Y 4
.F 76/1
M 57/7/
966
GOVERNMENT
Storage

1008-A

89th Congress
2d Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

REPORT OF THE SIXTH CONFERENCE OF THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FEBRUARY 1966

BY

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX, *Chairman*

OF THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DELEGATION

PURSUANT TO

PUBLIC LAW 86–420

APRIL 25, 1966

KSU LIBRARIES
A11900 910994

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
NOV 22 1966
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

61-444 WASHINGTON : 1966

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DELEGATION

ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., Delaware
JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., Texas
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
RONALD BROOKS CAMERON, California
HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Texas
ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, Texas
EDWARD R. DERWINSKI, Illinois
F. BRADFORD MORSE, Massachusetts
JAMES HARVEY, Michigan
ALPHONZO BELL, California
CHESTER L. MIZE, Kansas

ALBERT C. F. WESTPHAL, *Staff Consultant*
HELEN L. HASHAGEN, *Staff Assistant*

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

APRIL 25, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 86–420, it is my privilege and honor, as chairman of the House of Representatives delegation, to submit a report of the Sixth Conference of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, held in Washington, D.C., February 9 through 12, 1966, followed by a visit to Philadelphia, Pa., and San Francisco, Calif., through February 15.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT N. C. NIX,
Chairman, House of Representatives Delegation.

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal	1
Report:	
I. Background	1
II. Work of the Conference	3
A. Committee I.—Political Affairs	4
B. Committee II.—Economic and Social Affairs	9
III. Conclusion—Joint statement	19
Appendix:	
A. Welcoming address by Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, at opening plenary session	21
B. Address by Representative Robert N. C. Nix, chairman of the House delegation, at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa	23

REPORT OF THE SIXTH CONFERENCE OF THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

I. Background

U.S. participation in annual Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conferences was authorized by Public Law 86–420, approved April 9, 1960. The Interparliamentary Group meets in Mexico in odd-numbered years and in the United States in even-numbered years, to discuss matters of mutual interest. Hence, the first, third, and fifth meetings were held in Mexico, the latter in February, 1965, at La Paz, Territory of Lower California (Baja California Sur).

Pursuant to the terms of the authorizing legislation, the U.S. group consists of 12 Members of the House appointed by the Speaker, and 12 Members of the Senate, appointed by the Vice President. At least four of the Representatives and four of the Senators are to be members of the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees, respectively. These members are appointed to serve for the duration of a Congress, while the other members are appointed for a single meeting of the Group.

The U.S. delegation participating in the sixth meeting consisted of the following Members of Congress:

From the House of Representatives:

Robert N. C. Nix, of Pennsylvania, chairman [1]
Harris B. McDowell, Jr., of Delaware [1]
James C. Wright, Jr., of Texas
Harold T. Johnson, of California
Ronald Brooks Cameron, of California [1]
Henry B. Gonzalez, of Texas
Eligio de la Garza, of Texas
Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois [1]
F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts [1]
James Harvey, of Michigan
Alphonzo Bell, of California
Chester L. Mize, of Kansas

From the Senate:

John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, chairman [2]
Wayne Morse, of Oregon [2]
Mike Mansfield, of Montana [2]
Albert Gore, of Tennessee [2]
Ernest Gruening, of Alaska
Daniel K. Inouye, of Hawaii
Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin
Joseph M. Montoya, of New Mexico
George D. Aiken, of Vermont [2]

[1] Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.
[2] Member of Foreign Relations Committee.

Thomas H. Kuchel, of California
Paul J. Fannin, of Arizona
George Murphy, of California

The Mexican delegates were:

From the Chamber of Deputies:

Jorge de la Vega, of Chiapas, coordinator
Mauro Berrueto Ramón, of Coahuila
José Antonio Cobos, of Veracruz
Luis Dantón Rodríguez, of Guanajuato
Alejandor Carrillo, of the Federal District
Raúl Legaspi, of the State of Mexico
Abraham Aguilar, of Chiapas
Vicente Fuentes Díaz, of Guerrero
Antonio Martinez Manautou, of the Federal District
Aurora Navía Millán, of Zacatecas
Martha Andrade del Rosal, of the Federal District
Rubén Moheno Velasco, of Jalisco
Humberto Morales, of Sinaloa (alternate)
Arnulfo Treviño Garza, of Coahuila (alternate)

From the Senate:

Manuel M. Moreno, of Guanajuato, chairman
Manuel Tello, of Zacatecas, secretary
María Lavalle Urbina, of Campeche
Arturo Llorente González, of Veracruz
Manuel Bernardo Aguirre, of Chihuahua
Mario C. Olivera, of the State of Mexico
Arturo Moguel Esponda, of Chiapas
Filiberto Rubalcaba, of Jalisco
Amado Estrada Rodríguez, of Sinaloa
Eulalio Gutiérrez Treviño, of Coahuila
Ignacio Bonilla Vázquez, of Tlaxcala
Juan de Dios Bojórquez, of Sonora
Oswaldo Cravioto Cisneros, of Hidalgo (alternate)
Antonio Flores Mazari, of Morelos (alternate)

The Mexican congressional delegation arrived at Dulles International Airport on February 9, where they were greeted by the U.S. cochairmen and other members of the U.S. delegation and their wives. A color guard was provided by the Army. The formal meetings between the Mexican and United States delegations took place on February 10 and 11.

The Mexican delegation was received by President Johnson the afternoon of February 11, and on February 12, the two delegations participated in ceremonies at the Lincoln Memorial and at the late President Kennedy's gravesite.

On Sunday, February 13, the Conference moved to Philadelphia for a special commemorative session at Congress Hall in Independence Park, where the U.S. Congress met from 1790 to 1800. Representative Nix, chairman of the House of Representatives delegation addressed the delegations and Deputy Carrillo responded on behalf of the Mexican delegation. (The text of Representative Nix's address may be found in the appendix.) The Mexican flag which had been carried in the ceremonies at the Lincoln Memorial the day before was presented to the Mexican delegation by Representative

Nix. Earlier, at luncheon, the city of Philadelphia presented the Mexican delegation a suitably inscribed replica of the Liberty Bell.

On Monday and Tuesday, February 14 and 15, the delegations visited San Francisco where Mayor Shelley proclaimed Congress of Mexico Day and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce honored the Conference with a dinner.

The House delegation wishes to take this opportunity to thank the many individuals in the executive branch, in Philadelphia, and in the San Francisco area who did so much to make the Conference a success. The delegation is grateful for the assistance provided by the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Hon. Robert M. Sayre, and his able staff. The Department of State also made available equipment for simultaneous interpretation which was essential for smooth procedure at the meetings. The U.S. delegation is indebted as well to personnel from the Department of Defense, who made their services available at all times and whose diligent attention to many detailed requirements and needs added to the success of the conference.

II. Work of the Conference

The sixth meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group formally opened on February 10 in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the Capitol, where welcoming remarks were made by Representative Nix and by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Senator Manuel Moreno responded on behalf of the Mexican delegation.

