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

Rev. Dr. Eudvile Nemci, chaplain of Braddock General Hospital, Braddock, Pa., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Eternal Father, as we pause at this moment to invoke Thy blessing upon this august Senate of the United States of America which is graciously extending to the victims of the Iron Curtain, grant it the light to recognize the menace, and the grace to use the opportunity, to overcome the evil of atheistic communism, that seeks to destroy the dignity and rights of men and the nations they have formed in the mold of Christian principles.

Thou who, in Thy providence, didst enlighten the minds of the Founding Fathers of the United States to write into their Constitution the freedoms which are essential to the freedom of men, grant that these legislators do all in their power to prevent the enslavement of their youth. May they recognize the fact that that pattern of perfidy has spread ever nearer to the shores of this great American Nation. Let them in horror recall the victims of communism in Czechoslovakia: the denial of their human rights, the closing of private schools, the suppression of the free press, curtailing of the free pursuit of the arts and sciences, the imposition of false teaching and the indoctrination of their youth. In these legislators do all in their power to relieve the suffering that follows stark fear, hunger, the displacement, and the massacre of thousands of innocent people.

May they recognize their opportunity to resist this, the most violent barbarism in history. Made known to all the free world the inspirational leadership of those silenced at home, as well as those in exile. Bless the deliberations of the scholars presently engaged in the first Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in America, so that their work may reflect truth as a liberating and prevailing principle. Grant that truth will prevail and justice shall not perish.

From Thoe, O benign dispenser of all good, grant to this great and small nations await the bestowal of Thy blessing, so that they may enjoy freedom with the dignity of men, in love, in peace, and in justice, and that having shared in today's pas-sion, they may know the fulfilment of tomorrow's resurrection in the pursuit of happiness under God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 17, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 16, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1308. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Tatsumi Kamada.
S. 1320. An act for the relief of Mary Eliz­abeth Skor Polkowska.
S. 1378. An act for the relief of Edward Ying Liang.
S. 1363. An act for the relief of Felix Le­dina Mehn.
S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla.
S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mashurani; and
S. 2101. An act for the relief of Alida Mary Sorino Bocenley.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it jointed the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1404. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina.
H. R. 2187. An act for the relief of Augustin Ramirez Trejo.
H. R. 2198. An act for the relief of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca.
H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith.
H. R. 3565. An act for the relief of Anna Helena Alcon.
H. R. 5916. An act for the relief of Miss Susanna Moscato (Reverend Mother Charity).
H. R. 6021. An act for the relief of Lt. Don Walsh and Lt. Lawrence A. Shumaker.
H. R. 6330. An act for the relief of Vincent Edward Hughes, his wife, Carmel Phillomina Hughes, and their alien children.
H. R. 6386. An act for the relief of Cleo A. Dekot.
H. R. 6439. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll.
H. R. 8124. An act to authorize the sale of the mineral estate in certain lands.
H. R. 8631. An act for the relief of David B. Kilgore and Jimmie D. Rushing.
H. R. 9049. An act for the relief of Mary R. Galotta.
H. R. 9609. An act for the relief of Molly Kwaik.
H. R. 10440. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia.
H. R. 11033. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 2,923,071 stating that the badge of the Sons of the American Legion.
H. R. 11033. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 2,953,368 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary.
H. R. 11034. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 2,953,368 relating to the badge of the American Legion.
H. R. 11289. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 438. Concurrent resolution to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at ceremonies celebrating the 375th anniversary of the landing of the Lost Colony and the birth of the city of Dare; and

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S. 205. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for education purposes;
S. 503. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;
S. 508. An act for the relief of John E. Bertrand and Adelaide Bertrand;
S. 704. An act of the relief of Marily E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds;
S. 1067. An act to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smith­sonian Institution;
S. 2151. An act for the relief of Harvey Burstein;
S. 2319. An act for the relief of Harry E. Ellison, captain, U.S. Army, retired;
The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice with their titles and passed to the third reading:

H.R. 11404. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina; for the establishment of the former dwelling of James Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial.

H.R. 18103. An act for the relief of Antonio Ramirez-Trejo.

H.R. 18109. An act for the relief of Carlos Galotta; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 18134. An act for the relief of Janina Rainone; to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee to be composed of six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate to represent Congress at ceremonies to be conducted at Roanoke Island, North Carolina, during the week of August 29 to August 31, 1962, inclusive, jointly by the committee and by the Governor's Commission for the celebration of the three hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of Virginia Dare, in commemoration of the three hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the landing of Sir Walter Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, North Carolina, and the birth of the first English child in America, and of the Royal Island; and that the members of the joint committee shall select a chairman from among their number.

The expense of the joint committee incurred in carrying out the purposes of this resolution, not to exceed $1,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers authorized by such joint committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

WITHHOLDING FROM PAY OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES DUES FOR MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN EMPLOYER ORGANIZATIONS

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of proposed legislation to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employers' organizations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET, 1963, FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 28)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963, involving an increase in the amount of $2 million, for the Interior Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON NOTICE OF DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND AGRICULTURE TO INTERCHANGE JURISDICTION OF CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, and Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the intention of their Departments to interchange jurisdiction of military and national forest lands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF EXISTING LAW, RELATING TO RELATIONSHIP OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY TO THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so that they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AS AMENDED

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, for the purpose of proceeding with the construction and operation of facilities to meet during the session of the Senate.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND REQUESTS FOR FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of February 28, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING OF SERIES E U.S. SAVINGS BONDS, BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT (PARKERSBURG, W. VA., OFFICE)

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the automatic data processing of series E U.S. savings bonds, Bureau of the Public Debt (Parkersburg, W. Va., office); Treasury Department, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.
NATIONAL AND STATE BANKING SYSTEMS IN OREGON—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently I received from John Steelhammer, executive director of the Independent Bankers of Oregon, a resolution adopted by its board of directors on February 15, 1963. It describes the activities of the National and State banking systems in Oregon. It calls attention to what the board feels is growing domination of Oregon banking by two national banks operating statewide in the State, and urges that the dual banking system be encouraged. I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution read into the record.

WHEREAS the dual banking system has long been recognized in the State of Oregon as a system according to the best interests of all of the people of the State of Oregon; and

WHEREAS the dual banking system has prohibited the monopolistic domination of the banking industry in the State of Oregon by any one or any combination of large statewide national branch banking systems; and

WHEREAS the following statement is compiled as of December 30, 1961, from the reports of condition of all of the banks in Oregon; to wit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deposits</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Loans</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The First National Bank of Oregon</td>
<td>$832,600,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>$58,000,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>$890,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States National Bank of Portland</td>
<td>906,712,000</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>427,073,000</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>1,333,785,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,539,312,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>585,076,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,124,388,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bank of Commerce &amp; Trust Co., Portland</td>
<td>105,999,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>87,074,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>193,073,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other banks in Oregon, including 8 smaller independent national banks</td>
<td>361,047,000</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>167,506,000</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>528,553,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all banks in Oregon as of Dec. 30, 1961</td>
<td>2,323,780,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,101,208,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,424,988,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHEREAS currently the First National Bank of Oregon and the U.S. National Bank of Portland together operate 167 branches, which, with the home banks, total 159 banking offices now operating within the State of Oregon, and whereas there are 40 State charter banks having 28 branches, and 9 national banks and the Bank of California, totaling 88 banking offices now operating in the State of Oregon;

WHEREAS there is concentrated in two statewide banking offices 79.5 percent of the banking assets of the State of Oregon, and in the State-chartered banks, other national banks, including the Bank of California, 15.1 percent of the banking assets of the State of Oregon;

WHEREAS there is concentrated in two statewide banking offices 79.5 percent of the banking assets of the State of Oregon, and in the State-chartered banks, other national banks, including the Bank of California, 15.1 percent of the banking assets of the State of Oregon;

WHEREAS the above figures disclose that the two statewide banking offices in Oregon are approaching monopolistic domination of the banking industry in the State of Oregon; be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Independent Bankers of Oregon, that the dual banking system be encouraged and continued so as to make possible the perpetuation of the dual banking system in the State of Oregon; be it further

Resolved, That the increasing concentration of the banking assets in the State of Oregon in the hands of the statewide national banking offices be called to the attention of the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; that copies of this resolution be forwarded to each and every Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon.
REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment (Rept. No. 1352); and, as amended, to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments: S. 2919. A bill to authorize retired personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries (Rept. No. 1344).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 6916. An act to authorize grants for planning and carrying out a project of construction for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of George Washington University Hospital in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1345).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 1834. A bill to further amend the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 2901. An act to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1888, 76 years old (Rept. No. 1356); and

H.R. 6697. An act to provide for the incorporation of profit-seeking corporations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1357).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (by request):

S. 3197. A bill for the relief of Clara B. Fry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3198. A bill for the relief of Renata Lattanzi; and

S. 3199. A bill for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2900. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY):

S. 3201. A bill to amend section 401 of the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 588; 10 U.S.C. 7126), in order to authorize increased payments to committees in which Federal wildlife refuges are situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY):

S. 3205. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to confirm in the State of Idaho clear title to certain school indemnity lands heretofore selected by the State; and

S. 3206. A bill to afford relief for deficiencies in grants for school, college, and university purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

RENEATA LATTANZI

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Renata Lattanzi. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3199) for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold, introduced by Mr. Morse, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the child, Renata Lattanzi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Mary DiLoreto, a citizen of the United States: Provided, That the natural parents of Renata Lattanzi shall not, by virtue of such parenthood, be accorded any right, privilege or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

PETER K. BECHTOLD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3199) for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold, introduced by Mr. Morse, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the child, Peter K. Bechtold, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Peter K. Bechtold, and not, by virtue of such parenthood, be accorded any right, privilege or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

TERMINATION DATES OF CHAIRMAN, VICE CHAIRMAN, AND MEMBERS OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Federal Reserve Act by changing the terminating date of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. It would also increase their salaries.

This bill was proposed by the President in his letter of April 17, 1962. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the President's letter and the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3202) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to change the terms of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to increase the salaries of members of such Board, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Robertson, by request, was received; read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America...
April 19

MRS. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 for 2 years and would make a number of other changes in the act.

This bill was proposed by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record Mr. McDermott's letter and the statement and draft bill which he enclosed with his letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3203) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Robertson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows: Section 305(a) is amended by deleting from the parenthetical clause the word "domestic."

SEC. 2. Section 305(b) is amended by inserting a comma and the words "except for sales or contracts for processing or refining," after the phrase "but not exceeding."

SEC. 3. Section 305(c) is amended by striking out the following paragraph at the end of the section:

First, a list of such transfers, metals, minerals, and materials so acquired may be used to make payment in kind for the refining or processing in a form better suited for stockpiling of any materials held in, or to be transferred pursuant to this subsection, to the national stockpile established pursuant to the Act of October 25, 1950 (50 U.S.C. 88-88a). Such use shall otherwise be treated as a transfer under such subsection.

SEC. 4. Section 304(b) is amended by inserting the following after the first two words in the section:

In the case of such transfers, metals, minerals, and materials so acquired...
actions under section 303." Section 304(b) is further amended by inserting after the penultimate sentence the following: "Sometimes it is the result of amounts borrowed or which may be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out section 304(b). The words "304 shall not bear interest after June 30, 1961, and interest accrued or owing to the Treasury on such notes or other obligations is hereby canceled."

Sec. 5. Section 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The net uncovered loss, including nonrecoverable expenses and the unrecovered losses on the Secretary in connection therewith shall be reduced or canceled accord­ingly. Upon the cancellation of any such notes or other obligations so canceled, the Secretary of the Treasury in connection therewith shall be reduced or canceled accordingly. The aggregate amount of cancelling such notes or other obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury, the aggregate amount of borrowing which may be outstanding under section 304(b) of this Act, as amended, shall be reduced in an amount equal to the amount of such notes or to the obligations so canceled."

Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to reduce or write off the liability of any person, association, or corporation to the United States."

Sec. 6. The first sentence of section 717(a) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964."

Sec. 7. This Act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1963."

The letter presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

APRIL 19, 1962

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, The President of the Senate, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "To authorize the President to make purchases or commitments to purchase, and sales of, metals, minerals, and other materials. By means of this authority the Government could finance an expansion for the production of the metals and minerals industry to satisfy defense demands. The main device used to make purchases or commitments to the Secretary of the Treasury shall be by departments, agencies, officials, and corporations of the Government through the use of funds borrowed from the Treasury of the United States pursuant to this section shall, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, be written off by such departments, agencies, officials, and corporations, and the notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations issued to the Treasury in connection therewith shall be reduced or canceled accordingly. The aggregate amount of cancelling such notes or other obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury, the aggregate amount of borrowing which may be outstanding under section 304(b) of this Act, as amended, shall be reduced in an amount equal to the amount of such notes or to the obligations so canceled."

Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to reduce or write off the liability of any person, association, or corporation to the United States."

The first sentence of section 717(a) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964."

The Act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1963."

In view of the foregoing, section 304 should be amended to eliminate the requirement that sales or sales may be carried on notes issued to carry out section 303 purposes, however, were not lent to producers. Rather they were used to pay for defense contracts and to make other similar types of nonrecoverable expendi­

In many cases the Government purchased large amounts of low-grade mate­

1. In attempting to comply with the Presi­

In view of the foregoing, section 304 should be amended to eliminate the requirement that sales or sales may be carried on notes issued to carry out section 303 purposes, however, were not lent to producers. Rather they were used to pay for defense contracts and to make other similar types of nonrecoverable expendi­

In many cases the Government purchased large amounts of low-grade mate­

1. In attempting to comply with the Presi­

In view of the foregoing, section 304 should be amended to eliminate the requirement that sales or sales may be carried on notes issued to carry out section 303 purposes, however, were not lent to producers. Rather they were used to pay for defense contracts and to make other similar types of nonrecoverable expendi­

In many cases the Government purchased large amounts of low-grade mate­

1. In attempting to comply with the Presi­

In view of the foregoing, section 304 should be amended to eliminate the requirement that sales or sales may be carried on notes issued to carry out section 303 purposes, however, were not lent to producers. Rather they were used to pay for defense contracts and to make other similar types of nonrecoverable expendi­

In many cases the Government purchased large amounts of low-grade mate­
The lands in question are now owned by the State of Idaho, subject to a reservation in the United States of 190,000 acres, granted to the phosphate in them. They were selected as indemnity lands which would have been granted to Idaho, under our admission. In deciding upon those circumstances that they fell within the boundaries of national forests, national monuments, Indian reservations, fractional townships, or were for other special reasons unavailable, the public-spirited possession act authorized the State, in lieu of such lands, to select from the vacant and unappropriated public domain other lands of equal value.

