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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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 realinements 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 acquiese 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 restired 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 Taquechel; 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 intervention 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 sealanes 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 nonpartisan 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 nitpicking 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 brushfire wars; third, design techniques for stopping the infiltrative actions of the Reds in southeast Asia, Latin America, Africa, and alsewhere 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 imprimaturs?

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-suiters 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 Ritland'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 military 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, jurisdiction 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 transporation 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 spent 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 Railroad, 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 one 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 operation 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 carrying out a program for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area.

The program I have proposed is aimed at the widely varying transit problems of our Nation's cities, ranging from the clogged arteries of our most populous metropolitan areas to those smaller cities which have only recently known the frustrations of congested streets. There may, however, be some highly specialized situations in which alternative programs, for example, loan guarantees under stringent conditions, would be better suited to particular needs and the Congress may, therefore, wish to consider such alternatives.

(B) Emergency aid

Time will be required by most metropolitan areas to organize effectively for the major planning efforts required. Even more time may be needed to create public agencies with adequate powers to develop, finance, and administer new or improved public transportation systems. Meanwhile, the crisis conditions that have already emerged in some areas threaten to become widespread. Mass transportation continues to deteriorate and even to disappear. Important segments of our population are thus deprived of transportation; highway congestion and attendant air pollution become worse; and the destructive effects upon central business districts and older residential areas are accelerated.

In recognition of this serious situation, I also recommend that the Congress, for a period of 3 years only, authorize the Housing Administrator to make emergency grants, (a) where there is an urgent need for immediate aid to an existing mass transportation facility or service that might otherwise cease to be available for transportation purposes, (b) where an official long-range program for a coordinated system is being actively prepared, and (c) where the facilities or equipment acquired under the emergency grant can reasonably be expected to be required for the new long-range system. This emergency aid should not exceed one-half of the net project cost. Upon completion of an acceptable areawide transportation program within 3 years, these emergency projects, if a part of the ultimate system, should qualify for the balance of the regular Federal assistance available under the long-range program.

(C) Role of highways

Highways are an instrumental part of any coordinated urban transportation program, and must be an integral part of any comprehensive community development plan. Accordingly, I have requested the Secretary of Commerce to make his approval of the use of highway planning funds in metropolitan planning studies contingent upon the establishment of a continuing and comprehensive planning process. This process should, to the maximum extent feasible, include all of the interdependent parts of the metropolitan or other urban area, all agencies and jurisdictions involved, and all forms of transportation, and should be closely coordinated with policymaking and program administration.

Progress has already been made in coordinated transportation planning for metropolitan areas through the use of funds made available under both Federal highway and housing legislation. To increase the effectiveness of this effort, I recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to increase the percentage of Federal funds available to the States for research and planning. Legislation will be submitted to effectuate this change and to provide that (a) these funds should be available for planning and research purposes only; (b) the funds be matched by the States in accordance with statutory matching requirements; and (c) any funds not used for planning and research lapse.

In addition I recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to provide that, effective not later than July 1, 1965, the Secretary of Commerce shall, before approving a program for highway projects in any metropolitan area, make a finding that such projects are consistent with comprehensive development plans for the metropolitan area and that the Federal-aid system so developed will be an integral part of a soundly based, balanced transportation system for the area involved.

Highway planning should be broadened to include adequate traffic control systems, parking facilities, and circulation systems on city streets commensurate with the traffic forecasts used to justify freeways and major arterial roadways. 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 programing. 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 people 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 organization 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 patterns 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) programing 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) intergovernmen-

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, programing, 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 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 experimental 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 people 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 equivalence 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 Mohrardt, 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 Resere 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. PROXMIRE 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 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 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

[1] 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 consideration 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 virutally 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 yea-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. Kfreire (?), 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 preelection 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 agreement, 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 criticsm 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 example 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. JAVITS] 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 Gondra 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 pronunciations 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 alinement 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, bipartisanship 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 Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], 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	Gruening	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 Igancio Zargoza, 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 reestablish 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 Metropolitan Chicago, for their share in this award.

I want to especially thank one of your area groups who shares in this award, VFW Tioga 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 Tioga Post. They are members of the color guard of Tioga 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 discriminately 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 if 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 fail 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-young 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 Micara, 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 nonregulation. 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 nonregulated 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 truckdrivers 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 responsible 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.; Chesebrough-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 oversea 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 programers, 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 priorities 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 significance of Cuba in the Red military planning by Khrushchev and his coexistence coconspirators.

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 kidnaping 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 conconstituted 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 opponents 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. Lippard, dean of Yale Medical School; Dr. Arthur Larson, Duke University, former Director of USIA; 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 proposals 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 nonprofit 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 Cablon, 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-people 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 programed 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 everyday 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 cruelest 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 abstention. 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, Zaragosa 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 Maffia 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 overeagerness 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 barroom 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. Crazed 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 minors.

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 costy vice every study agrees. The crimes mainly take nonviolent forms, such as drug peddling, petty larcency, 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 slavering, 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 endorsers, 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, deadly 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 underway" 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 Committee 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 oclock 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