The work of the Conference was organized into two committees, with agendas as follows:

Committee I—Political Affairs:
- A. The Organization of American States
  - 1. Reorganization
  - 2. Peacekeeping
  - 3. Parliamentary participation
- B. Denuclearization of Latin America
- C. Central America and the Caribbean

Committee II—Economic and Social Affairs:
- A. Alliance for Progress
- B. Latin American Integration
- C. Cultural and Technical Exchange
- D. Trade and Commodity Matters
- E. Border Matters

Senator Kuchel was designated Chairman of Committee I, and Representative Derwinski, Vice Chairman. Representative Wright served as Chairman of Committee II, and Senator Gore as Vice Chairman.

In accordance with the agreed rules of procedure, no issues were submitted for a vote. It was recognized that neither delegation was authorized to speak for its Government.

At the closing plenary session of the Conference, which was held on February 11, the rapporteurs of the Mexican and United States delegations from the two Committees presented summary reports of the work of their respective committees. Concluding statements were made by Deputy Jorge de la Vega and Senator Sparkman. A

61-444—66——2

joint statement was also issued by the heads of both delegations, the text of which is on page 19.

The reports of the official rapporteurs for each of the two Committees, are set forth below:

A. COMMITTEE I—POLITICAL AFFAIRS

THE U.S. REPORT, PRESENTED BY SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues from Mexico and from the United States, the Political Committee met in an atmosphere of complete cordiality and frankness, an atmosphere, I might hasten to add, which has characterized each of these meetings since their inception several years ago.

The agenda under consideration included the reorganization of the Organization of American States, denuclearization of Latin America, and items of interest concerning Central America and the Caribbean. One subject which was not on the agenda, but which stimulated considerable discussion, was the proposal by the Mexican delegation that more permanent liaison be maintained between our respective Congresses. No conclusion was reached.

The American delegation was impressed with the thoroughness with which the Mexican position on each of these vital issues was presented. The position papers were expertly prepared, expertly delivered, and most helpful in letting us know not only where Mexico stands on the issues under consideration, but what actions she has taken in her capacity of leadership in hemispheric and/or world affairs. The effectiveness of the American delegation was hampered by the fact that the U.S. Congress was in session during the first day of the discussions, and the Conference was interrupted several times by rollcall votes and other demands on the delegates' time. Nevertheless, a helpful exchange of opinion took place despite the interruptions.

Although an attempt was made to follow the agenda in its stated order, the conversation returned time and again to the question of nonintervention and the corollary issue of recognition of de facto governments as they appear. These issues dominate current discussions by nations of the hemisphere to restructure the OAS, and they lie at the heart of United States-Latin American relations with regard to the Caribbean area. It is natural that they receive considerable attention by our respective parliamentarians. Until there is wider agreement as to definition of "intervention," in all its facets, its inception, and what transpires as a so-called intervention takes place, collective action—particularly action by unanimity—to protect both national interests and interests of this hemisphere will continue to confront grave difficulties.

The American delegation recalled the situation of Cuba as exemplifying the difficulties invclved in defining intervention. It was pointed out that the end result of overt and covert intervention is the same. Once force is imposed on a people, self-determination is gone, and the task of using influence and resources to bring a better life to them is made immeasurably more difficult if not impossible.

Two additional points were made with regard to Cuba: (1) as a great power, the United States is more concerned with the "balance of power" in the world than would be a smaller nation. (2) The

United States is solid in its belief that the Monroe Doctrine should remain in force.

The U.S. Congress has been most concerned with the problem of intervention as a divisive force in the hemisphere. There was some divergence of view which was registered upon the initial decision of our Government with regard to the recent crisis in the Dominican Republic. But once the President of our country had made his decision, virtually every Member, regardless of party, rallied to his support. We believe that politics still stops at the water's edge.

Congressional debate is directed not toward criticism of past actions, but rather toward how the United States and other nations of this hemisphere may insure tranquillity in that unhappy land and the rapid return to the Dominican Republic of the means of control of their own destiny by their own people.

In complete candor, it was pointed out in the discussions that President Johnson, after his initial orders for landing troops in the Dominican Republic only after the second appeal from the Dominican Government itself to do so, and only after other countries likewise had requested such action for the protection of their nationals—very shortly took the matter to the Organization of American States.

The problem of recognizing de facto governments has likewise occupied the attention of the U.S. Congress, although the actual decision to extend recognition under our constitutional system, properly belongs to the President himself.

A most fruitful exchange took place on the denuclearization of Latin America. The U.S. delegation unanimously commended Mexico for the action first begun by ex-President Adolfo López Mateos, and continued under your present great leader, President Díaz Ordaz, to declare Latin America a nuclear-free zone.

The United States of America, under President Kennedy, took a major step toward achieving nuclear sanity in this war-weary globe by proposing and securing a limited nuclear test ban treaty.

Under the leadership of Mexico another major step is about to be completed. The United States has some questions which were frankly raised about the effective policing of any multilateral agreement on such a ban in this hemisphere and about the possible effects it might have on a later decision, for example, to excavate a second canal linking the two oceans with atomic explosives. But there is general agreement that these should not be considered insuperable obstacles, and it was generally understood that no ban should be contemplated on the peaceful uses of atomic or nuclear energy.

The U.S. delegation views with satisfaction the trade and cultural activities of Mexico in Central America. The successful trip of President Díaz Ordaz, and his disavowal of territorial ambitions, were received favorably in this country. We take the view that, while American firms operating in that region may experience some initial difficulties, greater trade and keener competition will ultimately benefit all nations involved, particularly those of Central America itself. Our Congress went on record as favoring freer trade with the passage of the historic Trade Expansion Act of 1962—an act which will come up for review this year.

In closing, the delegates from the United States to Committee No. I want to stress again the very enormous value of the cordial and frank discussions between two peaceful neighbors, Mexico and the United States.

We look forward, Mr. Chairman, to renewing them again next year in the land of our sister republic to the south.

THE MEXICAN REPORT, PRESENTED BY SENATOR MARÍA LAVALLE URBINA

Mr. Chairman, fulfilling the duty entrusted to me, I venture to submit the report of Committee I. Committee I was responsible for political affairs. The Chairman at the first meeting was Representative Derwinski, the Vice Chairman of the U.S. side; the next one was presided over by Senator Thomas Kuchel.

The first topic under consideration was presented by Senator Manuel Tello, who referred to the Rio Conference of the Organization of American States. He expressed the pleasure that he felt over the attitude of the Foreign Minister of Mexico that the structure of the OAS should be subject to revision, but that on the other hand, such principles as that of nonintervention, the juridical equality of states, and the prohibition of the use of force, should not be touched. He indicated that in reality the danger did not lie in the modification of the articles of the charter as to nonintervention, but rather the introduction of a provision or resolutions contrary to existing texts which would leave the American Governments, as a consequence, with contradictions and without a clear norm to guide their action.

Finally, he stressed that it would be incomprehensible since the United Nations has strengthened the principle of nonintervention through Resolution 2131, that the OAS should weaken that principle.

Then Dr. Arturo Llorente González dealt with the topic of expansion of the authority of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, and a convention on that subject.