Distinctly arises when the State undertook to make these selections, however, because other lands of equal value simply were not available. In the early decades of this century, the hard-pressed State government, needing school revenue, accepted certain sections as indemnity lands in which the phosphate minerals were reserved. The bargain was a bad one for Idaho and a worse one for the circumstances which rendered it impossible for the State to obtain the benefits clearly intended by the Congress when the admission act was approved.

The purpose of the measure to be introduced is to rectify this inequity by granting to the State of Idaho clear title to the lands and minerals in question. I ask unanimous consent to extend the time the bill may appear in the RECORD following these introductory remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be printed and appropriately referred; and when printed, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3204) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to confirm in the State of Idaho clear title to certain school indemnity lands herefore selected by the State, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is, authorized and directed to amend the certificates attached to Clear Lists numbers 15, 18, 21 and 26, approved by the Department of the Interior on January 31, 1918, March 27, 1918, July 10, 1918, December 27, 1919 and October 13, 1920, respectively, by deleting from each such certificate all reference to a reservation in the United States of phosphate in the lands covered by said Clear Lists, thereby confirming to the State of Idaho full and clear title to the school indemnity lands so listed, without reservation.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to assign to the State of Idaho the interest of the United States in any lease or contract affecting the lands described herein to which the United States is a party.

RELIEF FOR DEFICIENCIES IN GRANTS FOR SCHOOL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY PURPOSES

Mr. CHURCH. Next, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to confirm in the State of Idaho clear title to certain school indemnity lands heretofore selected by the State.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to confirm in the State of Idaho clear title to certain school indemnity lands heretofore selected by the State.
In nearly all the public lands States, certain sections out of each township were set aside, under the various admission acts, for the benefit of the State, to be received inalienably. The intent of the Congress, in making these grants, was to compensate the States, in part, for the fact that much of the land within the States was claimed by the public domain, and produces little tax revenue.

In cases where the sections granted to the States had been withdrawn, or were later withdrawn, by the Federal Government, or as was done when the national forests were established—the laws generally provided that the States could select other land, of equal value, from the public domain, as indemnity for their losses. But many of the States have not in fact been made whole by these provisions, for the reason that other lands of equal value, on a section basis, have simply not been available.

The bill I now introduce is intended to be of general application in all such cases, and to carry out the intent of the Congress, that the States have elected in the original grants. It directs the striking of a balance, under which the States could not obtain, from the public domain, lands equal in value to the withdrawn lands.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be published in full at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3205) to afford relief for lands and mineral interests in lands equal in value to (1) the full value of the lands, or the mineral character of any of the lands, selected under this Act; and (2) the value of all lands, and mineral interests selected under this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in all cases where a section has been selected under Federal law, other than under the indemnity laws, for the benefit of the public domain, and produces little tax revenue, the President, in the exercise of his power of appropriation, may provide for the acquisition by any State which did not vest but would have vested in the State, but for application of the provisions of the Act, of the full value of the lands, less (2) the value of all lands, and mineral interests therein received by such State by reason of (a) the original grants or (b) indemnity or lieu selection law.

SEC. 3. A complete description of the lands and mineral interests entitled to such grant shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior within five years after the effective date of this Act. In addition to such description the bill shall require the Secretary of the Interior at the same time a description of the lands or mineral interests therein for which relief is sought under this Act.

SEC. 4. All determinations of value under this Act shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal as of the date of the filing of the election specified in section 1 of this Act, with the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 5. (a) Selections under this Act may be made in accordance with, and subject to the laws specified in section 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended and supplemented, 43 U.S.C. 862. However, no requirements that relate to the nature of the base land shall in any way affect the right to selection under this Act.

(b) Any selection under this Act shall be subject to classification by the Secretary of the Interior under the principles of section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act, 43 U.S.C. 315f, as amended.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 3126, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962, to provide greater continuity of Federal financing in the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas.

Mr. President, a number of organizations requesting the submission of this amendment have stressed to me the importance of continuity in Federal financing if this proposed mass transportation program is to succeed. A number of Senators have indicated to me that the method of financing enacted last year by Congress for the mass transportation demonstration program, which was not hamstrung during the closing hours of the session last year, should be preserved and continued for the proposed long-term grant program.

Therefore, I am submitting this amendment, so that this important assistance be provided during hearings on the legislation, and so that the Senate may be permitted to express its will, as it was unable to do in the closing hours of the session last year.

Mr. President, I should like for a moment to describe some of the arguments that have been made to me on behalf of this amendment, by a number of interested organizations. They stem from two aspects of the President's legislative recommendations which I had the pleasure of introducing on April 5.

First, the President stressed the importance, in planning and organizing, and financing mechanisms necessary to achieve a coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of urban areas. Quite obviously, this is not going to be an easy task. It is going to require a high degree of cooperative effort on the part of many separate political jurisdictions, over a long period of time.

Secondly, the President's proposals recommend that the Federal grants be not only matched by local contributions, but also be applied only to the net cost of the mass transportation project. The net project cost would be the part of the project cost which cannot reasonably be financed from revenues. In other words, this grants would pay for a part or some part of the cost—and in many cases a major portion of the cost—will be borne by private financing, probably through the issuance of revenue bonds.

It is for this reason that I ask that the President stated in his message that

Only a program that offers substantial support and continuity of Federal participation will be of general application in all such cases, and to carry out the intent of the Congress, that the States have elected in the original grants. It directs the striking of a balance, under which the States could not obtain, from the public domain, lands equal in value to the withdrawn lands.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be published in full at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3205) to afford relief for deficiencies in grants for school, college, and university purposes, and to compensate the States, in part, for loss by reason of Federal assistance and to private financing.

Let us assume that a city wishes to undertake a $50 million mass transportation project, to carry out the method of financing enacted last year by Congress for the mass transportation demonstration program, which was not hamstrung during the closing hours of the session last year. The important point here is that State and local governments would find it extremely difficult, and most public authorities would find it virtually impossible, to arrange for private financing of the original $20 million portion of the project if they must wait year by year for additional grants.

Therefore, I am submitting this amendment, so that this important assistance be provided during hearings on the legislation, and so that the Senate may be permitted to express its will, as it was unable to do in the closing hours of the session last year.

Mr. President, I should like for a moment to describe some of the arguments that have been made to me on behalf of this amendment, by a number of interested organizations. They stem from two aspects of the President's legislative recommendations which I had the pleasure of introducing on April 5.

First, the President stressed the importance, in planning and organizing, and financing mechanisms necessary to achieve a coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of urban areas. Quite obviously, this is not going to be an easy task. It is going to require a high degree of cooperative effort on the part of many separate political jurisdictions, over a long period of time.
appropriation process proposed in Senate bill 1326 would make it very difficult to make long-term commitments and to form plans for spending, and it would make possible substantial private investment. This would be especially true in undertaking major new mass transportation systems.

The proposed amendment would not eliminate a review of the program by the annual appropriations process; but it would give the administrator of the program a definite authority of $800 million over 3 years, or whatever amount Congress might decide to approve, with which the administrator could make contract commitments. In this way the State and local governments could make their long-term plans and financial arrangements with assurance that there would be continuity in Federal financing, and Congress would still exercise its annual appropriation review process.

This is the procedure which has been adopted by Congress for the urban renewal and other programs, and it has worked exceedingly well. Those who urge this amendment for the mass transportation program contend that the need here is even more compelling.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that this amendment would provide the opportunity for a careful, thorough, and responsible exploration of this question by the committee and by the Senate, for it is the financing and the arguments raised on behalf of the amendment are worthy of serious consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COSPONSORS OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL, S. 1326

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on April 5 I had the pleasure of introducing the administration's urban mass transportation bill, S. 1326. I would like to inform the Senate at this time that the following Senators joined in sponsoring this measure, and that their names have been added to the bill when a star print was made of it to correct errors in the bill: Senators BEALL, BELE, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, CLARK, COOPER, DODD, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, GRIEVEY, HUMPHREYS, JAVITS, KUCHEL, Long of Hawaii, Long of Missouri, MURSKY, MUSIE, SMITH of Massachusetts, SYMON, and YOUNG of Ohio.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished jurist, Senator from Washington (Mr. Jackson) be added as a cosponsor of the bill at its next printing.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EXRA GLASER TO BE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, April 20, 1962, at 10 a.m., in Room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Ezra Glaser, of Virginia, to be Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

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

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Johnson), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Kefauver), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Wiley), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Scour), and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THURGOOD MARSHALL TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SECOND CIRCUIT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Johnson), and on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled for Tuesday, April 24, 1962, on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit, has been rescheduled for Tuesday, May 1, 1962 at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

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

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Johnson), as chairman, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska), and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF STEPHEN J. ROTH TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 26, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Stephen J. Roth, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Clifford O'Sullivan, elevated.

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

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Long), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Fouse), and myself, as chairman.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on Tuesday, April 17, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 205. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes.

S. 505. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson.

S. 704. An act for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds.

S. 1097. An act to provide for the National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution.

S. 2541. An act for the relief of Harvey Burstein.

S. 2589. An act for the relief of Harry W. Wilson, Captain, United States Army, retired; and


HATTON W. SUMNERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we have just received the sad news that a distinguished statesman of this country—Hon. Hatton W. Sumners—passed away this morning at Dallas, Tex., at age 87.

He retired voluntarily from Congress in 1946, after having served for 34 years in the House of Representatives; and for many years of his service there he was chairman of the powerful House Judiciary Committee.

Hatton Sumners, like many other Texans, including Davy Crockett, Sam Rayburn, Sam Houston, and others—was a native of Tennessee. He was born in Tennessee in 1875, came to Texas at age 16, and was admitted to the Texas bar in 1897. He was elected prosecuting attorney of Dallas County in 1909, and served two terms, during which he was president of the District and County Attorneys' Association of Texas.

He was elected to Congress in 1912, and came to Washington in March 1913. He served through succeeding Congresses until January 1947.

Chairman Sumners was recognized as one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers of the Nation. He achieved great distinction in the House of Representatives, and he lived out that distinction to the end.

He was beloved by the people of Texas. After his retirement from Congress, he lived in Lawyers' End, at the Southwestern Legal Institute, on the campus of Southern Methodist University.

He, Mr. President, later today I shall make an appropriate motion.

It is with great regret that we have learned of the passing of Hatton W. Sumners.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of interest in the recommendations of the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee, with regard to political candidates and their use of Government licensed media radio and television stations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of the unanimous report of the subcommittee, as filed with the Commerce Committee.
In dealing with a subject of the public domain known as the broadcast spectrum, the Congress has been confronted with unique and varied problems. No other form of human technology in revolution in communications upon traditional concepts and institutions has been felt in almost every phase of our everyday life.

From the inception of commercial radio broadcasting, Congress has been concerned with the air waves as a vital means of communication, capable of making a major contribution toward an informed public, which is indispensable to the proper functioning of our democratic system. It is to encourage the full realization of these capabilities within our institutional framework of freedom that the Congress has legislated in this field. So, it is in the best American tradition that the Congress, in granting the public franchises for use of the airwaves, has required equal time for the viewpoint of one candidate, equal conditions to the use of that privilege, and that these public franchises be used—serve for the public interest, and the mandate of the "fairness doctrine" that opposing positions must also be presented.

By law and regulation, the broadcast spectrum has been kept free from governmental dictation, on the one hand, and free alike from editorializing by the private licensees, on the other.

Our primary concern has been the use of this technology as a communications link between the public and the people. Section 18 of the Radio Act of 1927, carried forward later as section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, delineated the basic principle: that the only restraint being the obligation to the public interest, and the mandate of the "fairness doctrine" that opposing positions must also be presented. Congress, in section 315, purposed to pre-empt upon the licensees to "devote a reasonable opportunity to hear the views of the opposing political parties." The licensee has been encouraged to edit-orialize, and whilst we do not desire editorializing; however, many licensees are loath to follow through, once the medium is one of opportunity to editorializing for the public interest. We are confident that the networks cooperated to the best of their ability; but, just as some of the speeches of the presidential candidates, themselves, were lost, some news scripts were lost. In part IV of this report, we have printed these newscasts. In attempting to analyze in depth the news in the presidential campaign so presented, it became immediately apparent that all news programs, regardless of the time or area set. In a few cases the scripts of newscasts simply were lost, or misplaced, or unavailable for one reason or another. We are confident that the networks cooperated to the best of their ability; but, just as some of the speeches of the presidential candidates, themselves, were lost, some news scripts were lost.

In part IV of this report, we have printed these newscasts. In attempting to analyze in depth the newscasts in the presidential campaign so presented, it became immediately apparent that all news programs, regardless of the time or area set. In a few cases the scripts of newscasts simply were lost, or misplaced, or unavailable for one reason or another. We are confident that the networks cooperated to the best of their ability; but, just as some of the speeches of the presidential candidates, themselves, were lost, some news scripts were lost.

The preparation of parts I, II, III, and IV of this report would not have been possible without the cooperation and assistance of many people. Acknowledgment must be made to Sam Brightman, Muriel Hart, Mary McCarthy, who were members of the staff; Mrs. Reggie Schuebel, and Maurice Keville, of the Democratic National Committee staff; Elizabeth Fielding, of the Republican National Committee staff; Mrs. Christine Grimley, Office of the Press Secretary, the White House; Dorothy Craft, Vice President Nixon's office; and Ben Franklin, librarian, of the New York Times.

