60-mile-per-hour highway, for instance, driving at less than 40 is actually dangerous. But on a wet road at night, you should stay under the legal speed.

7. Make courtesy a habit. Psychological studies show that accident repeaters tend to be overly aggressive. Don't work off your tension on the highway. You'd do better to tell off your boss—it could cost you your job, but not your life.

8. Exercise self-control. We all know the "big George" type of driver who weaves in and out of line, cussing everyone else on the road. Remember you're traveling for enjoyment. Relax.

9. Communicate. We must cooperate with other drivers to stay alive. Let the fellow behind know what you're going to do. Use all four kinds of signals—not just left turn or right turn, but "slow down" and "pass me." If your car breaks down, warn other drivers by tying a handkerchief on the traffic side of the car or, at night, keeping dome and tail lights on.

10. Be imaginative. Imagine yourself in that other car in the next lane, for example. Think what you would do if you were its driver, and guide your own car accordingly. Of course, you can't anticipate everything; expect the unsuspected and be ready to act promptly.

Every driver can and should add items to this list. But I guarantee that if each of us concentrate on these 10, we'll soon make a change in the present intolerable situation, where it's at least 50 percent more dangerous to drive a car than to ride an airliner, where almost 5 million people are injured each year—equal to the combined population of Los Angeles and Philadelphia.

Labor Day is a time to work for safety. Let's put these 10 watchwords into practice then—and every other day too.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1962

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 5: 9: *Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God.*

O Thou God of all goodness, may we truly be numbered among the family of nations who love liberty and respect Thy law of righteousness and justice.

May all the nations of the earth be blessed with wisdom enough to submit their disputes to arbitration and honor enough to abide by its decisions.

Grant that, drawn together by many common bonds and driven together by many common dangers, we may cultivate the art of living together in amity and concord.

Inspired by wise counsel and wholehearted cooperation may we seek to settle all our differences in an enlightened civilized manner and be determined to achieve and preserve the spirit of friendship and fraternity.

May we make the peace of the world our personal concern and use every means, at our command of power and influence, to help bring an intelligent and articulate public opinion to the side and service of peace and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 508. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of "Structure and Organization of the Communist Party of the United States," 87th Congress, 1st session.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of

the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 224. Joint resolution to authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7283. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7283) entitled "An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses," and requests a conference with the House, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. KEATING to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R.