He stated that the principles embodied in the American Declaration of Bogotá relative to the rights of man as well as those enunciated subsequently in the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man are deeply rooted. Consequently, this has been a very important part of the movement of social improvement in our time.

He added that the position of Mexico with regard to the protection of human rights may be summarized by stating that such protection primarily should be the responsibility of each state, and that international observances of those rights should be achieved gradually and progressively through the functioning of the Inter-American Commission, and the conclusion of a declarative convention which could be revised and broadened from time to time.

In a second phase he mentioned the desirability of an additional protocol establishing the international organs and instruments that might prove to be advisable from the experience of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, and having strict respect for the domain which is reserved to the states.

The final point discussed by the morning session was recognition of de facto governments. It was pointed out that during the Second Special Inter-American Conference held at Rio the delegation of Mexico abstained from the vote on a draft resolution to establish a system of consultation among the member states in the event of the overthrow of a government and its replacement by a de facto regime. On this occasion, the chairman of the Mexican delegation, and Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Carrillo Flores, made a declaration explaining his abstention, and mentioning the traditional position of

Mexico, known as the Estrada Doctrine, which was enunciated for the first time on September 26, 1930, by the then Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, Don Herrera Estrada.

This doctrine essentially maintains that Mexico does not declare herself in the sense of recognition, because this is a humiliating practice which, in addition to wounding the soverignty of nations, places them in a position where their internal affairs could be judged at any time by another government.

The first topic discussed at the afternoon meeting was the maintenance of peace, by Deputy Alejandro Carrillo. He referred to the mission entrusted to the OAS to guarantee peaceful relations among the member states.

After analyzing the problem of the competence of the world organization and of regional organizations in such eventualities, he referred to the creation in Bogotá of the Organization of American States one year after the signature in 1947 at Rio de Janeiro of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. He said that the principle of nonintervention constitutes the cornerstone of the Inter-American system, and he stressed the importance of the Inter-American Treaty for Peaceful Settlement, also known as the Bogotá Pact of 1948, which the Government of Mexico considers to be the most precise and adequate instrument to assure peaceful relations among the states of the hemisphere.

He stated that it would be very desirable if the Inter-American Juridical Commission should produce a definition of the concept of collective action to avoid confusing it with that of nonintervention and finally he suggested the desirability that the member states of OAS who have not yet done so, should formulate a declaration, as provided in paragraph 2 of article 36 of the statutes of the International Court of Justice, accepting obligatory jurisdiction of the Court for cases specified in that paragraph.

Deputy Raúl Legaspi dealt with the topic of parliamentary cooperation, stating that the ever greater need of seeking understanding among nations with regard to the problem of human survival and social justice has led to increasingly frequent dialogs among peoples through their parliamentarians. This coincides with the recommendations of the Second Special Inter-American Conference with regard to parliamentary participation in the strengthening of the inter-American system. He proposed the creation of a commission or the seeking of a procedure which would make it possible to give these parliamentary meetings a permanent nature. Their activities are now practically suspended for a whole year, until the next meeting is held.

Deputy Ruben Moheno proposed that it be the chairmen of both groups who should establish that sort of permanent committee.

Immediately thereafter, Mrs. Lavalle Urbina spoke and she referred to the same topic but, as she stated, looking at it from another angle. Many antecedents are found in Resolution 5 of the Second Special Inter-American Conference at Rio as a basic argument for the acceptance of this resolution. It was adduced that, in order to achieve plans for social development of the OAS, the most efficient guarantee lies in the cooperation of the popular masses in such programs, with the participation of the legislative bodies of the member states being of special interest.

She added that unfortunately the Mexican Congress has not declared itself yet on this topic and, consequently, it was not possible to express an official opinion on the matter. But, naturally, through a constitutional mandate it is the President of Mexico who has the authority to direct the foreign policy of the country. The Senate shares some responsibilities with him, such as those derived from sections 1 and 2 of article 76 of the Constitution.

To conclude, she suggested some tentative ideas by way of possible channels to promote other possibilities along this line.

The last topic discussed at the afternoon session was the denuclearization of Latin America. The discussion was in the hands of Vicente Fuentes Díaz, who stated this is one of the noblest tasks undertaken by the Latin American community, and that its slow but steady progress stresses the profound aspirations of the peoples of Latin America to see themselves freed from the menace of nuclear war or of the negative effects of nuclear tests.

The organ responsible for giving form to the proposal or project for denuclearization is a preparatory commission which has had two working sessions, which gave rise to the negotiating commission of the governments of the 19 Latin American countries including Mexico. that adhered to the proposal,

At the morning session of today, we proceeded to study the final topic of Central America and the Caribbean. It was presented by Manuel Moreno. He started with the affirmation of the interest that Mexico has in strengthening its friendly relations with its neighboring countries located to the north and south of its borders and, too, with the sister republics of the Caribbean and of Central America.

The occasion of the visit of the President of Mexico to Central America clearly defined the position of his country with regard to the countries visited. This position is characterized by the absence of all territorial claims or contentions, a desire for close international cooperation, and the purpose of achieving economic integration, of strengthening the bonds of friendship of a selfless type, and peaceful relations which unite Mexico to the countries of Central America.

With regard to the Cuban case, Mexico intended to maintain diplomatic relations with the Government of that country, within the terms of the Estrada Doctrine, so as to be sure of being able to establish subsequent arrangements for happy relations between Cuba and the rest of the Latin American nations.

With regard to Santo Domingo, he reiterated the concepts expressed by President Díaz Ordaz in the sense that it is up to the Dominicans and only up to the Dominicans, to decide regarding the form of government which is most desirable for that people and, generally speaking, with regard to their future, without any direct or indirect, overt or covert, interference, coming from abroad.

With discussion of this topic, Mr. Chairman, we covered completely the work agenda of our Committee. I thank you very much for your attention.

B. COMMITTEE II—ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

THE U.S. REPORT, PRESENTED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR.

Committee II ranged in frank and unrestrained discussions over a wide area of economic and cultural policy. The comments of delegates from both nations were remarkably candid and specific, and we were impressed again with the quality of preparation which characterized the presentations of our Mexican guests.

As freely as our thoughts flowed back and forth, so freely we hope may the main arteries of major commerce and the more numerous and sensitive veins of cultural and intellectual interchange one day flow unimpeded across our common border to the synchronized pulse beat of two peoples harmonized in hope and united in fulfillment.

We of the United States, in our 60th consecutive month of continuous economic expansion, rejoice with our neighbor Republic of Mexico in its phenomenal rate of economic growth, which in the past year—as a percentage of the gross national product—has outstripped our own.

In face of the dramatic upswing in world population, we know that real economic progress is realized only when production and employment are enlarged more rapidly than the number of people. We earnestly congratulate Mexico upon the attainment of this goal. And we join Mexico in the determined hope that this progress may continue unabated until it penetrates to the most modest home in the most humble village in the most remote region of your land.

We have learned that an increase in the production of goods and services for sale, if it is to be continuous, must be supported by a commensurate increase in the purchasing power of those who make up the market for those goods. The dispersion of buying power among the greatest number of people is therefore the necessary oil that both lubricates the machinery of national prosperity and placates the troubled waters of social unrest.