In addition, the subcommittee is appreciative of the work of the following people who helped in obtaining material for the volumes:

John E. Boll, Associated Press.

Jack L. Bell, Associated Press.

F. D. Bunker, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Dr. Clay Cochran, APL-CIO.
Clayde Ellis, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.
Nelson McCormick, Mutual Broadcasting System.
Howard Monderer, National Broadcasting Co.
Morris Novik, radio consultant, New York City.
Mr. and Mrs. Nelson Poynter, Congressional Quarterly.
Ben Stong, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee staff.
In particular, the cooperation and assistance of Dr. Hugh Elsbree, Director of the
Library of Congress, and his staff were invaluable.

Special acknowledgment is made to Aaron Blauer, Laurence Frank, and Joseph Roth, of
the Government Printing Office, and to William Throckmorton, of the subcommittee
staff, who have rendered invaluable assistance in the preparation of this report.

3. NETWORK NEWSCASTS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Insofar as the two major Presidential candidates are concerned, and with regard to
televised network newscasting, the subcommittee has presented in the first four parts of this report the raw material for an analysis of the dissemination of news by networks during the 1960 campaign. Portions of each of the four parts have been set up in chronological order, so that it is a relatively easy matter to read, for any
given day in the Presidential campaign, what both candidates said on that day; and then by observing the way in which the network radio and television newscasters were reporting of what the candidates said. It is in the exercise of editorial judgment of what to report, out of the whole volume of words which seems the imperative of Presidential campaigning, that radio and television newscasters exercise a tremendous power over the formation of public opinion during a Presidential campaign.

It is also fruitful to read the various newscasts on any given day and compare what was considered significant by individual newscasters.

It is possible to follow the development of such 1960 campaign issues as religion, national growth, the prestige of America abroad, the general development of the economy, and the manner in which the candidates handled these issues. In some instances the network newscasters did not include candidacies that were actually under consideration, or that some of the newscasters said. In some instances, network newscasters did not include candidacies that were actually under consideration, or that some of the newscasters said they said.

In most cases, network newscasting was balanced as to time spent on reporting of each of the two major candidates. Quantitatively, at least, the scales were balanced in most cases. Qualitatively, we must simply state our judgment. [Individual members of this subcommittee reserve their personal opinions as to this matter of qualitative coverage.]

In only one instance brought to the subcommittee's attention did a network newscaster's editorializing in favor of one of the two major candidates. (See the broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., November 7, 1960, p. 1156, part IV of this report.) This was a clear abuse of newscast time, there can be no doubt. The 1960 amendment, modifying the equal-time provisions of the act, does not apply to network newscasts, either in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance, and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance.

The report on editorializing, adopted by the FCC on September 14, 1969, should now be re­adopted by the FCC—and codified either by reference or incorporation—as a rule, a violation of which would cause for revocation of a station's license.

At no time in our Nation's history has it been so important that the public be informed of ideas. The Federal Communications Commission has today, in its role as the protector of the public interest, the public's right to know, and the public's desire for the intelligent collective judgment, which is the genius of our democratic processes.

Licensees should editorialize. Strong convictions are to be encouraged. It is in the spirit of moderation that intellectual integrity is maintained; the licensee who exercise his editorial judgment, to the point of censorship of news of candidates or issues of which he disapproves, should continue to enjoy the privilege of a public franchise.

After considering the many complaints received by the subcommittee during the period from September, October, and November, 1960, the most representative were selected for publication in Part IV of this report, held on March 27, 28, and 29, 1961. These hearings, with extensive exhibits in the appendixes, are printed in full at page V of this report.

It is from these hearings, and a consideration of the other complaints and information received by the subcommittee, that the following recommendations are derived:

I. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Section 312(a) of the Communications Act provides that the FCC may revoke any station license "(4) for wilful or repeated violation of * * * any rule or regulation of the Commission."

2. Licensees may not arbitrarily set an upper limit on the amount of editorializing prior to an election, should be able to order and pay in advance, at the going rate charged by interested parties.

3. Licensees may not, after a licensee editorializes on behalf of or against a candidate or party, the script of the broadcast, if on radio, or a film or tape, if on television, should be required to keep on file and available for inspection by interested parties for a reasonable period of time, not less than 1 week.

4. Advance notice that an editorial is to be broadcast should be given to the candidate or candidates or political party against whom the editorial is directed.

5. Equal opportunity to use the station's facilities to present a fair and impartial presentation by interested parties.

6. Licensee promotion of an editorial, spot announcements, and other advertising should be equal to that being used for editorializing.

7. Where a licensee editorializes on behalf of a slate of candidates in one time segment (say, 5 minutes) but the time spent on any one candidate is minimal—a few seconds for the mentioning of his name—the opposing candidate or candidates should in fairness be allowed sufficient time for his representative to present adequately the opposing position (say, 1½ minutes)?

II. LICENSEE EDITORIALIZING ON BEHALF OF A POLITICAL CANDIDATE OR A POLITICAL PARTY

Licensee editorializing on behalf of a political candidate or a political party is subject to some ground rules. The Federal Communications Commission should consider a series of measures to develop the rules such that it may be observed or monitored.

3. Equal opportunity to use the station's facilities to present a fair and impartial presentation by interested parties.

1. Licensee editorializing on behalf of or against a candidate or party, the script of the broadcast, if on radio, or a film or tape, if on television, should be required to keep on file and available for inspection by interested parties for a reasonable period of time, not less than 1 week.

2. Advance notice that an editorial is to be broadcast should be given to the candidate or candidates or political party against whom the editorial is directed.

3. Licensee promotion of an editorial, spot announcements, and other advertising should be equal to that being used for editorializing.

4. Where a licensee editorializes on behalf of a slate of candidates in one time segment (say, 5 minutes) but the time spent on any one candidate is minimal—a few seconds for the mentioning of his name—the opposing candidate or candidates should in fairness be allowed sufficient time for his representative to present adequately the opposing position (say, 1½ minutes)?

III. THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Federal Communications Commission should modify the rule or regulation under which licensees may require the advance notice and the time spent on any one candidate is minimal—a few seconds for the mentioning of his name—the opposing candidate or candidates should in fairness be allowed sufficient time for his representative to present adequately the opposing position (say, 1½ minutes)?

The Federal Communications Commission should prescribe appropriate rules and regulations under section 315 covering the use of the equal-time privilege by legally qualified candidates for public office.

1. That licensees who determine in advance of a political campaign that time will be made available to any candidate, regardless of particular race may not change said determination without the acquiescence of all candidates.

2. That licensees may not arbitrarily set a cutoff date for the sale of political time prior to an election.
The Federal Communications Commission should study in depth the use of broadcast time for discussion of controversial issues. Some guidelines should be established for the licensee to follow in presenting both sides of such issues:

1. The licensee should be required to set in motion procedures to make available, at the opposing viewpoint prior to the presentation of the original editorial discussion, rather than awaiting complaints, by the opposing viewpoint and offer to anyone wishing to take issue. Every effort should be made for balanced programming in order that the public could be informed at the time of the editorializing that the opposing view will be heard at a given time.

2. The Federal Communications Commission should determine whether the licensee can require a commercial advertiser, who buys time for the presentation of an advertisement, the use and timing thereof is a matter for the licensees to act in the public interest.

VIII

It is the subcommittee's opinion that considerable changes be made in the provisions of section 315 of the Communications Act along the lines of the presidential and vice presidential candidate exemption of 1960 is premature at this time, but recommends a review of this matter early in the next (the 86th) Congress.

Various suggestions have been put forth that section 315 should be permanently modified so that not only the presidential and vice presidential candidates be excluded from the coverage of the statute, but that candidates for the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, State Governors, and perhaps other candidates, be likewise exempted.

In a majority of the U.S. congressional and senatorial campaigns and State gubernatorial campaigns, there will be only two legally qualified candidates in the general election who could, under the provisions of section 315, make time available for a series of debates or public appearances of the candidates. We would be better advised to wait until the elections of 1962 have been held and to consider the making time available in those cases where only two candidates are involved before considering permanent legislation of this type.

The drive for suspension of section 315 permanently has some curious overtones. There seems to be a feeling on the part of some proponents of this type of legislation that those who are eminently qualified in the field of entertainment are better able to judge the forms and content of political programs designed to enlighten the public than the candidates themselves. Those who make this argument forget that the program does not stop there. Should the public be given an opportunity to assess the candidates for the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, State Governors, and perhaps other candidates, be likewise exempted.

The physical handling of such complaints—in the mailroom—at the first point by the Federal Communications Commission can also be organized and staffed so that the action to ascertain all necessary facts on a given complaint begins within 24 hours of receipt of same by the Commission.

Licensees likewise should be advised by the Commission that receipt by the licensee of a complaint from the FCC regarding a violation of the Fairness Doctrine is not an indication of FCC disapproval of the program or of the licensee's conduct. The Commission will maintain an open mind and consider the evidence presented by the party alleging a violation of the Fairness Doctrine before acting. The Commission will consider whether or not the licensee is in compliance with the Fairness Doctrine and the general public interest.

The Federal Communications Commission should consider the establishment of a hearing function under competent examiners for the immediate taking of testimony in the field when necessary to determine a receipt by the Commission within the time stated. In case of arbitrary delay and refusal to answer within a stated time, the Commission should call an immediate hearing.

The Federal Communications Commission should consider the establishment of a hearing function under competent examiners for the immediate taking of testimony in the field when necessary to determine a receipt by the Commission within the time stated. In case of arbitrary delay and refusal to answer within a stated time, the Commission should call an immediate hearing.

The Federal Communications Commission should consider the establishment of a hearing function under competent examiners for the immediate taking of testimony in the field when necessary to determine a receipt by the Commission within the time stated. In case of arbitrary delay and refusal to answer within a stated time, the Commission should call an immediate hearing.
Mr. YARBOURGH. Mr. President, a noted historian of my State recently delivered to the Public Relations Society of America the initial lecture of that oration, delivered to the Public Relations Society of America, at Houston, Tex., on November 13, 1961.

Dr. Vandiver is a remarkable scholar. He was awarded a Ph. D. degree from the University of Texas without having obtained a bachelor's degree. He did the work for a bachelor's degree before he was 16. He was such a brilliant scholar that he had earned his Ph. D. at an age when most men are seeking their bachelor's degree.

The address is a most informative account of the efforts of the rival Presidents to mobilize public opinion in the segments of the Nation of which they had control through their armies; and he points out that Abraham Lincoln won the battle of public opinion before he won on the battlefield. The address was delivered before the conference of the Public Relations Society of America, at the Shamrock-Hilton Hotel, in Houston, Texas, Saturday, April 19, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the address by Dr. Vandiver, entitled "The First Civil War: 1861-65."

Strange as it may seem, the no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FIRST PUBLIC WAR—1861-65

(By Frank E. Vandiver)

Strange as it may seem, the no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FIRST PUBLIC WAR—1861-65

(By Frank E. Vandiver)

Strange as it may seem, the no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FIRST PUBLIC WAR—1861-65

(By Frank E. Vandiver)
New nation, and hopes were high for liberty and safety. Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, the Confederacy's Chief Executive, had the requisite aspirations for southern nationalism, but never had he camped with fire-eating secessionists—he was a moderate, and so his administration. Although he had fought for the States Rights, he soon saw the need for a strong government and became a Confederate nationalist. As such, he strove for aims remarkably like those beguiling the President of the United States.

In working to perfect a cause, make a government and win a war, Davis and Abraham Lincoln were the central figures of the years 1861-65. Each had no doubt to his dual ideas of democracy, each typified his Nation to a large degree and each had an image of his country's destiny and fought to forge that destiny with every tool available. Forming government is, after all, largely an executive function. And it was especially so in 1861, for never before had Americans faced efforts so prodigious, war so total. No previous experience offered guidance, no career of postrevolutionary planning or fame, no precedents to his. But in the process of democracy, Davis faced civil war, consequently the possibility of defection and blurred patterns of loyalty. Davis, after a long period of building a nation while constructing a war effort.

It is not surprising then, that the Civil War became largely a war of opinion, a war to win people's approval, a truly public war. Victory might well go to the people who responded first and with the fullest national effort.

Even a cursory glance at statistics showed that the South, in terms of a chance in a lost votary, France with its levee en masse. For the French had faced outsiders, could count on the help of the King of England, and faced civil war, consequently the possibility of defection and blurred patterns of loyalty. Davis, on the other hand, could only hope to build a nation while constructing a war effort.

Davis, more of a realist than most others, feared the horrors of defeat and finally advocated emancipation, the executive effort. In the end, what Davis fought to sustain was State rights; none accepted methods of public appeal. Often but never had he camped with fire-eating secessionists—he was a moderate, and so his speeches to Congress, his public papers, powerful because they were close to the mighty, soon showed the contempt of familiarity and several became vitriolic voices of opposition.

Many other papers in the Confederacy followed suit, especially when the President sponsored such un-Confederate measures as construction of fortifications, private property, mild regulation of private industry and public transportation, and the use of the African race turned against the Government Davis fell back on more speeches himself and on requests to their fellow citizens. He sought, too, approval from the pulpit—a standard method of reaching large segments of the populace. Southern clergymen, most of them, proved staunch rebels; paeans of patriotism rose each Sunday, and countless sermons to civilians and soldiers alike. The Government and called down the wrath of the Old Testament's Jehovah on barbarous, un-Christian Yankees.