In all of this, we are mindful of the words of the late President John F. Kennedy, spoken in his message to Congress in 1962, wherein he said:

"We are not developing the Nation's wealth for its own sake. Wealth is the means—and people are the ends. All our material riches will avail us little if we do not use them to expand the opportunities of our people."

In order that the growing industrialization of our two countries then may spread its benefits broadly among the people, we believe that the direction of this industrialization inevitably must lead to ever lower units of profit and an ever higher volume of sales.

Thus, our policy of trade and aid, industrialization and investment, must be aimed at techniques of maximum efficiency of production and distribution.

Trade

Trade, we recognize, is a two-way street. The United States has been, for Mexico, the most significant single outlet for exports and imports. Our Nation comprises the source for more than 60 percent of the commercial exchange for Mexico. At the same time, we are

conscious that any nation must sell if it is to continue buying. And we recognize that the expansion of employment and improvement of wages constitutes in any country the best guarantees of a growing market for products produced both internally and externally.

We acknowledge that the trade balance between our two nations has been a favorable one for the United States. Mexico has purchased a greater dollar volume of our goods than we have bought of hers. We suggest, however, that this is at least partially offset by the fact that the United States has maintained an umbrella of protection over the free world and has contributed vastly through its economic assistance programs to the developing nations of the world. In the current year our budget for defense and economic aid programs will represent a composite expenditure of more than $64 billion. The only way our Nation can maintain such a level of expenditure is by maintaining a favorable balance of trade.

We offer as an additional counterbalancing factor the great volume of U.S. tourism which replenishes the Mexican economy. Mexican income from tourism and border transactions in 1965 amounted to approximately $800 million, and it is estimated that some 87 percent of all tourists visiting the interior of Mexico are citizens of the United States. The tidal wave of visitors arriving in Mexico from our country increased from approximately 622,000 in 1961 to an estimated 1 million in 1965.

In today's world no nation, any more than a man, can be an island unto itself. Our public policies, and particularly those involving trade, inevitably produce a chain reactive repercussion like the waves which emanate in ever-widening concentric circles from a stone dropped in a tranquil pond of water.

It is only natural then that the effects of U.S. trade policy would be felt first and sometimes with the greatest impact among our closest neighbors.

Exploratory efforts will result from our conversations aimed at alleviating where possible any unintended maladjustments regarding the flow between our countries of such mutually significant commodities as barite, graphite, and fluorspar.

Cotton

Recognizing the unique importance of cotton to the rural economy of both Mexico and the United States, our delegation desires to stress that our most recent legislation emphatically is not intended to subvert or destroy the markets for either Mexican or U.S. cotton.

Any indiscriminate or wholesale "dumping" of these cotton stocks held by our Commodity Credit Corporation would depress our own markets first, and therefore we should like to allay any concern arising from fear that such a course might be followed.

While the immediate, short-term effect of this legislation may have produced apprehension, we believe that the long-term results of our policy inevitably must redound to the benefit of all cotton-producing areas in the hemisphere, for the following reasons:

1. The new legislation is expected to reduce the volume of U.S. cotton production to the point where we no longer will be amassing costly surpluses. This will greatly help in reconciling the present world imbalance between supply and demand.

2. Our Congress is presently considering laws and programs designed to increase the consumption of cotton, both in the United States and throughout the world, which in the long run must form the basis of any ultimate solution to the stabilization of price.

3. We would look with favor upon participation in an international cotton agreement aimed at a more orderly common assault upon this mutual problem.

4. To avoid severe market dislocations in the interim period, the United States will exert every reasonable effort to make prudent use of its surpluses.

Alliance for Progress

We are proud that our Nation has served to some degree as a catalyst in the development of the Mexican economy. In the years since 1961, direct U.S. loans to Mexico have totaled some $462 million, and loans from the World Bank and the International Development Bank have come to an additional $507 million.

Yet we are aware that, if the Alliance for Progress is to succeed, these sums must generate and stimulate far more by way of capital investment and expansion.

Not all of this can originate in the United States. Much of it must arise internally. Much must come from private, rather than public sources. To the degree that it is possible, we would like to cultivate a climate conducive to the maximum development of Mexico's own resources. To broaden the base of local enterprise, we believe that new emphasis should be given, in our programs of long-term loans and loan guarantees, at considerable rates of interest, not only to big commercial undertakings but to small individually owned indigenous enterprises which utilize and develop the agricultural, mineral, and human resources of their individual localities.

With respect to private U.S. investments in Mexico and other developing countries in the hemisphere, we believe the broad guidelines of the future might properly encompass four fundamental objectives.

1. Wherever possible, U.S. ownership and management of firms should be shared with citizens of the country in which they are located.

2. Widespread popular ownership of interest in industrial establishment should be promoted through investment programs designed to permit the population at large to realize a return from the profits of such enterprises, through the offering of stocks and bonds on terms which will permit systematic participation in investment by the greatest possible number of the citizenry.

3. U.S. investors should look with favor on incentive programs designed to share the fruits of increased production and efficiency through profit-sharing plans, with the employees of the firm itself.

4. Additionally, we feel that there should be a definite policy of reinvesting a portion of the profits from each such enterprise in the civic and social and commercial development of the host country.

And we believe that we in the United States, rather than waiting for developing neighbor countries to insist upon such conditions, should voluntarily assume the initiative to encourage the development of such a policy.

In these ways, foreign investment—so essential to any developing country—may cease to bear the onus of exploitation; and the tarnished

image of "commercial imperialism," which skims off the cream from the patrimony of the land and departs, may give way to a new long-range policy of mutual growth and shared benefit.

Interchanges

In regard to the expansion and development of cultural, technical and educational exchanges, the U.S. delegation reiterates each of the points enumerated by our representatives on Committee III at the Fifth Annual Interparliamentary Conference in La Paz, Baja California, in 1965.

We look upon Mexico as an indispensable partner and a natural leader in the development of the free nations of the New World.

Only a few years ago, when we began this series of parliamentary interchanges, we seemed in some ways like two men adrift in a life-raft on the ocean. One asked the other if he could see anything in any direction, and the other replied, "I can see nothing but the horizon." The first rejoined, "Then set sail for the horizon; it is a better goal than nothing."

In the 6 years which have intervened, we have seen tangible fruits of our labors in the amicable solution, so long deferred, of the Chamizal territory and in the recent progress in salinity eradication in the waters of the Colorado and the Rio Grande Rivers.

For the fulfillment of more complete cooperation, we join our friends on Committee I in the belief that the continuing dialog between our two groups would be facilitated by the creation of an interim committee consisting of a few members from each of our delegations.

To our two peoples in this generation has begun to come an answer to the ancient prayer murmured many centuries ago by Aristophanes among ruins of the Greek temples devastated by the Peloponnesian War:

"From the murmur and subtlety of suspicion
With which we vex one another,
Give us rest;
Make a new beginning,
And mingle again the kindred of the nations
In the alchemy of love;
And with some finer essence of forebearance
Temper our minds."

The shoreline of true mutual understanding, at first beyond our view, is coming now into the range of our vision. And on the horizon we perceive the sunrise of a still better day.

THE MEXICAN REPORT, PRESENTED BY DEPUTY JOSÉ ANTONIO COBOS

Mr. Chairman, Committee II dealt with United States-Mexican economic and social policies.

Trade

It was pointed out that some U.S. policies need to be adjusted to take into account the economic situation in Mexico and Mexican policies to have protective import policies, especially for those particular products which represent a higher aggregate total value. This is an important factor.

More than 60 percent of Mexico's trade is with its neighboring country. The increase in Mexico's exports closely follows or corresponds to the U.S. national income, and any change in the U.S. income as far as trade is concerned has a direct effect on Mexico.

The balance of trade, therefore, with the United States has been traditionally in deficit. In accordance with figures which are available in 1965 we see that Mexican exports to the United States were reduced whereas exports from the United States to Mexico increased.

Mexico would be in favor of the establishment of world agreements which would serve to stabilize prices of raw materials, and the establishment of such agreements should be brought about with frank and decided participation on the part of the United States.

One of the measures taken by the United States in order to reduce its deficit in the balance of payments consists of requesting U.S. companies which operate in other countries to participate in a voluntary program of leaving earnings in such countries provided that such action is not detrimental to the countries concerned. By leaving the earnings for reinvestment it would be possible to accelerate the rate of development in those particular countries. We should also consider that any other measures adopted by the U.S. Congress or the executive branch of the U.S. Government should not be applied to the same degree to underdeveloped countries. For instance, in the exemption on goods which U.S. tourists can bring back duty free to the United States, consideration should be given to the country of origin of the goods, particularly since the exemption has been reduced from $500 to $100.

Cotton

Deputy Luis Dantón Rodríguez referred to the problem involved in cotton production which affects both Mexico and the United States. He pointed out that in order for the country to continue with this source of foreign exchange through its export of cotton, it would have to continue to invest more than 3 billion pesos and this represents a source of livelihood and affects hundreds of thousands of workers in our country. It was pointed out that Mexico was well aware of the problem being faced in the United States as far as cotton production is concerned. Mexico is interested in a solution which might be devised and utilized for the purpose of having stable prices, to guarantee domestic consumption, and to avoid drops in production, as well as to take into consideration the particular difficulties posed by competition from synthetic fibers.

It was also pointed out that some of the measures which might be utilized for the primary purpose of attaining the aforementioned goals have been introduced. Also a drop in the world price and the principles set forth in the new legislation do concern Mexico. It will not only make it difficult to handle the situation and the surplus of the United States but will also present serious difficulties as far as establishing the price in the world market is concerned. Actually the disposal of cotton has been further speeded up by cotton producers in the United States who look to the possibility of getting subsidies. This hasty sale lowers the price. It causes difficulties and will certainly cause difficulties in the future.

Another point to be considered is the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has a certain way of taking care of its surplus in

storage; also to be considered is whether the new congressional arrangement would make it possible to reach an international agreement with the other cotton-producing countries of the world.

These points of concern are the result of the downward trend which we are already starting to see in the price of cotton. Despite the fact that the law has not yet been put into effect, there are certain repercussions which are felt in Mexico. The drop in foreign exchange inflow, which is quite necessary to supplement industrial development and also for industrial relations with the United States, will have an effect on both countries. A drop in sales will be the result. There will also be a recession as far as credit is concerned, and lastly it will affect the economic development which the United States promotes.

The aims of all the cotton-producing countries were mentioned. The particular aims on which we cotton-producing countries can agree have to do with an increase in cotton consumption, the establishment of an international cotton agreement, and the strengthening of the cotton market as well as improvement in the price for this particular fiber. That summarizes the Mexican position vis-a-vis cotton. It was suggested that the surplus held by the Commodity Credit Corporation perhaps not be placed on the market with such rapidity. It was hoped that it would be possible also for the Secretary of Agriculture and others to consider the possibility of maintaining the price which was established so as not to cause difficulties in the international price for cotton.

Fluorspar and Barite

Concerning fluorspar, Senator Gutiérrez pointed out that the United States is not self-sufficient, and Mexico supplies 90 percent of U.S. imports of fluorspar. Since the United States is the major consumer of this product, it has been possible to develop some of the deposits of fluorspar in Mexico. He also pointed out that differential terms of treatment for this particular product that have been established by the United States, especially as regards fluorspar for metallurgical purposes, have an adverse effect on the small producers of fluorspar in Mexico, and therefore, endanger the development of some of our deposits in Mexico since we do not have the funds to help them. Only a revision of the tariff, both for the acid grade and the metallurgical grade of fluorspar, would help us solve that particular situation.

He also pointed out that the United States does not have sufficient production of barite, and that Mexico is the principal U.S. supplier. But this should not operate to the detriment of Mexican producers.

We will have to continue our efforts in exploring all our reserves and deposits in Mexico, because so far, we have been involved only in the higher grades of barite which will not be available for an indefinite time and therefore accordingly difficult for the United States to obtain since it needs the high grade barite for its industry.

Now for Mexico to be in a position to be able to guarantee the complete utilization of these particular minerals and to provide them to comply with your specifications, as Senator Gutiérrez pointed out, it would be necessary to further develop these particular deposits in order to create supplies of less intense, less concentrated types of barite, and to do this, of course, we have to utilize new metallurgy processes.

However, taking into consideration these sales prices and the price which is paid by the United States, it is very difficult to undertake any of the new processes which are envisaged for the purposes of improving the quality of the mineral.

Alliance for Progress

Deputy de la Vega referred to the policy of Mexico and to the Alliance for Progress. He pointed out that Mexico had completed the reforms which it had preached and that they were already underway as a result of the programs of the Mexican revolution. He also referred to the establishment of the Planning Secretariat which has been operating for some years and by which Mexico plans its development.

He pointed out that in 1965 investment in Mexico has been more dynamic than in preceding periods. This, of course, was absolutely essential in order to meet the need for ever-increasing employment as a result of the population increase. It has also resulted in the increase in the GNP. This was considered to be absolutely essential and in accordance with the principles set forth in the Alliance for Progress.

In analyzing the progress which as been made and maintained within the framework of the Alliance for Progress, he pointed out that there are possibilities of accelerating our progress with appropriate techniques. He was also pleased to see that there was a committee established in 1963, to wit, the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress, as well as the recent establishment of the Special Fund for Emergency Assistance within the inter-American framework. We feel that in considering the purposes and the programs developed in the Alliance for Progress, this is a further extension which is timely indeed.

Deputy de la Vega also pointed out that the amount of credit obtained by Mexico through the Alliance for Progress had been reduced. This is particularly apparent when we take into consideration overall investment but, nevertheless, Mexico renews its confidence in the Alliance for Progress in view of the fact that the principles, the goals, and the aims of the Alliance coincide with the principles of the Mexican revolutionary movement, as was clearly stated in a speech made by the President of Mexico, Díaz Ordaz.

Other Senators on the committee continued and spoke primarily of the features involved in public investment in Mexico and the importance of this for the economy in general and planning in particular.

It was pointed out that the investment policy of the Mexican Government of obtaining the optimum yield from the application of limited resources should take into consideration practically unlimited needs.