Southern Governors were not nearly as helpful as southern ministers. After all, one of the things many southerners felt they fought to sustain was State rights; none thought so more fervently than Gov. Joseph E. Brown of Georgia—a larger Confederate milestone. Often at odds with Davis, often in direct conflict with Confederate war policies, State-Righter Brown did much to wreck the southern effort. But even Brown could be fired to nationalism by an occasional Presidential plea. Following Lee's Appomattox and to history, Davis—president on the run—made his most eloquent appeal to Davis on the field. He spoke, too, of the future. "Animated by the desire of the people, which is the spring and fountain of the public authority, in which no voice has been denied," the President is reported to have said, "the Government has, on the national front, in the interest of the people, pursued the policy of neutrality. On the home front, the Constitution of the Confederate States, which disqualified the Government from entering into the conflict, the Constitution of the Confederate States, which disqualified the Government from entering into the conflict, has been preserved."
Lincoln faced similar problems in public relations himself. When the Southern States began to leave the Union the North reasoned in New England, and the Middle West voiced the belief that the South at last had gone its way. Others felt secession to be illegal but felt secession to be inevitable. Some, like Thoreau, thought the preservation of the Union at any cost. How could these discordant elements be welded into a united force? It could not be done. By turning it out, by reminding northerners of a common dream—the dream of equality and freedom, the dream of a community of all men, the dream of abolition—it made it the buckler of the Union.

Means and measures available to Lincoln were not very different from those used in the South: speeches, textbooks, newspapers—even Greeley's antiblackist New York Tribune. Lincoln had to rely on the same media for public information as did Davis, but he had a few significant advantages.

The northern people had long been addicted to private associations as a means of getting things done; the craze for joining hill clubs had been beautifully developed. The South. And as a consequence, such voluntary organizations as the Union League and the Lincoln League became important adjuncts of the northern war effort. Private funds and private zeal made the league one of the most successful moral bureaus of the week. Army chaplains went with the troops, ministered to their comforts, offered small luxuries midst the crudities of camp. And always these could provide rations of propaganda in the form of articles, books, poems, and speeches.

The Loyal Publication Society, founded in New York City, was especially energetic in distributing patriotic reading matter. It raised over $40,000 by subscription, published pamphlets, and distributed 900,000 documents. Associations of this sort were not officially recognized nor under Government direction, but they had wide influence, and did much more useful service than disorganized southern citizens.

Like Davis, Lincoln also appreciated the importance of winning Europe's favor. Early in the war he dispatched a propaganda mission to France and England charged with presenting the North in favorable guise. The main task of this commission turned out to be constant efforts at countering Hoezer's Indiscretions.

But Lincoln's greatest asset was himself. True, some northern Governors emulated southern methods of adding to the official list in summoning heroics by the pen, but their activities were insignificant in comparison to Lincoln's.

Lincoln had a terrific advantage over Davis in public relations because he had long been a stump-speaking offiIcee, had for years wheeled country voters and coaxed canny politicians, while Davis' honors came by appointment or unopposed election. Experienced as the North's leader had to be in talking to people, how to engage their help, win their confidence, use their talents, accept their opposition Counseling of his humble profession, Lincoln felt his way through the nort hern mind. When the North was uncertain and thinking, wavering, he repeated, as Sumter and about the cause, Lincoln waited, selected the moment, and moved in to explain what the war was about, to mold the will, to hold the attention. He opened the period with the first inaugural, March 4, 1861. "I hold, in that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Union under which the United States is perpetual ..." It follows from these views that no State, upon its own mere motion, can extricate itself out of the Union ... and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, in the course of any controversy arising between two or more of States is treasonous."

After thus explaining his political philosophy, he moved to the issue of the moment, the one that then and later seemed the cause of all the trouble: "One section of our country be­ came, and ever since has been, dissatisfied. They would be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute." The last part of this sentence, amended in parenthesis as an example of Lincolnian prose at its best; and is also superb propaganda. "In your hands, fellow-countrymen, and fellow-citizens, the destiny of a great and glorious Union, in your hands, fellow-countrymen, the redemption of a common cause, in your hands, fellow-countrymen, the vindication of a sacred trust, in your hands, fellow-countrymen, the solution of a difficult question, in your hands, fellow-countrymen, the preservation of a sacred government."}

A member of Congress once asked the President how he reconciled his actions with his own personal convictions. "Oh, sir," replied Lincoln, "I am a perfect slave in this matter."

"But Mr. President," the member of Congress said, "you are not a slave in all things?"

"Oh, sir," replied Lincoln, "I am a perfect slave in this matter."

"But Mr. President," the member of Congress said, "you are not a slave in all things?"

"Oh, sir," replied Lincoln, "I am a perfect slave in this matter."
cotton and other agricultural commodities and (2) storage programs for grains and other agricultural commodities, with a view to determining in the case of each such program the manner in which officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture have discharged their duties and obligations in dealing with persons affected by or related to the programs.

The request for this investigation was particularly pointed at the financial transactions which had taken place between certain organizations, the Department of Agriculture and Mr. Billie Sol Estes, of Texas, and the allegation that numerous high officials in the Department of Agriculture had been the beneficiaries of his benevolence.

Mr. Estes is alleged to have improperly, if not illegally, obtained substantial allotments for cotton acreage, in addition to having a multi-million-dollar grain storage operation with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In this connection, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the following three very significant articles, the first of which appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 16, 1962, in which is outlined the manner in which two employees lined up farmers with displaced cotton acreage allotments, in violation of the law. These employees were suspended for 2 weeks, and then were put back on the payroll.

The next two articles, the first of which appeared in the Kansas City Star of April 15, and the second of which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 17, 1962, in which are outlined the manner in which certain high-placed officials were allegedly involved in the manipulations of Mr. Billie Sol Estes.

I ask unanimous consent that these three articles be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of Apr. 16, 1962]

TWO AGRICULTURAL AIDS SUSPENDED IN DEALS

The Agriculture Department confirmed today that two of its employees in Oklahoma were suspended and reprimanded last year for accepting commissions in connection with the transfer of cotton acreage allotments.

The two were identified to United Press International as Russell Dill, office manager of the Custer County Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service at Clinton, Okla., and Henry E. White, perennia l supervisor.

Mr. Dill received a total of $4,108.75 and Mr. White, $1,875.

Informants said that Fred Chandler, Sr., Fort Stockton, Tex., paid each of the officials $1,785 for lining up farmers with displaced cotton acreage allotments. The sale of such allotments is prohibited by law.

An Agriculture Department spokesman said the two employees were suspended 2 weeks without pay. They were put back on the payroll after they returned the commissions.

[From the Kansas City Star, Apr. 15, 1962]

A POLITICAL STAR DIES—EMERY E. JACOBS

HAS RANDED THE CAPITOL HILL PATHS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BUT A REPORT FROM TEXAS CHANGES THINGS—LINK TO ESTES—THE EMBATTLED TYCOON HAS EVEN HOWN TO DISMISS ONE OF HIS DEPUTIES

(By Jack Williams)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Agriculture, with more than 100,000 on its payroll and spending upward of $5 billion annually, is the biggest troupe of trained politicians in any Federal department.

One of its stars has been Emery E. Jacobs, recently dismissed by the Farm Credit Corporation and Deputy Administrator for State and County Operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

"Will Defend Them"

Jacobs, 245-pound redheaded Oklahoman, has resigned in the midst of charges he was accepting gifts, such as $245 suits from Billie Sol Estes, 37-year-old Texas agriculture tycoon.

Jacobs says he resigned so that he could go to Texas and refute the charges.

Jacobs is a big, friendly man. His friends call him "Billie." Two days around the Capitol are enough to change the political front here from the White House rose garden to table reservations at $100-a-plate Democratic dinners of the New Frontiersmen.

Washington, ever alert for a fresh scandal, is wondering just how much the Agriculture Department is involved in the affairs of the fabulous Billie Sol Estes of Pecos, Tex. The FBI is investigating. A Federal grand jury has indicted Estes on 57 allegations of fraud.

The quietest places in the Capital today were the massive Agriculture Department Buildings near the Potomac. Questions were not being answered.

FBI IS BUSY

After Secretary Freeman accepted the resignation of Jacobs, it was reported at the Department, the FBI was investigating charges that Department employees had accepted gifts from Estes.

Two other employees are understood to be under investigation. One is William A. Morris, 46, $14,380 assistant to the director for Farm Credit, was fired following testimony that he had received gifts from Estes.

Another man then up in questioning at an inquiry into the affairs of Estes by Will Wilson, attorney general of Texas.

They are Dr. James T. Ralph, former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture now in training to become an official Attaché for the Department in the Philippines, and William E. Morris of the Farm Credit Administration.

They have not offered resignations or been suspended pending the investigation.

Jacobs, whose salary in the ASCS was $16,530 a year, is reported to have acted as master of ceremonies at the State ASCS "convention" here about 10 days ago.

There are three ASCS members from each State and all were said to have attended the session here last week. The cost of the taxpayers $75,000 and was to put pressure on Congress to bring out the Kennedy farm act down.

Jacobs is said to have escorted the group to the White House rose garden for a chat with the President, and to show them the farm bill under his name.

Their irregular attendance at the House committee. The politically appointed top State ASCS men then called Members of Congress from their States.

It was revelation of the amazing financial operations of the Agriculture Department and Jacobs into the picture. Secretary Freeman had named Estes to the Cabinet.

Estes bought two tables for President Kennedy's birthday dinner here May 27, 1961. The 20 seats cost $2,000. One of Estes' guests was Senator Ralph Yarbrough, Democrat, of Texas.

Yarbrough, whose name is involved in the testimony at the Texas inquiry, also was listed as a guest at the Estes table.

Again, January 26, at the big inaugural and the paying guests, Estes and his wife were hosts at two tables. YARBOROUGH was present again. Estes is reported to have contributed to the fortification campaigns in Texas and the $100-a-plate expenditures could be counted toward the State campaign contribution totals to the national committee.

Jacobs turned in his resignation 24 hours after the Texas court of inquiry heard testimony about when Jacobs went shopping for $245 suits at the Neiman-Mar cus store in Dallas.

The investigation also is going into the allotment of cotton acreage to Estes for acreage which had been transferred from and which had been taken over for reservoirs and airfields.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 17, 1962]

FIRE AGRICULTURE AID IN FOB OF ESTES LAND DEALS—INVESTIGATE LINKS WITH TEXAS TYCOON

(By Russell Freeburg)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—The Department of Agriculture today fired an employee linked with Billie Sol Estes, Texas farm magnate. The appointment came from the Agriculture Department official resigned in the face of a probe of his dealings with Estes.

Estes, who has said his political empire gone, is under indictment for fraud. His tangled financial dealings are being investigated by a grand jury in Texas.

The case broke wide open last week when Emery Jacobs, the $16,530 a year deputy administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, quit following testimony that he had received gifts from Estes.

[From the Washington Daily News of Apr. 16, 1962]

AN ENRAGED CREDIT OFFICIAL

William A. Morris, 46, $14,380 assistant to the director for Farm Credit, was fired today.

Thomas R. Hughes, executive assistant to Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Freeman, said Morris was dismissed for failure to discuss the case with Department investigators.

Hughes said, two Republican Congressmen introduced resolutions in the House calling for probes of the ASCS. An investigation was conducted by the Senate Agriculture Committee, but Representative Harold Cooley, Democrat, of North Carolina, committee chairman, said he thought that his group will not act at this time.

Introducing the resolutions were Representatives Robert Dole, Republican, of Kansas, and Representative Florence Rydell, Republican, of New Jersey. Dole said the Jacobs incident was the latest in a series which has emboldened the ASC in political controversy during the Kennedy administration.

SELLS MINE STOCK

Morris is a former administrative assistant to Representative H. Carl Anderson, Republican of Minnesota, who also has been linked to Estes in Texas. The career of Anderson said today his dealings with Estes were strictly business. He said he, along with more than 100 other guests at Estes' home during a trip concerned with the sale of stock in a family coal mine. Estes, Anderson said, was involved in the sale.

The case of the allotments on 3,123 acres of Texas cotton land was reported by Agriculture Department officials to have involved more than 100 farmers in Georgia, Alabama, Oklahoma, and Texas. They made contracts to transfer their allotments to lands they were buying from Estes.

Estes would receive Government price support for the cotton grown on the acreage.
EDITORS ON MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a number of New Jersey newspapers have commented on the President's recent transportation message, especially on his recommendations for legislation on urban transportation.

Several editorials have pointed to the apparent paradox between the President's recommendations for less regulation and more responsibility of the private groups operating in the urban transportation field and his proposal for a $500 million, 3-year capital grant program to improve urban mass transportation.

The contracts provided that Esso lease back the land from the farmers for as high as $175 a bale in some cases. Lease payments, however, were small compared with the money from price supports. Besides, the lands would revert to Esso if the farmers missed purchase payments.

It contains so many criticisms of Federal regulation and governmental control that it might easily be mistaken for a discarded Republican campaign proposal.

The President lists two objectives of major concern to New Jersey:

A nationalization system to provide the most efficient and inexpensive connections between the 40 supercities that are growing up within the metropolitan areas.

Vast improvements in mass transportation within the big cities.

To achieve this objective, the President urges sweeping removals of governmental controls that have been accumulating over the past 75 years. And he wants fewer Government undertakings and an emphasis on free competition to improve services and reduce costs.

When the President gets to big cities, the President finds governmental activity less objectionable. He proposes a half-billion dollar crisis and speed co.1.urs toward solving it.

The contracts provided that the lands would revert to Esso if the farmers missed purchase payments.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Apr. 6, 1962]

KENNEDY'S MASTER TRANSIT PROPOSAL

Traffic-strangled cities, which certainly include the New Jersey-New York metropolitan area, are calling for special attention to their difficulties, but even the form and substance of assistance still are remote.

The 10th message to Congress from President Kennedy has committed the administration to sympathetic measures and change, but has left the New Jersey Senators Case and Williams supplementing the White House proposal, otherwise in independent gestures.

The President presented a summary of obvious needs and advocated a $500 million appropriation. Senator Case almost simulaneously pressed his legislative advance coordination of mass transportation and highway systems. An earlier measure in which Senator Case participated called for Federal assistance and would make funds available.

The President’s program looks to continued use of privately owned and operated facilities, to the overhaul of the complex and disputatious rates and variances now permitted, and particularly to measures to reverse the trend of mass movement of people from rapid transit to automobiles.