Investment in the public sector was also described. It was stressed that the general guiding efforts made by the Government have made possible a higher yield in these investments. In almost all cases public funds that lead to projects of social benefits and for development purposes are channeled into this framework. We have utilized internal domestic resources as much as possible, and this goes to the bulk of our investment.

On the other hand, foreign credit has been used to supplement these investments. This has proved to be a very successful policy, but it has limited our external creditors to an extent. We might consider that we have been most scrupulous in fulfilling our foreign obligations.

This does not mean that Mexico is self-sufficient and is not interested in soft credit.

There are considerable areas of our country which need credit at low-interest long-term interest rates. These areas especially include agriculture, which in some cases shows a low production and yield. Resources are lacking for the development of these areas.

Latin American economic integration

Senator Mario Olivera dealt with the top of economic integration of Latin America. He gave some background information on the extent of the concept and the framework for the integration of the economies of the Latin American countries. He described in detail the negotiations which had been undertaken.

Consideration was given to the different levels of economic development. He referred to recent events and particularly the importance of the last meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs which established agreements representing a decisive forward thrust for future Latin American association. For instance, there will be periodic meetings at a high level to make decisions which will facilitate the process of integration, and an automatic system will come into operation to effect the reduction of tariffs and other barriers.

He concluded by pointing out that he felt that harmonious industrialization, so to speak, as far as the Latin American area was concerned, was a factor which would certainly help to broaden commercial relations with the rest of the world and most especially with the United States.

Cultural exchange

Regarding the problem of cultural exchange, Dr. Martha Andrade del Rosal pointed out the tremendous importance we have attached to intensifying and strengthening cultural and technical exchange programs between Mexico and the United States. She stressed that there was a need to consider all of the social sectors in areas of both countries and that the knowledge which has been generated in both countries of traditions and characteristics should be further studied and further understood by both countries. She further stated that we should get to know the heritages of both countries, especially when we are trying to strengthen the ties of friendship and understanding between our peoples. She pointed out finally that technical and cultural relationships between Mexico and the United States could be increased and enhanced through planned action as well as through encouragement on the part of both countries' Governments and that this program could be entrusted to a specific agency, which, in addition to these basic duties and attributes, would also serve as a consultation and advisory service so that there could be a positive definite cultural technical program.

Border affairs—Migratory workers

As far as border questions are concerned, Deputy Aurora Navía Millán said a problem is being faced by Mexican migratory workers. She said that she felt that the migratory flow of Mexican braceros to the United States would persist to a greater or lesser extent as long as there continues to be a need for labor and manpower in the United States and that it would be advisable to seek a solution jointly. The termination of the agreement in the summer of 1964 had contributed

to an exacerbation of the problems involved, and this is a situation where it would be unwise to increase the migratory flow to the United States. It had never at any time been Mexico's wish to encourage, to induce, or to authorize this outflow of labor to the United States, for the purpose of promoting the displacement of U.S. labor.

She also pointed out that opinions had been expressed in public and these opinions sometimes were contradictory. There had been an increase in the flow of Mexican workers into the United States. This had led to confusion, and made it difficult to establish the very fact that other methods could be utilized for the purpose of obtaining solutions to the problems involved therein. It would be good to establish a bilateral commission which would make a similar study of this particular problem.

Tourism

Further in connection with border questions, reference was made to tourism—the tourist trade in general. It was pointed out that Mexico intends to intensify development of the tourist trade because of the economic benefits derived by Mexico and also because of the fact that this strengthens understanding between our peoples.

It was also pointed out that the number of Mexicans who have come to the United States has increased some 20 percent over the last few years. It was said to be economically advisable to intensify tourist trade from Mexico. This would be of direct benefit to the United States because the foreign exchange income earned by Mexico would come back to the United States through the purchases of goods and services by Mexicans in the United States.

Mexico has said it will make it easy for people to come into its territory by suppressing certain visa and passport requirements and eliminating, as recently approved by the Mexican Government, duties for tourists on certain articles up to a certain limit.

It was requested that U.S. legislators undertake certain measures to enhance the tourist trade to Mexico. Perhaps it might be possible to authorize U.S. tourists to return from Mexico with a maximum purchase of $500. It would be good for the Civil Aeronautics Board to consider the possibility of preferential air fares for flights to Mexico and Central America, because these are outside of the framework of IATA. It would be good to have promotion campaigns which would stress the advisability, the timeliness and the desirability of visiting Mexico because there is a certain attractive feature in the differences of traditions in the country.

Finally Senator Bojórquez referred to the problem dealing with the law passed in the latter part of 1965 which restricted the importation of liquor. Instead of a gallon as previously authorized now only one-quarter of a gallon can be brought back to the United States duty free. This measure affects border trade, and we find that in the border towns of Sonora and in Nogales alone some 56 percent of the stores have closed.

Beef

Deputy Mauro Berrueto Ramón referred to the beef problem. He indicated that Mexican beef exporters had reduced the amount which they were sending to the American States because of the fact that there has been a drop in beef prices, high tariff rates, and a lack of

organization in the market. He recommended that inspection be eliminated or limited, because beef which is exported to the United States has already undergone considerable and thorough inspection in Mexico. He also suggested the desirability of establishing a joint United States-Mexican committee which would undertake to investigate the different aspects involved in trade and in industrial development in this particular area.

Brooms

He also referred to the problem of the sale of brooms, suggesting the advisability of Mexico having a quota of 180,000 dozen to 200,000 dozen brooms per year and that this quota be divided into quarters.

In-Bond Stores

Finally Deputy Berrueto referred to unfair competition which is suffered both in Mexico and in the United States because of the presence of in-bond stores and warehouses at the border.

Sugar

Sugar was also discussed. It was pointed out that the development of the Mexican sugar industry was based primarily on domestic consumption. Nevertheless, some 700,000 tons of sugar had been exported from Mexico. This was very important, taking into consideration the present quota system in the world. Perhaps in the future, in the long run, it might be possible for Mexico to have an increase in the quota, but in the short run there are certain unfair, unfavorable factors operating in the world market which are especially difficult to separate as far as the price is concerned.

The principal sugar market for Mexico is the United States, and that U.S. sugar legislation is very important as far as Mexico is concerned. During the last 6 years the average annual export from Mexico to the United States was nearly 400,000 tons. It was also pointed out that the sugar market is subject to the restrictions imposed by the sugar legislation of the United States and that this is affecting Mexican industry.

In 1965 a quota of 390,000-odd tons had been reduced to 348,000 tons. This figure is less than the annual average for the last few years.

It was requested that the U.S. Congress study the problem and allot to Mexico any shortfall in the quotas of other countries.

The Mexican cochairman for this study group expressed his gratitude and thanks for the manner, the pleasantness and the arrangements which have been provided for us and the manner in which our U.S. colleague, Representative Wright, acted as cochairman. He also expressed his thanks to us, his colleagues, and to the U.S. legislators who participated in the meetings, mentioning the situation involved in considering these matters in Congress. We are very pleased that they were able to take time out to participate in these meetings with us in spite of the volume of work which had to be dealt with.