Thus, while transit continues to serve an essential rush hour and standby need for those unable to use automobiles, and while the urban areas need increased levels of rush hour transit service, in order to help cope with the growing problems of traffic congestion, the private carriers are finding it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to provide it.

The only solution is the injection of public funds, in order to help bridge the gap between the financial abilities of the private carriers and the increasing needs of the urban areas. And as President Kennedy’s message recognizes, the Federal Government has an inescapable responsibility to bear some measure of the financial burden, together with State and local governments and private enterprise.

While some may question Federal aid in one area, I would say that without it, the tendency toward entrapment in urban transportation will become all but inevitable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record several thoughtful editorials that discuss the President’s recommendations.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday Star-Ledger, Apr. 8, 1962]

SIGNIFICANT STEP

One of the most important movements of the New Frontier is President Kennedy’s just-issued message on transportation.
use of public funds and private operation. In fact, I would go so far as to say that if public funds are not soon provided to fill the gap between the financial abilities of the private carrier and the increasingly pressing mass transportation needs of our urban areas, the demise of private transit services in this field is all but inevitable.

In his message to Congress, recommending a program of financial assistance for urban mass transportation, President Kennedy stated:

Although grants and loans would be available only to public agencies, those agencies could lease facilities and equipment or make use of them on a for-profit basis. As a result of assistance under the program, the President asked for a program that would emphasize more competition, and less regulatory control, as long as it can prove safe. A trend got underway in that direction, because the transit operators amounted to the Second Annual Institute of Motor Transportation Management last February be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were in their meeting urban transportation needs, particularly with respect to bus service.

He makes the important point that:

While transit has lost approximately half of its customers over the last decade, the demand for service facilities has not diminished. In order to handle the rush hour traffic, which has either increased or remained constant, the transit operators are required to maintain service at least as many vehicles as were required 10 years ago to transport as many passengers. * */

It is a matter of plain economies that an operator cannot be expected to maintain a large fleet of modern buses to operate only 2 hours of the day.

Yet Mr. Ison goes on to point out what is becoming increasingly clear to more and more people, that this limited rush-hour service is essential because the costs of trying to meet it exclusively with highways and automobiles are tremendously expensive and tremendously damaging to the structure of the city.

He concludes that governments defined in terms of present financial need in transit, and this is the reason for the administration's bill, S. 3126, to aid in this effort. Mr. Ison goes on to say that the public assistance should not be used to operate by shifts of up to three shifts made it possible for a large number of employees to go back as much as possible, to the money to do it with. Whether or not enough money, kept people at home at night, away from the scene, not assist in financing urban transit. They definitely should.

How has urban transit fared under public ownership? Reasonable men have honest differences of opinion on this question. Certainly, the public transit systems in our large cities have made a substantial effort to provide safe and adequate urban transportation, given the money to do it. Whether or not a public authority or public transit operators acted economically is another question. For instance, the annual governmental subsidy of the New York transit authority exceeds $100 million.

A frank discussion of the views in support of rather side of those questions necessarily involves disagreement with the views in support of the other side. My personal view is that private enterprise should be permitted to compete with the public authorities without interference by any regulatory bodies. This is the view of many cities in urban transit, which they received a shocking blow. Even the most optimistic transit operator was discouraged. Higher fares became another deterrent to transit riding.

Public ownership appeared to many to be the answer. A trend got underway in that direction. Public transit authorities started appearing on the scene. Urban transportation in most of our large cities is being performed more and more by transit authorities. Many of the problems facing mass transportation, the President recommended a program of financial assistance for urban mass transportation. The solution sought for should stimulate competition, and less regulatory control, as long as it can prove safe.
The experience of the Atlanta Transit System keynotes the problem being experienced by the transit industry generally stemming directly from the rush hour travel. While the problem is not new to the transit industry, the nature of it has either increased or remained constant, the transit operators are required to maintain those vehicles as were required 10 years ago to transport twice as many passengers, even though many of the transit operators are working on a just-in-time basis anywhere from 2 to 4 hours a day. It is a matter of plain economics that the operators cannot be expected to maintain a large fleet of modern buses to operate only 2 to 4 hours daily. Consequently, many of the buses used in rush hour service are old and outmoded, resulting in many passengers getting a poor impression of transit service in general. Addressing myself for a moment to the situation here in Washington, on the average it requires three buses to perform rush hour service as compared to one bus to perform the base hour service. Consequently, for the same number of passengers the cost of buses is sitting idle on the lots of the transit operators. Base service requires only one vehicle during each hour of the day for urban operators. If the operators in the Washington area were required to maintain a completely new fleet of modern transit buses for the rush hour service, unquestionably the fares would have to be considerably higher than they are at present time. A new modern, air conditioned bus costs something in the neighborhood of $830,000, and based on an annual amortization charge of approximately $65,000. If the buses were put in service they would require an annual amortization expenditure of $650,000 to be paid by the travel- ers. Therefore, it behooves everyone, in a position to act, to resort to every means in order to alleviate the rush hour traffic problems.

Again addressing myself to the Washington area, the Bureau of the Budget has done what I consider an excellent job in the staggering of working hours for Federal employees. The starting hours of Federal Government agencies are spread over 2 hours in the morning and evening rush hours. This, of course, is due to another inescapable fact—that the modern city is wholly organized on the basis of everyone going to work and returning home at approximately the same hours of every working day. It is also obvious that this rush hour situation has intensified greatly since World War II, as a result of the spreading of peak transit riding more evenly over 2 full hours in the morning and evening. Consequently, the Bureau of the Budget, together with several other agencies, is taking a new look at the situation to see if further improvements can be made. The rumble and rumble of the movement of people who come into central Atlanta every day, from one side to the other, and back again, is a poor impression of transit service in general. Thus, it behooves everyone, in a position to act, to resort to every means in order to alleviate the rush hour traffic problems.

Speaking of the rush hour problem, I would like to quote Robert L. Sommerville, president, Atlanta Transit System, discussing the transit problems in Atlanta:

"The metropolitan area of Atlanta has just topped its 2 millionth population, and is showing signs of rapid growth. In fact, of that metropolitan area my company serves a population of 695,000 with 550 transit vehicles, just over 300 trackless trolleys and the balance diesel buses, all the buses being less than 7 years old. We have 1,100 employees, carry upward of 50 million revenue passengers a year and travel 16,000 miles a year to do it. Of all the people who come into central Atlanta every working day, we carry half. And here is one significant thing. We have lost passengers like every other transit system. We carry only half of the people who take transit a decade ago and yet we actually carry about the same number of people in the rush hour that were carried in the rush hour 10 years ago. Again mark that rush hour. It is not so much the key to the future as the immutable fact to which cities have to adjust.

"Now although we have lost passengers, as I say, we have faced the facts of the changing pattern of the city and we have made some practical and significant changes in our vehicles and our operations in the last 6 years. Our route miles have gone up from 483 in the middle of 1954 to 896 today, and the amount of passenger miles handled by the new service is rush hour work. That is when the people want to go so that is when we have to take them."

What it comes to is that whether operation is private or public, mass transportation in our big cities is the business of the entire community. Mass transportation facilities can be operated for profit but they must be in the area just as streets and highways are. There is nothing illogical or even arguable about this. It cannot be regulated and expressways are publicly owned and the users then have to provide the vehicles and pay for the service, so it is for the daily mass rush hour, but for the daily mass rush hour. It is not so much the key to the future as the immutable fact to which cities have to adjust.
from the regulatory bodies of Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, Congress and the State Legislatures of Maryland and Virginia, made several proposals and recommendations with the single purpose of improving transit in the Washington metropolitan area. It is true that, however, that under the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Virginia was not able to coordinate efforts within the Washington metropolitan area to the end that the maximum possibility of the commission is the coordinating of in transit authorities such as bus stop facilities and bus bays to discuss the options of some, the commission has the mere power to approve things, rather than to identify growth into highway plans. Contrary to the opinions of others, the commission must be selected from the regulatory commissions of the respective jurisdictions. In order that the views of local political subdivisions and planning commissions might be expressed to the commission, there was also created by the compact a Traffic and Highway Board, which is composed of the mayors and high officials of the counties and cities encompassed within the metropolitan district. In addition, several of the various planning commissions within the Washington metropolitan district are also represented on the board. The purpose of this advisory board is to make recommendations to the commission with respect to traffic engineering, the selection and use of streets for transit routing and the requirements for transit service throughout the metropolitan district.

What are the advantages of vesting in a single commission the regulatory authority exercised by separate State and Federal commissions? The compact requires that the program must provide for its operation by public enterprise wherever possible. Thus, the traditional myth that public moneys cannot be used to assist private enterprise in solving urban transportation problems has been erased. And it would appear that unless mere lip service is paid the clear intent of Congress in making money available for transit improvements, the advantage of a publicly operated transit will be reversed.

In concluding my remarks, I would like to summarize the problems and outlook in urban passenger transportation, the subject of my discussion. First, true to the basic traditions upon which this country has been able to prove its greatness, urban transportation was performed by free enterprise. Following World War II, a series of events and circumstances collaborated in a strange way to deal the free enterprise era in urban transportation a severe blow. Many of these events and circumstances can be attributed directly to either action or inaction of governmental authorities. Taxes and the possibility of Soviet jet bombers and ballistic missile bases being made available to them. I also asked the distinguished Secretary to establish a policy for the State Department to keep the American public continually advised and informed as to this situation.

On March 2 I received a call from Mr. Barrett, of the State Department, advising me that within a matter of 2 weeks I would have the information and answer to my request. On March 7 a release was circulated among Members of Congress from the Department of State with reference to many of their activities, a portion of which was devoted to congressional correspondence, in which they stated that there was a stepped-up drive to insure replies of a prompt, responsive, and accurate nature.

As of that date I still had no reply to my letter of February 6. On March 27 the Department of State issued to the press an extensive release with reference to the military arms buildup in Cuba. On April 13 I finally received a letter from the State Department in answer to my original inquiry of February 6. Attached to it was a copy of the Department's press release of March 27. My purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of this body this morning is to prevent this from happening to others of my colleagues, and in the hope that the State Department will adopt in fact a policy of keeping the American public informed.

In closing this statement, it is my hope that this information, which is complete and full statement of the situation as it exists. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the Secretary of State and the letter I received, together with the Department's release, be printed in the Record.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

The Honorable MAURICE J. MURPHY, Jr.,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: I refer to your letter of February 6, 1962, about the arms buildup in Cuba which I sent to you in conversation with Mr. Barrett of the Department's Office of Cuban Affairs.

The Communist military aid has turned the Cuban military department into one of the most formidable in Latin America. We are informed by the appropriate Government agencies, including the State Department, that there is no evidence the Soviet Union has supplied Cuba with missiles or that missile bases are

COMMUNIST MILITARY AID TO CUBA.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the State Department has been the subject of considerable discussion within and without this Government. I wish to call attention to an incident that happened to me personally. On February 6, following a statement circulated in a newspaper, I sent a letter to the distinguished Secretary of State requesting that the State Department make available to the American public the information with reference to the possible landing of Soviet missiles in Cuba and the possibility of Soviet jet bombers and ballistic missile bases being made available to them. I also asked the distinguished Secretary to establish a policy for the State Department to keep the American public continually advised and informed as to this situation.

On March 2 I received a call from Mr. Barrett, of the State Department, advising me that within a matter of 2 weeks I would have the information and answer to my request. On March 7 a release was circulated among Members of Congress from the Department of State with reference to many of their activities, a portion of which was devoted to congressional correspondence, in which they stated that there was a stepped-up drive to insure replies of a prompt, responsive, and accurate nature.

As of that date I still had no reply to my letter of February 6.

On March 27 the Department of State issued to the press an extensive release with reference to the military arms buildup in Cuba. On April 13 I finally received a letter from the State Department in answer to my original inquiry of February 6. Attached to it was a copy of the Department's press release of March 27. My purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of this body this morning is to prevent this from happening to others of my colleagues, and in the hope that the State Department will adopt in fact a policy of keeping the American public informed.

In closing this statement, it is my hope that this information, which is complete and full statement of the situation as it exists. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the Secretary of State and the letter I received, together with the Department's release, be printed in the Record.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

The Honorable MAURICE J. MURPHY, Jr.,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: I refer to your letter of February 6, 1962, about the arms buildup in Cuba which I sent to you in conversation with Mr. Barrett of the Department's Office of Cuban Affairs.

The Communist military aid has turned the Cuban military department into one of the most formidable in Latin America. We are informed by the appropriate Government agencies, including the State Department, that there is no evidence the Soviet Union has supplied Cuba with missiles or that missile bases are

COMMUNIST MILITARY AID TO CUBA.
under construction in Cuba, and no Soviet bombers are known to have been delivered to Cuba.

Under construction in Cuba. No Soviet bombers are known to have been delivered to Cuba.

On January 5, 1962, during a military parade celebrating the third anniversary of the revolution held by the present regime, Cuba announced an impressive display of military equipment. This display is indicative of deliveries up to that time. Units equipped with medium and heavy tanks, assault guns, truck-mounted rocket launchers, and modern armaments, such as mortars, as well as rifles and machineguns, were featured prominently. A fly-by of MIG-19 jet planes, including the high-performance MIG-19, was one of the highlights of the air display.

The capabilities of the Cuban ground forces have increased steadily since the introduction of bloc equipment and training in the autumn of 1960. The ground forces are estimated to number some 300,000. All units are equipped with bloc small arms and many have bloc equipment as well. bloc military aid is strongly reflected in Cuba's ground forces organization which resembles that of the bloc. The bloc has supplied Cuba with MIG jet fighters, helicopters, transports, and trains. Extensive military training has been provided both in Cuba and abroad. Communist military aid has turned the Cuban military establishment into one of the most formidable in Latin America. The bloc has helped build a military capability hitherto not present in any of the Latin American countries of the Caribbean area. However, there is no evidence that the Soviet Union has supplied Cuba with missiles, or that missile bases are under construction in Cuba.

The Soviet Union at first moved cautiously in responding to Cuban requests for military assistance. Once underway, however, the Cuban buildup proceeded swiftly. The bloc's military aid program in Cuba has been concerned primarily with training, assimilating new equipment, and expanding the Cuban military establishment along bloc organizational lines.

SCOPE OF BLOC MILITARY AID

From late 1959 until the late summer of 1961, bloc arms deliveries were initiated by the Cuban Government as early as 1959, but no firm military aid pacts were concluded until the summer of 1960. During 1960 and early 1961, bloc purchasing missions traveled frequently to Cuba.

Type of equipment: Estimated quantity

MIG jet fighters

Medium and heavy tanks

Wz-50-75

Field artillery

Antiaircraft artillery

Mortars

Small arms

Patrol vessels

Motor torpedoes

FEBRUARY 6, 1962.

The Honorable David Dubinsky, Secretary of State, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I understand that certain information concerning the arms buildup in Cuba has recently been declassified by the State and Defense Departments. This information indicates that Castro has built up the "most formidable military establishment" ever seen in Latin America. It is also my understanding that Castro is now in the process of establishing ballistic missile bases and is stockpiling equipment to develop a long-range model Soviet-built jet bombers. This type of weapon is not needed by the Castro regime for the purpose of maintaining its hold on the Cuban people. To me this would indicate that Castro could engage in aggressive warfare, and this would be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,
FREDDIE G. DUTTON
Assistant Secretary.

Sino-Soviet Bloc Military Aid to Cuba

The following summary on Sino-Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba is issued in response to numerous requests for up-to-date information on this subject.

For about a year and a half the Sino-Soviet bloc has supplied Cuba with large-scale military assistance. Bloc military deliveries for Cuba during 1961 included armaments ranging from small arms, such as M44 rifles, to modern jet fighters. Bloc military aid to Cuba is issued in response to requests by Raul Castro, which probably was the most well-publicized trip to Prague and Moscow in response to Cuban requests for military training, including pilot training, in the bloc. This information indicates that Castro has built up the "most formidable military establishment" ever seen in Latin America.

It is also my understanding that Castro is now in the process of establishing ballistic missile bases and is stockpiling equipment to develop long-range model Soviet-built jet bombers. This type of weapon is not needed by the Castro regime for the purpose of maintaining its hold on the Cuban people. To me this would indicate that Castro could engage in aggressive warfare, and this would be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,
MAURICE J. MORRIS, JR.

MARCH 7, 1962.

Dear Senator: I want you to know of several new services which are being undertaken by members of the Foreign Relations office and which I hope you may find useful.

First, there are new possibilities: A twice-monthly compilation of short items on a variety of foreign policy developments will be prepared by Members of Congress who prepare newsletters to send to their constituents. These reports will be objective and nonpartisan, and will not duplicate regular reports from established services. If you receive these materials, please have your office call Miss Meredith Burch in my office at 242-6851.

Second, briefings for special visitors: Special foreign policy briefings will be initiated this month. Visitors to Washington on request of individual Congressmen. These briefings will be held each Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at 9:30 a.m. They will follow the small early morning tours for congressional guests at the White House, and are being provided for the same general group of visitors. Large groups cannot be accommodated. If you wish to receive these materials, please have your office call Miss Meredith Burch at least 24 hours in advance (code 182, ext. 2663).

Third, radio and television taping: Arrangements are being made for some of the principal State Department officials to be available from time to time for brief television or radio interviews with individual Members of Congress. These sessions will be scheduled so as to complete a maximum number of interviews within a time period making effective use of Department officials. Because of the limited number of Congressmen who avail themselves of this service, we will appreciate your making only limited use of it. If you are interested in scheduling Department officials for radio or television taping in the House or Senate studio, please have your office call Mrs. Mary Russell (code 182, ext. 3277).

When you are on a regular television or radio public affairs programs such as "Meet the Press" or one of the other shows, be sure to be glad to try to provide up-to-date background materials on current foreign policy matters for them. For this purpose you may call Meredith Burch (Code 182, Ext. 5905).

4. Notice of State Department officers in your area: Officials of the Department are making new information available to the press and people in various parts of the country, and we are undertaking to inform the relevant Mem-
bers of Congress when that occurs. Your office may then wish to consider contacting the particular official as to the possibility of other nonpolitical use of his time to provide public information on foreign pol icy matters, if such problems if his travel schedule will permit that.

Congressional correspondence is now the object of a stepped-up drive to assure that the Department's replies are prompt, responsive and courteous. If you have criticism of such correspondence, please let me know or have your office contact the new reviewing officer. Congressional correspondence, Miss Jean Gillespie (Code 182, Ext. 6904).

Telephone inquiries from congressional offices concerning matters that cannot await a letter can often best be handled especially by aides in the office of Mrs. Edith Wasewisk (Code 182, Ext. 4747).

The steps listed above are being taken to encourage better service for Members of Congress and to facilitate better public understanding of U.S. foreign policy objectives. None will require additional personnel. If you ever have suggestions on how we can be of greater assistance to you, I hope you will be sure to let me know.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

LABOR AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this year college debate teams throughout the nation are considering the question, "Should labor organizations be under the jurisdiction of the antitrust legislation?"

There recently came to my attention an excellent statement on this topic by A. J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists of the AFL-CIO.

This will be of interest not only to debate teams, but to all who are interested in the question of labor unions and the role they play in a free and dynamic society. I ask unanimous consent that the recording be printed in the Record, as follows:

LABOR AND ANTITRUST LAWS

By A. J. Hayes

This year most debate teams are arguing that labor organizations should be encouraged under the law as a kind of organization that is necessary to the American system—whether they should be outlawed as "restraints of trade." Recently, I was invited by the Midwest Debate Bureau of Normal, Ill., to answer three questions that students are asking on this subject. This brief contains my answers to those questions. I regret deeply that I could not be here with the hope that they will help debaters and also help to inform others who are interested in avoiding a serious miscarriage of justice.

Should labor organizations be under the jurisdiction of antitrust legislation?

At the outset let it be clearly stated, and fully understood, that labor organizations and business organizations are two entirely different institutions. They are in no way comparable. The purpose of business is to make a profit, while the purpose of unions is to protect workers. Thus, legislation applicable to one is not necessarily applicable to the other.

In the case of antitrust legislation, the purpose is to prohibit "restraints of trade" that threaten economic power because of insufficient price distortions by those possessing a high degree of economic power over the economy. Since workers and their families comprise the overwhelming majority of the public, antitrust legislation would apply to worker organizations would in effect penalize—and reduce—the efforts of the majority to protect themselves against economic exploitation.

Those who support the application of antitrust legislation to labor organizations pretend to see a conflict between the needs of business that sells—the labor organizations and the worker sellers. However, easily identifiable differences between the two make such an equation patently false.

First, commodities can generally be withheld from the market when the price is not satisfactory. Labor, by comparison, is highly "perishable." Any attempt to restrict the supply of the manpower that is the wage is too low results in an immediate and permanent loss to the worker.

Second, commodities can easily be transferred from an unfavorable to a favorable market. Labor, on the other hand, is relatively immobile, being rooted in a particular locality not only by such ties as family, friendship, kinship, familiarity with the surroundings, but by lack of knowledge of employment opportunities elsewhere.

Third, business commodities are vastly more varied and numerous than are employees of labor. In fact, in recent years a trend of corporate mergers and absorptions has concentrated the control of production and jobs into fewer and fewer hands. At the present time, for example, more than one-half of America's productive capacity—and more than two-thirds of its industrial profits—are accounted for by only 150 of its largest corporations.

Fourth, owners of commodities, corporate and otherwise, normally have financial resources in the form of property and inventory that workers do not have.

Because of these significant differences, there can be no valid comparison between labor organizations and business organizations. As Congressman Emanuel Celler has so cogently summed it up, unions cannot be compared to business monopolies because they "do not have the control over the labor of their members that is enjoyed by owners over the goods they sell. No more than their individual members can unions store or ship that labor. Nor are they in a position to divert the supply of it. This imperfect control, compared to the control exercised by sellers over their goods, sharply limits the power of unions. They are not, of course, engaged in the production of labor, in which case it would be a perishable, variable, and relatively immobile product."

Thus, a "conspiracy in restraint of trade" that must be applied to any legislation aimed at reducing the role and effectiveness of unions in our economic system: would it enhance or reduce the public welfare?

In part, the answer can be found by referring to earlier years in this century when unions were weak and workers competed without union protections in the job market. The church affiliation and sweatshops, the exploitation of women, child labor, the 12-hour day, company towns, the Appalachian industrial accident rate, and a generally depressed standard of living for the working people of America.

However, the widespread results that could logically be expected, since pure competition between workers would normally be expressed, would not be able to set the lowest value on labor.

There is little reason to suppose that in the absence of antitrust legislation the results such as these would not be repeated today.

And if they were repeated, would the public interest be served?

Are low wages and their corollary, low purchasing power in the work force, beneficial in a society where capacity to produce already threatens to outrun effective ability to consume?

Can low wages and depressed conditions in the work force provide a base of prosperity for merchants, teachers, farm­ ers, or for industry itself?

Can America meet the challenge of rapid economic expansion if it is faced with a depressed, "low wage" economy?

The answers are evident. Even the Taft-Hartley Act recognizes that without effective unions there can be no effective bargaining between employers and workers. And, without collective bargaining and effective working conditions must inevitably sink to the level set by the most ruthless employer, and the human wage will become a political issue.

Since the purpose of antitrust legislation is to prevent undesirable monopolies it must be noted that this purpose would be directly contravened by application of antitrust principles to unions. For it is only through unions that workers have achieved a measure of control over the conditions under which they labor. And if unions were destroyed, through misapplication of the antitrust principle, this control would pass to the employer. In effect this would reestablish, under the exclusive control of self-interested employers, the complete monopoly of jobs and job conditions.

It is probable that the severance of long­sought legal bargaining powers would initially lead to chaos in labor-management relationships. A corporation with 10 separate plants would have to bargain with a union for one agreement covering all, but with 10 fragments for 10 different agreements.

However, the unexpressed purpose of those who seek to treat unions as a "conspiracy in restraint of trade" to achieve industrial peace by transferring to employers absolute power in the work place. And undoubtedly, this kind of peace they would eventually achieve. For it is obvious that large corporations would have little difficulty disposing of the labor movement once it was fragmented into tens of thousands of isolated parts.

And once management possessed complete and absolute power it could safely ignore any demand by workers for a greater share of their own rising productivity. And, of course, the result—absolute power on the part of labor—would be economic stagnation.

In a society as highly industrialized and integrated as America's, the employer without regulation of business and industry, would be necessary. In the end, free collective bargaining between workers and employers would be supplanted by complete Government regulation of the employ­er-employee relationship.

This necessary enlargement of the Government's role would automatically diminish the prerogatives of management. For, as employers in other countries have found, Government takes the net as a local board regulation and control of wages, hours and working conditions, the next step—to govern the regulation of prices, production, markets and profits—is both short and inevitable.

Finally, it must be noted that the question implies that unions now enjoy a blanket exemption from the anti-trust laws. However, an inspection of the text in fact. The purpose of the anti-trust laws is to prohibit a "conspiracy in restraint of trade." And the anti-trust law, in fact, specifically declares that unions per se are not a conspiracy, this does not mean that there are exemptions for any union when they engage in activities (in concert with employers) that do, in fact, constitute a restraint of trade.
Any attempt to compare the so-called power of organized labor with the all-pervading influence of big business in the economic life of the community is bound to fail, even under rational examination of the evidence.

Although organized labor directly represents the interests of workers and seeks to advance the economic, social, and political welfare of all workingmen's families, its effectiveness is seriously impaired by the control that businessmen exert over the Nation's press, television, radio, magazines, advertising, and the whole apparatus of public information and understanding. One result of this control is, of course, that political candidates can ride the waves of public opinion handpicked by a hostile and unfair press.

A further result is that the wishes and views of big business outweigh those of labor at all levels of government, from local school boards to the Senate of the United States. Accordingly, it is not labor, but the business community that selects the Nation's textbook as well as the Nation's laws. This was dramatically illustrated in the 1961 session of Congress.

Although labor fought, and fought hard for such desperately needed national programs as basic education, medical care for the aged, minimum standards that would protect migrant farm workers against medical exploitation, and special tax exemptions for the very rich, these measures were buried under the disapproval of such influential and politically influential groups as the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Medical Association, the American Farm Bureau, and the oil and gas industry.

Similarly, in most State legislatures, years of effort by organized labor have failed to achieve basic and long-overdue reforms in antiquated workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and factory inspection laws.

In looking at the myth of "labor's power" it is also necessary to consider that not a single union in the country has assets that compare with those of the large corporations that dominate the economy.

The resources of the United Auto Workers, for example, are microscopic as compared to those of the steel companies or the rubber industry. The total assets of the United Steel Workers, after a quarter of a century of the virtual fractionation of its net profits of any of the major steel producers. The reserves of the Machinists Union, for example, are in the hundreds of millions of dollars, building, amount to less than $25 a member. And so it is in industry after industry.

As a result of Industry's financial and political advantage—and despite the distortions of the press—industrial democracy is far from being realized in the United States today. In the 1960s, as in the 1930s, organizers are still being beaten by company inspired police or company hired thugs.

Workers who exercise their rights supposedly guaranteed them by well defined Federal legislation are still subject to economic coercion by employers and by unions. And, as the workers in Henderson, N.C., and Winchester, Va., know well and bitterly, even a long-established union tradition can be crushed by the economic power of an irresponsible employer, especially if that power is supported by court injunctions, impoundment orders, boycotts, widespread newspaper publicity, and the presence of the State militia.

As the campaign to fragment the labor movement under the pretense of anti-trust comes at a time when union strength is waning, the effect is to subvert the bargaining strength of a workers.' union in every industry, to weaken the solid power of a single union in the country. For to do so would be self-destructive.