The Mexican Cochairman stressed the fact that the attitude of Mexican legislators was not along the lines of demanding a solution for the problems of the country, but was merely for the purpose of expressing on a very frank basis, a very frank approach, just what the Mexican viewpoint was. These views were expressed bearing in mind the needs which are faced by our constituents.

We expressed our opinion about the situation as we see it, and we have made a sincere effort to understand the viewpoints of our friends in the U.S. Congress. We do so for the purposes of strengthening the ties of friendship which already unite us and making them closer ties. There is recognition on the part of the U.S. delegation—that is, the recognition of the principles activating our investment policies as well as the statements which were made in this regard—which acknowledges that the agriculture law of the United States should not be harmful to the interests of the farmer and the agricultural interests in Mexico. In emphasizing the Mexican attitude we pointed out that our own development was being carried out primarily with our own resources. And while we have resorted to foreign credit the very fact that we are very scrupulous indeed in fulfilling our credit commitments should not be interpreted as an absence of need for soft types of credit.

And finally, as far as the migratory workers problem is concerned, the conviction was expressed that in Mexico above all we prefer exporting Mexican products and effort, that is, our own products and effort, and not our labor force.

Thank you very much.

III. Conclusion

The U.S. delegation was pleased to serve as host to the Mexican delegates during the sixth meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group. This meeting, as in the case of the five meetings which preceded it, was highly successful. At its conclusion, the following joint statement was made by the chiefs of both the United States and the Mexican delegations:

1. They once again confirm their adherence to the democratic form of government as the most effective to stimulate growth and progress of nations.

2. They firmly oppose all forms of armed aggression and the intervention of one state in the internal matters of another.

3. They consider that the most effective means, based on law, for the solution of international conflicts is the strengthening of the United Nations and, for the matters of this hemisphere, that of the Organization of American States.

4. They deem it desirable to carry on the program to establish a nuclear-free zone in Latin America as a means to guarantee peace.

5. They express their agreement on the need to accelerate the advancement of the Alliance for Progress, as a vigorous means of international collaboration.

6. They look on programs of cultural interchange and technical assistance as an efficient way to stimulate the growth of both nations.

7. They consider tourism as a practical formula contributing to peace and concord among nations through direct understanding among peoples, as well as an important economic factor for their development.

8. They indicate their satisfaction upon ascertaining through their talks, the coincidence of points of view, and

they observe that there are very few matters on which there are differences of opinion.

9. They are pleased that the conversations have been held in an atmosphere of open cordiality and opinions have been expressed most frankly, as a true image of the good relations existing between the two countries.

10. The Mexican delegation, on its part, wishes to express its appreciation to the authorities, the people of the city of Washington and the Federal Government of the United States, for the open hospitality it was offered.

APPENDIX

A. Welcoming Address by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, at the Opening Session of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, Old Supreme Court Chamber, the U.S. Capitol, February 10, 1966

Congressman Nix, Senator Moreno, distinguished delegates and Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to have visited Mexico many times with great delight, and to come here to take part in the opening session of the sixth annual meeting of legislators of Mexico and of the United States.

When President Kennedy visited Mexico 4 years ago, he recalled that President Roosevelt had predicted that the day would ultimately come when the Presidents of our two countries would freely meet and freely discuss their common responsibilities and common opportunities.

In November 1964, when our present President met with the President-elect, Díaz Ordaz, President Johnson said, "Part of the feeling of friendship of our two great countries is that their Presidents should meet, talk, counsel, and be friends."

This meeting today is evidence that we have come even further than President Roosevelt prophesied.

Since 1960, members of our two great legislative bodies have met jointly each year to discuss problems of common interest to the United States and Mexico. These annual meetings are another link in the chain of common interest which unites our two nations.

We believe that our relations with Mexico have never been better.

In early 1964, our two countries were successful in settling the half-century-old Chamizal dispute. Last year the lower Colorado River salinity problem was resolved.

We have made considerable progress in alleviating the problems that remain.

I know that you will be devoting much of your time during your meeting here to these problems. I am convinced that you can contribute a great deal toward their resolution.

I note that one of the items in your agenda refers to trade and commodity matters. As you are aware, a joint United States-Mexican Trade Committee met for the first time in Washington last October. It is to meet again this year in Mexico City. The creation of this joint committee represents the first effort by our two Governments to initiate and maintain a permanent institution for the regular exchange of views on ways to promote mutually beneficial trade. We believe that regular talks of this kind offer great promise for increasing both trade and understanding between our two countries.

The excellent relations that exist between Mexico and the United States today result not only from the efforts of our two Governments, but from the increasing understanding on the part of private individuals and organizations on both sides of our 2,000-mile-long common border.

More than 3 million of our citizens are descendants of yours. More than a million U.S. citizens visited Mexico last year. Several hundred thousand Mexicans visited the United States.

More than 1,700 American students are enrolled in Mexican schools, and almost that many Mexicans attend the U.S. colleges and universities.

Commercial information and entertainment produce an enormous exchange of ideas.

Our athletes regularly compete against each other in a variety of sports. We all are too aware of the prowess of men like Antonio Palafox and Rafael Osuna, to mention two of your outstanding tennis stars.

Intellectual exchange between our two countries in the artistic and scholarly fields is extensive. Anthony Quinn, born in Chihuahua, is one of Hollywood's finest actors. Mario Moreno, as Cantinflas, has enriched the world with laughter.

Mexican painting, sculpture, music, command high prestige in the United States. Mexican muralists have achieved great renown, and Mexican folk singing and dancing enjoy increasing popularity in this country.

Carlos Chavez gained international fame as a conductor and composer, and the outstanding Folklore Ballet of the Mexican Institute of Fine Arts has performed here and has delighted many thousands of Americans who have visited Mexico.

Mexican and North American historians, archeologists and anthropologists, scientists and scholars, are working closely together in both countries.

Our two nations were born of revolution, and the spirit of their revolutions remains a vital living force.

You in Mexico are seeking further to extend the benefits of your revolution to all classes of society. President Díaz Ordaz has said, "To raise within the shortest possible time the general standard of living for the vast majority of our people has been and must continue to be the great undertaking of the Mexican people." And we in the United States are seeking to create a Great Society, to abolish poverty, and to assure equal rights for all.

Beyond our own borders, our two nations in concert with our sister republics of the hemisphere are engaged in a peaceful but revolutionary effort under the Alliance for Progress to expand the opportunities for better housing, better health, and better education.

President Johnson has declared that the people of Mexico and the United States, working together, can make the Western Hemisphere and the entire world a better, healthier, more peaceful, and a safer place to live.

Mexico has often been cited as an example for the rest of Latin America and as a show window of the Alliance for Progress. The reasons for this are not difficult to find. In an area where more often than not political transition has been achieved through violence, all of Mexico's Presidents elected in the last three decades have served out their full term of office.

Despite an annual increase in population of more than 3 percent, Mexico has consistently exceeded the Alliance for Progress goal of 2½-percent annual per capita increase in income.

Mexico's famous extensive agrarian reform program was initiated nearly 40 years ago. Agriculture has been diversified. A strong and stable middle class has developed. Industrialization has been rapid. One-quarter of Mexico's national budget is spent on education.