Moreover, a union's demands must always be related to the strength that management maintains. Wage policy, therefore, must be competitive and profitable. In other words, a union cannot hope to bargain for any improvements without an employer's incentive to remain in business. For to do so would be self-destructive.
It is indeed ironic that while America seeks to show Asians, Africans and others how to build a strong labor movement as a basis for a growing enterprise, its own labor movement at home is constantly threatened and harassed by the threat of legislation, the effects of which are little understood by either those who support it or those who would suffer because of it.

YOUTH CAMPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was extremely pleased to read in the New York Herald Tribune of April 13, 1962, the report on the Gallup poll which indicates that 8 out of 10 people queried felt it would be a good idea to set up youth camps, such as are provided in measures now reported out of both the Senate and House Committees on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to be the principal sponsor of similar legislation in the 86th Congress, which passed the Senate and was bogged down in the House due to the opposition of the Eisenhower administration. I was also privileged to be the principal sponsor of legislation which has been reported out of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to establish a Youth Conservation Corps in all regions of the United States.

The Gallup poll shows an overwhelming number of people in favor of the Youth Conservation Corps in all regions of the country, as well as at the grassroots level, a modern-day and an executive secretary of the Crop Quality Council, Inc., before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

The proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps would set up youth conservation camps for young men between the ages of 16 and 22 for work on needed conservation projects and public lands.

The Gallup poll shows an overwhelming support for the Youth Conservation Corps in all regions of the country, as well as at the grassroots level, a modern-day variant of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The American people in their innate good sense recognize the Youth Conservation Corps as a powerful preventative against juvenile delinquency and a magnificent method of developing character and skills among our young people.

The proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps is legislation which the American people want and which they want now. The American people have responded to this proposal to provide useful work and training for young men who are finding each year a more difficult labor market.

The American people in their innate good sense recognize the Youth Conservation Corps as a powerful preventative against juvenile delinquency and a magnificent method of developing character and skills among our young people.

The proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps is legislation which the American people want and which they want now. The American people have responded to this proposal to provide useful work and training for young men who are finding each year a more difficult labor market.

It is my hope, and that of my distinguished colleagues from Minnesota (Mr. Rus­sell), that the Senate Committee on Appropriations will include in the 1963 USDA appropriations bill an amendment for such a laboratory. It is our further hope that the invaluable resources of the University of Minnesota will be utilized for this purpose by authorizing the construction of such a laboratory in St. Paul directly adjacent to the new $1 million Crop Research Laboratory. This latter new building has been constructed entirely through appropriations by the State of Minne­sota and is a part of the Institute of Agriculture, one of the Divisions of Agronomy, plant pathol­ogy, biochemistry and soil work on problems of crop research.

In recent years, a number of important Federal laboratories have been estab­lished by the U.S. Department of Agriculture a Federal crop quality lab­oratory at the University of Minnesota campus in St. Paul.

The purpose of this laboratory would be to provide for the development of the most modern and comprehensive agricultural research establish­ments in the Nation.

In recent years, a number of important Federal laboratories have been estab­lished by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. For example, the last laboratories to be established in North and South Dakota, re­spectively.
The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of persons in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of the U.S. Coast Guard be agreed to en bloc.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

IMPORTATION OF EGGS FROM POLAND AND ITS THREAT TO THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call attention to another ridiculous situation resulting from one of our foreign aid giveaway programs.

During the past 2 years our Government has shipped to Poland 826,300 metric tons of grain under Public Law 480. Under the terms of this sale the American taxpayers receive practically nothing for this grain, since whatever is charged is paid in the form of Polish currency, which in turn can only be used by the U.S. Government in that country. Dollar sales of grain to Poland in that same period were less than 5 percent of the total.

It is true that under the most of these sales agreements the grain being shipped supposedly was not to be used for the feeding of livestock, but, under a socialistic government which handles all importation of grain for livestock feed as well as that for human consumption, certainly the grain cannot be kept separate.

In any event what is in effect practically a gift of 826,300 metric tons of grain to Poland has the indirect effect of reducing the cost of all grain in that country, whether such grain is used for livestock or for human consumption.

The result has been that Polish poultry farmers for the past 2 years have been able to buy American grain or byproducts from American grain, for the feeding of their livestock, at prices far cheaper than they are able to poultry farmers here in America.

As evidence of the ultimate effect of such a contradictory policy, Poland is now shipping 40,000 cases of shell eggs produced by a Belgian citizen, and that this Canadian importer is in turn selling to a Canadian citizen, and that this Canadian importer has received assurances that both Departments are aware of the results of a continuation or acceleration of the importation of these eggs and they have promised to give this problem their attention.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter dated April 17, 1962, received from Mr. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, confirming these importations and the shipments of this subsidized grain.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of persons in the U.S. Coast Guard be agreed to en bloc.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

IMPORTATION OF EGGS FROM POLAND AND ITS THREAT TO THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call attention to another ridiculous situation resulting from one of our foreign aid giveaway programs.

During the past 2 years our Government has shipped to Poland 826,300 metric tons of grain under Public Law 480. Under the terms of this sale the American taxpayers receive practically nothing for this grain, since whatever is charged is paid in the form of Polish currency, which in turn can only be used by the U.S. Government in that country. Dollar sales of grain to Poland in that same period were less than 5 percent of the total.

It is true that under the most of these sales agreements the grain being shipped supposedly was not to be used for the feeding of livestock, but, under a socialistic government which handles all importation of grain for livestock feed as well as that for human consumption, certainly the grain cannot be kept separate.

In any event what is in effect practically a gift of 826,300 metric tons of grain to Poland has the indirect effect of reducing the cost of all grain in that country, whether such grain is used for livestock or for human consumption.

The result has been that Polish poultry farmers for the past 2 years have been able to buy American grain or byproducts from American grain, for the feeding of their livestock, at prices far cheaper than they are able to poultry farmers here in America.

As evidence of the ultimate effect of such a contradictory policy, Poland is now beginning to ship eggs produced by a Belgian citizen, and that this Canadian importer is in turn selling to a Canadian citizen, and that this Canadian importer has received assurances that both Departments are aware of the results of a continuation or acceleration of the importation of these eggs and they have promised to give this problem their attention.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter dated April 17, 1962, received from Mr. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, confirming these importations and the shipments of this subsidized grain.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of persons in the U.S. Coast Guard be agreed to en bloc.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

IMPORTATION OF EGGS FROM POLAND AND ITS THREAT TO THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call attention to another ridiculous situation resulting from one of our foreign aid giveaway programs.

During the past 2 years our Government has shipped to Poland 826,300 metric tons of grain under Public Law 480. Under the terms of this sale the American taxpayers receive practically nothing for this grain, since whatever is charged is paid in the form of Polish currency, which in turn can only be used by the U.S. Government in that country. Dollar sales of grain to Poland in that same period were less than 5 percent of the total.

It is true that under the most of these sales agreements the grain being shipped supposedly was not to be used for the feeding of livestock, but, under a socialistic government which handles all importation of grain for livestock feed as well as that for human consumption, certainly the grain cannot be kept separate.

In any event what is in effect practically a gift of 826,300 metric tons of grain to Poland has the indirect effect of reducing the cost of all grain in that country, whether such grain is used for livestock or for human consumption.

The result has been that Polish poultry farmers for the past 2 years have been able to buy American grain or byproducts from American grain, for the feeding of their livestock, at prices far cheaper than they are able to poultry farmers here in America.

As evidence of the ultimate effect of such a contradictory policy, Poland is now beginning to ship eggs produced by a Belgian citizen, and that this Canadian importer is in turn selling to a Canadian citizen, and that this Canadian importer has received assurances that both Departments are aware of the results of a continuation or acceleration of the importation of these eggs and they have promised to give this problem their attention.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter dated April 17, 1962, received from Mr. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, confirming these importations and the shipments of this subsidized grain.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of persons in the U.S. Coast Guard be agreed to en bloc.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.
CALIFORNIA SETS PACE IN EDUCATION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, we Californians are proud of our State's leadership in education.

Among the many achievements of the administration of Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown are the steps taken to provide even finer educational opportunities for today's young people and for those who will follow them into the classroom in their turn to come.

One aspect of California's preeminence in the field of education is discussed in an article by Mr. Ron Moskowitz, education editor of the San Francisco Examiner, in the newspaper's April 13 issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

(From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 13, 1963)

WE'RE SETTING PACE--STATE LEADS IN COLLEGES

(By Ron Moskowitz)

Los Angeles County is a wondrous place. You drive for miles and miles through subdivisions without end until you feel almost like "Alice in Suburbia."

And no matter from which direction you head out of Los Angeles' sprawling downtown area, if you drive long enough through this carucature of all suburbs, you will reach a State college. Usually a beautiful State college.

There are now 15 State colleges with 16 campuses. And two more are planned for the Los Angeles area, which already has the majority.

I sometimes wonder if the people of California realize the wonder of it all. State colleges close enough to the people so their sons and daughters can commute from their homes.

Beautiful new college that are attracting better and better faculties.

Last week the State board of education met on one of the newest of the campuses, at San Fernando Valley State College at Northridge. It is only 10 years ago it was a bald spot in a desolate area. Today it is a growing campus—growing in prestige as well as size.

A similar miracle is taking place in its earlier stages just 50 minutes from San Francisco. Today, near Cotati in Sonoma County, 275 students study in temporary quarters. Nearby is a 275-acre plot of land barren except for a few trees.

In about 20 years, that land will be topped with a carefully planned campus of Sonoma State College. Enrollment will have grown to 12,000. The master plan was tentatively approved last week by the board.

Again, I wonder if Californians appreciate the fact that the site was purchased at a reasonable price before the people crowded into the area. The master plan for this campus was carefully developed so building would be designed for the type of program to be offered there; that such far-ahead planning and vision is saving the State millions of tax dollars while providing Californians with better education than many States not afflicted with the growth problems we have here.

At a dinner party the other night, the inevitable question brought you to California. The question made the rounds and a couple in their forties answered:

"We were living in the East, where the good colleges and universities are so crowded that even students of better than average ability are unable to enter."

"It was as if we were our own sons to go to good colleges that brought us to California. We don't have a lot of money."

I wonder if the educated education has brought to California. I wonder how many new industries have been attracted to the west coast because of good educational planning.

I wonder if those businesses and Industries realize that tax dollars are well spent when they are invested in education.

California is setting the pace in the Nation in higher education. I hope Californians realize it.

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE AND THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, farmers in California are deeply concerned about the possible effects of the Trade Expansion bill. They are now taking a long, hard look in an attempt to estimate what new trade restrictions might mean to their livelihood.

They have some considerable reason for concern, because recently announced European Common Market external tariffs fixed for California products at levels higher than the average of duties of member countries. I have specific reference to prunes, fruit juices, and canned pineapple. These new higher-than-average tariffs are disappointing and have brought some disillusionment, not only to prune growers and the others directly affected, but to other producers who speculate that they will be faced with similar treatment in the future.

California leads the Nation in agricultural exports, with more than 200 specialty crops. Our farmers necessarily fear that these specialty crops—many of them grown primarily if not almost entirely in California—may be used as concessions in future negotiations aimed at gaining entry into Common Market markets for other U.S. products. Recognizing that California is something of a "political sitting duck" with only two U.S. Senators and only a limited number of California farmers, the California farmers are anxious about what the Trade Expansion Act might mean to them.

Nevertheless, they have not turned against the bill. Instead, they are suggesting ways in which the bill might be revised to take care of certain specific problems.

One of the best, moderate statements on the subject is that of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The membership of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council represents the major U.S. fresh and processed fruit exporting industries.

The council's objective is to facilitate exports. In recent years it has emphasized the need to obtain competitive access to export markets. The major problem confronting U.S. fruit exporters has been the existence of non-tariff barriers (quotas, prohibitions, licensing, etc.), maintained by Western European countries.

The council wants to protect European markets for U.S. fruit products, which it believes are of the highest quality, but it does not wish to harm the American farmers.

The council has asked Congress to amend the Trade Expansion Act to remove the non-tariff barriers that are currently in place.

One of the major purposes of the Trade Agreement Act of 1954 was to enable the negotiation of favorable tariffs with the European Economic Community. The recently announced European Common Market external tariffs agreed upon at GATT negotiations and the provisional Common Market fruit and vegetable policy are a great disappointment to us.

Tariffs are fixed after taking into consideration the duties of the member countries, this at a time when reductions were supposed to be negotiated under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act of 1954.

We are also concerned from study of the provisional Common Market fruit and vegetable policy, that the EEC countries intend to continue or indeed increase their non-tariff barriers.

We need to know whether the Common external tariffs negotiated with the EEC are capable of being nullified by non-tariff barriers. If they are, it is necessary for this country to obtain firm commitments that this will not be done or else withdraw concessions.

European duties on horticultural items too often have been augmented by non-tariff barriers, and many of the problems were created by either obtain firm commitments that this will not be done or else withdraw concessions.
To do this, the President should take special precautions to insure that existing tariffs or subsequent tariff concessions for the country in question are not revoked by quotas or other import restrictions.

The legislation should provide that whenever the EEC or any foreign country takes actions that impair existing or future tariff concessions granted on these products, equivalent withdrawals will be made by the United States. Similar action should be taken against countries who refuse to remove existing unjustifiable barriers.

The legislation should also prohibit the President from making any future concessions available to any country that has unjustifiably nullified or impaired concessions previously granted to the United States without having made adequate compensation therefor; concessions negotiated in multilateral agreements must be withheld from any such countries.

This recommendation is made because experience has demonstrated that representations on the part of the United States have not succeeded in modifying or removing some of these nontariff barriers, despite GAFTA. We believe their removal can be speeded up if our representations have taken place over the past several years and if we seek relatively few and quantitative or seasonal restrictions on imports of fresh apples and pears in most Western Europe, we should be able to get the grapefruit and processed orange and grapefruit products in the United Kingdom, and on imports of most horticultural products into France. Despite these, little significant progress has been made. Hence, representations alone apparently are not capable of securing removal or even reductions of these barriers.