All of these advances have been achieved within a framework of democratic institutions.

Mexico has in many ways demonstrated its readiness to assume leadership in advancing the objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

Students from many other countries in the hemisphere are learning about malaria eradication, construction of rural schools, highway engineering, modern banking, agricultural planning, and other vital subjects in Mexican schools and universities.

Mexico was one of the original participants in the Montevideo Treaty which established the Latin American Free Trade Association. We gave our wholehearted approval on our side to the basic principles of the Montevideo Treaty. We continue to view favorably the efforts being made in Latin America to reduce internal trade boundaries, to create broad regional markets, and to encourage industries to seek advantages of large-scale operations.

We believe that effective economic integration in Latin America would be an important step in accelerating economic development and in attaining the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

Mexico has assumed a leading role in the efforts to establish a nuclear free zone in Latin America. With respect to our own attitudes toward these efforts, permit me to quote from my statement of November 1965 to the Second Special Inter-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro:

"The United States believes that the project of a nuclear free zone in Latin America is constructive statesmanship in the best tradition of the hemisphere. We welcome the effort and would be glad to see it reach a successful conclusion."

I was interested to learn that your itinerary in this country will also take you to Philadelphia, a city rich in our historic traditions and brotherly love, and to San Francisco, one of our most beautiful cities, the home of cable cars and the baseball Giants. We think it important that our friends who visit us from abroad have the opportunity, not only to come to Washington, but also to visit other areas of our country.

And so, I wish you all an interesting and an enjoyable stay in this country, and extend to you every wish for success in your deliberations, and I would like you to know that those of us in both Governments who are carrying on the day-to-day responsibilities will give an attentive ear to your counsel and to your discussions.

Thank you very much.

B. Address by Hon. Robert N. C. Nix, Chairman of the House of Representatives Delegation, at the Special Commemorative Session of the Sixth Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, Held at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, February 13, 1966

In the 6 years that we have met, our deliberations have been supplemented by—and on occasion overshadowed by—the opportunities each of us has had to travel in the host country. Both Mexico City and Washington are cosmopolitan cities that suggest the rich and varied qualities of our countries. Yet as legislators who represent widely scattered parts of our country we are the first to recognize that the eminence our capitals so well deserve today is often the result of events distant in time that transpired outside their confines.

An obscure 19th century American poet wrote: "A land without memories is a land without history." When the U.S. delegation visited Mexico 3 years ago, you showed us that yours was a land of memories. I well recall the occasion of the solemn session in Dolores Hidalgo. It was there, we were told, that Hidalgo uttered his famous Grito or "call to independence" that sparked your people to establish an independent country. The interval of more than 150 years since the call was uttered has neither dimmed its sound nor diminished its significance.

Today it is the pleasure of the U.S. delegation and my particular privilege to bring you to Philadelphia where the "Grito" of American independence was sounded. Within a radius of 1 kilometer where we are assembled today occurred many of the most stirring episodes in our quest for independence and the establishment of our country.

The United States started as 13 colonies scattered along the Atlantic coast, ranging from close to what is now the border with Canada to what is now the northern boundary of Florida. In the 18th century they grew increasingly restless under the arbitrary rule of the British. Scattered outbursts, protests, and boycotts against the British took place. In 1774, prominent men from all the colonies met in what we call the First Continental Congress in Carpenters' Hall, about 3 blocks from here, and determined to boycott all British goods. The following year, 1775, the Second Continental Congress met in the Pennsylvania Statehouse, known now as Independence Hall, the building that adjoins this one. The sporadic fighting with the British had turned into war. The Congress commissioned George Washington to be General and Commander in Chief of the Army, and it was in Independence Hall that he accepted that commission.

Armed conflict made inevitable some kind of statement why the fight against Britain was being waged. The Members of the Congress carried on lengthy and informal discussions and exchanges on this subject. One of them, Thomas Jefferson, was the principal draftsman of the document that was adopted in Independence Hall on July 4, 1776. It was—and is—our Declaration of Independence. It was more than an indictment of the "King of Great Britain"; it was a clarion call for free government in the United States.

Fifty-six delegates from the 13 colonies signed the Declaration of Independence. They were of varied background, age, education, property, and experience. Their average age was 45 years—rather old by 18th-century standards. Twenty-five were lawyers, 12 were merchants, 9 were landowners, 4 were physicians, 2 were full-time politicians, 1 was a clergyman, and 1, Benjamin Franklin, was a printer. Less than a third of them were rich men by the standards of their day. But almost all of them lost what wealth they had during the Revolutionary War that followed.

Even before the defeat of the British in 1781, the colonies joined in "a league of friendship" under the Articles of Confederation—what one writer has described as "a government of responsibility without power." The problem that beset the leaders was how to mold the colonies into a government with power. They met in the summer of 1787, again in Independence Hall, to draft a constitution adequate to the requirements of the day. I shall not recite here the many days and months of debate, of compromise between conflicting views, that transpired. But out of the deliberations came a Constitution of the *people*, not of the colonies. The thoughts expressed in the opening words of that document have proven the inspiration for men all over the world.

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States."

During the first 2 years of our new Government, the capital of the United States was in New York. But in the decade from 1790 to 1800 the seat of Government was in Philadelphia. This building, built by the County of Philadelphia as a county courthouse, was made available to the new Government and was occupied by the Congress of the United States until 1800 when the Government moved to Washington.

This room, in which we are gathered, was the meeting place for the House of Representatives. The Senate met in the room on the second floor. The Supreme Court met in the building on the other side of Independence Hall. Working in this room in the heat of summer and the candlelit gloom of winter evenings, thronged about by constituents who pressed against the railing and cut off the circulation of air, the Representatives nurtured and kept alive the infant government and perfected its machinery.

It was here that the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, were added to it. The First Bank of the United States and the Mint were established to provide some degree of stability for the financial problems of the Government. In the Senate chamber upstairs George Washington was inaugurated for his second term in March 1793. In this chamber John Adams was inaugurated as second President of the United States in March 1797.

Perhaps the saddest occasion occurred in 1799 when Congress received the news of the death of George Washington. The chambers were draped in black crepe and John Marshall rose from his seat in the second row, in front of the pillar, to deliver his famous eulogy. He described Washington, in the words of Henry Lee, as the man who was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Distinguished guests, almost two centuries have passed since the momentous events that occurred in this city shaped the course of our national existence. Many others have transpired in the interval. But in the broad view of history all of them have been directed to preserve the liberty and to assure the justice that those who met in Philadelphia sought. We of the U.S. delegation, who have been privileged to meet with you during the years, have come to recognize that these ideals are no less a part of the heritage of Mexico. Thus, in planning this occasion my colleagues deemed it most appropriate that the flag of Mexico, which yesterday was displayed in the ceremony at the Lincoln Memorial should also grace this hall. Upon the conclusion of this meeting it will be my privilege to present to the delegation of Mexico this flag as a meaningful symbol of the common dedication of our two peoples to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

○

MANHATTAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
JUN 22 1961
MANHATTAN, KANSAS