Another recommendation which is related to the previous one, is that the United States modify its most-favored-nation policy for tariff concessions. We suggest that tariff concessions be available only to those countries who have tariff agreements with the United States or are members of the GATT. We cannot understand why countries who do not reciprocate with the United States should receive the benefit of our tariff concessions.

Mexico is a good case in point. Despite increased imports into the United States from Mexico, of horticultural products, practical restrictions on imports of horticultural items into Mexico are restricted. At times, these exports have been subjected to embargoes almost without notice. We believe that a country which continues to impose such restraints on trade should not be eligible for the benefits of all concessions made under our trade agreements program.

Also, we believe that the most favored nation policy should be modified so that concessions may be withdrawn from individual countries which maintain nontariff barriers. Because representations alone have proved inadequate to secure access to foreign markets, we believe the Congress must insist that withdrawals of concessions be used as a sanction under this end.

We recognize the danger to trade involved in a mutual withdrawal of concessions. Also, we know that retaliatory measures involving occupations of foreign goods, alone generally offer reasonable access to foreign outlets for our products. But lack of progress in the removal of these trade barriers has persuaded us that more than such actions before used are required if we are to continue obtaining reasonable opportunities to export our products.

Although Senator Williams' triumph was complete, this whole business leaves a bad taste in our mouths. We believe it is essential to destroy the essential reason for civil service, which is that it should give the country service of the highest quality.

The highest officers of the administration advised that the law be violated openly, and then the President, his brother, the civil service chairman emerged as principal offenders against the Hatch Act, which prevents those receiving Federal funds shall engage in political activity.

It was a good day's work by the Delaware Senator—one among many for which his fellow citizens should be duly grateful.

**KENTUCKY ARMY RESERVE, 100TH DIVISION**

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by him regarding the mustering back into active duty of the 100th Division, Kentucky Army Reserve, as a part of the program to strengthen our defense capabilities to meet the challenges of peace and our own national security.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

**STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORTON**

Late last summer the deteriorating Berlin situation and the Kremlin's belligerent attitude during this crisis gave the United States little choice but to strengthen our defense capabilities to meet this challenge to world peace and our own national security.

The military establishment turned to the citizen-soldiers of the Reserves, our peace-time militia, to provide the muscle for the buildup of the Armed Forces. The first division to be mustered back into active duty was the 100th Division, a Kentucky Army Reserve outfit whose primary mission is the training of troops.

The Pentagon picked the 100th Division because its record speaks for itself and because of its defense capabilities to meet this challenge to world peace and our own national security.

Since then, thousands of young soldiers have received their indoctrination in the basic skills of infantry warfare at the hands of real professionals. The division's performance at Fort Chaffee has more than justified the judgment of the Pentagon in recalling the 'Century men' for their important and necessary national security assignment.

Recently, it was my great pleasure to visit Fort Chaffee, spend time with my fellow Kentuckians, inspect various facilities, and observe the division in action. Let me say that I was never prouder of Kentuckians. Their record at Fort Chaffee is exemplary of the finest of our citizen-soldier traditions. They have done the job called for and more. They have not only far surpassed the training standards originally projected, but their trainees have shown a remarkable degree of proficiency at the end of basic training.

Recently, it was my great pleasure to visit Fort Chaffee, spend time with my fellow Kentuckians, inspect various facilities, and observe the division in action. Let me say that I was never prouder of Kentuckians. Their record at Fort Chaffee is exemplary of the finest of our citizen-soldier traditions. They have done the job called for and more. They have not only far surpassed the training standards originally projected, but their trainees have shown a remarkable degree of proficiency at the end of basic training.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Kennedy's Lobby Is Turned Back," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 18, 1962. The editorial deals with the successful efforts by the Senate from Delaware [Mr. Williams] to upset the Kennedy administration's plan to convert more than a million Federal Civil Service workers into a huge lobby on behalf of Civil Service concession programs. The plan had the blessing of Chairman John W. Tolan of the Federal Personnel Commission and of the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

Mr. Williams seized his opportunity when the administration presented a half billion dollar appropriation bill. The Senator of­ficially panned the administration's call for restraints on trade should not be eligible for their trade agreements program.

We have received our indoctrination in the military establishment turned to the citizen-soldiers of the Reserves, our peace-time militia, to provide the muscle for the buildup of the Armed Forces. The first division to be mustered back into active duty was the 100th Division, a Kentucky Army Reserve outfit whose primary mission is the training of troops.

Mr. Williams did not need to labor the point that this was a scandalous attempt to convert the whole of the civil service into advocates who could only see one side of any question. President Kennedy himself en­tered the field when he told 175 agricultu­ral stabilization and conservation commit­tee men that, though their activities were not supposed to be circumscribed by custom and law, they were still at liberty to function as lobbyists "acquainting" Members of Con­gress with the administration's views on farm policy.

Before Senator Williams could bring the controversy to a head, he went down the floor to take a telephone call announcing Macy's capitulation. Senator HAYDEN, Democratic chairman of the Appropriations Committee, announced that Macy had withdrawn his ill-advised scheme.
The division, according to procedure, is supposed to have a week's respite between groups and regimental review. It is standard practice now for companies to ship our trainees on Saturday morning and return them to Fort Chaffee by Tuesday morning. We picked up where they left off without a break. When asked if it can handle additional soldier-trainees, the division commander says it can do so if there are capabilities and let you know later. It says, "Sure, we can handle them," and then adjusts its manpower and facilities to handle the additional load without in any way impairing its training efficiency.

I was impressed by an administrative procedure followed by Maj. Gen. Dillman A. Rash meets weekly with the division's top enlisted men, from the peaceful pursuits to the necessary responsibilities entrusted to it as reservists without creating hardship. Many of the Century men and their families have real serious and human problems. They have suffered a reduction in income, or had to give up their homes, or surrender business opportunities, or interrupt their education. They were, of course, anxious to know when they would return to civilian occupations where they might earn a living. Since the announcement of an August release was made, I was interested in communications, in education, in new techniques used during a national emergency. They recognize the continuing seriousness of the crisis which led to their calling up, and they know that these Communist-mastered world technicians are real leaders of the people and nations of the world. America is at war, and the long, desolate years have not been forgotten.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a week-end of great significance to all Christen-
The leading authorities on space, in Government service and in private industry, will present a complete overview of what is being done and where we are going in this exciting new frontier. It will not be a technical meeting of scientists talking to scientists, but instead a forum from which the entire world public can gain a better appreciation of what this new science is doing and where it is going.

"Many of the instruments, equipment, power sources and techniques that we devise to work in space may be adaptable to use on earth," says Mr. Webb, "will be adaptable to other uses. The result will be a great variety of new commercial industries and processes that will raise our standard of living and return tremendous benefits to us in the practical application of this new frontier technology."

Just what is happening in our efforts to conquer space? How will this research benefit mankind? What lies ahead in this exciting new frontier in our history? The presentation will talk about peaceful uses and space.

From my own committee work, I have some knowledge of the eventual global impact of this new science. I predict that someday people throughout the world will have access to visual instruction on how to better their health and the administration of simple health measures and how to increase their food production. I know that the communications satellites, which are but one portion of our civilian space program, can be a most valuable instrument of good will for all mankind.

As many Senators know, the genesis of this conference was in the imaginative thinking and foresight of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma who heads our committee. He has received the support and cooperation of the leading citizens in my State decided that a second meeting should be organized this year and agreed to underscore the importance of this second conference. So far, the cooperation of Mr. Webb, Administrator of NASA, the Seattle sponsoring committee and affiliated organizations has organized an outstanding program.

Vice President Johnson will participate, as will the 10 American space pioneers who have gone over 100,000 feet into space in balloons, X-15's and Mercury capsules. Distinguished national leaders will discuss the impact of space research on everything from industry and labor force, on medical research and development, on youth and in all nations can derive many benefits through space research that are of worldwide importance.

Consider, for instance, the miniature instruments (sensors) attached to our astronauts to gage their physical responses in space-flight via telemetry. These devices measure heartbeats, brain waves, blood pressure, breathing rates, etc. In civilian life, the "electronic nurse" are already being applied to hospital patients so that they can be watched by remote control. The moment a patient's condition changes, it is instantly recorded and a warning flashed. Such telemetry systems are used in the Lafayette General Hospital in New Orleans on patients on operating tables at the North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, and are components of the automated hospital of the future.

Pressed space suits (developed by B. F. Goodrich Co.) are making it possible for bedridden victims of strokes to walk and work. They may restore the necessary tone to the blood vessels so that blood pressure would otherwise be impeded by stresses in space flight, such as acceleration and deceleration. An Illinois farmer, afflicted with a rare disease that adversely affected his heart, and made him an invalid for years, donned space suit trousers and was able not only to walk but to do heavy farming chores. Cases of stroke victims who walked again have been reported in Los Angeles and Santa Monica, Calif.

This spring, an electronically rigged helmet was used during football practice at Northwestern University to obtain data about the effects of shock waves from high-speed receivers by gridiron players. The apparatus, located in the crown of the helmet, resembles those used by our space experts to telemetering critical data back to earth from the astronauts. The research at Northwestern is to determine the standards of performance for football headgear.

Among drugs emanating from our space efforts is one, developed from a missile project, which has been found effective many times from the peaceful application of space technology. The impact of this new science will be felt in our daily lives. It can bring closer together through improved communications. It can help control the weather and the climate around us. We can safely predict that the impact of the space age will have a far-ranging effect within industry and in our labor force, on medical research and development, in practically every profession and activity."

"It was prepared by Edward Gottlieb and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, at this time, a projection of some of the possible uses of space research—already achieved or reasonably attainable in the foreseeable future—has been compiled.

"FOR HEALTH AND HUMAN BETTERMENT Research in aerospace medicine will further worldwide improvements in the diagnosis and treatment of diseases, and in the prolongation of life.
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that LASER may be used for coating in brain surgery as well as in eye tumor removal and retinal welding. (For more on LASER, see page 7096.)

Our astronauts’ flights into space may affect the physical checkups your doctor will give you. Although Dr. John M. Stone, chief of medicine aboard Apollo 7, reported no side effects after his historic flight, Lt. Col. Stanley C. White of the Air Force Medical Corps, who monitored missions of the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo spacecraft, was still far from ready, rather than at rest. 40. Medicine, Dr. White urged, should move toward a “dynamic type of physical” in which the patient is examined and tested while he is in bed, instead of just sitting still while things are done to him. In other words, if you’re a sedentary worker but sometimes run for a bus, you’ll be tested while running on a treadmill, to get a true picture of your health.

**NEW BENEFITS FOR THE CONSUMER**

For the housewife, the homeowner, for all citizens, numerous practical byproducts are emerging from technological and scientific research dealing with space—and more are coming on the market.

Our study of foods best suited for space flights is bound to lead to improved nutrition and the possible growth of synthetic fabrics or new foods could prove invaluable as the world’s population expands and the need for food and clothing mounts.

From its space experimentation with algae, the Boeing Co., of Seattle, has fully developed a process for making flour of high nutritious value from bleached seaweed. The flour, originally developed as a possible space food, has actually been made in making cookies, and it has been offered by Boeing as a low-cost, easily produced earth food.

Other related research has come specific new tools for the food and agriculture industry. Infrared food blanching, for instance, is highly effective in preparing foods for canning and freezing.

The American Machine & Foundry Co., believes that better coffee is in the offing due to a new teflon-coated cloth filter, designed for use in space research where extreme cleanliness is required. The company reports that when the grains of percolated coffee is enhanced when this filter is substituted for ordinary paper or cloth filters.

Improved protective clothing, plastic fabrics and specially ventilated garments developed for our spacemen will affect even the clothes we’ll wear in the not-too-distant future.

For homeowners, there’s a houseplant that never needs watering. Do-it-yourselfers, who like to repair gutters, flashing, utensils, bikes, screens, metal boats, radiators, electrical joints and other items will find multiple uses for the new fluxless aluminum soldering, an outgrowth of missile work. It’s already being sold in hardware stores.

In heating our homes, new cheaper ways of utilizing fuel may come from the work of scientists. By cooling heat sources, scientists are designing heat exchangers in space capsules. Less energy would be needed for heating and cooling if the air and other space vehicles were kept cool and not sterilizing devices developed for satellites.

Nonchattering solenoid valves and other power needs replacement. Do-it-yourselfers for houses and other space vehicles should provide important refinements for household air-conditioning systems.

Your home will be better safeguarded from fire as result of the ultraviolet phototubes developed for space probes by the industrial laboratories of IT & T. These tubes may be miniaturized and built to detect fires of the alarm-type.

The car you drive will reflect the progress of space science. Among the things to come are miniaturized electronic controls for automobiles, capable of maintaining a desired high speed, clamping the car when it is necessary to avoid obstructing it in dangerous situations. The powerplants of tomorrow’s automobiles, as a result of the miniaturized electronic controls, can burn new fuels more efficiently. According to the Aerojet-General Corp., a new brushless generator now in use in various space programs may be used in the automobiles of tomorrow. From space technology will come a system for the automatic changing of road signs as the weather changes.

Tiny batteries designed for space equipment can operate a timing mechanism developed for an Explorer satellite—have been adapted for a wristwatch you can buy now. On the market may be a radio transistor the size of a small tomato. Tracy’s famous two-way wrist radio is not as incredible as it once sounded. A transistor radio of practically the same type is now being marketed. The word is that these “radio transistors” will can operate as long as the sun is shining. It can be used in a shelter with the “solar pack” already available, which can generate power on the roof, and will roll down a cable which also doubles as an antenna.

New battery-powered searchlights can be recharged by plugging them into a household outlet. Research by the General Electric Co. has led to the development of a self-recharging, or “miniaturized” battery now in production. This battery can be recharged simply by plugging it into an electrical outlet. At the moment, the current is produced by carbon batteries, but it is expected that by the end of the year a rechargeable flashlight will be available.

**GLOBAL WEATHER OBSERVATION—AND ITS POTENTIAL**

With our Tiros meteorological satellites, and the upcoming Nimbus and Aeroc space craft, we are heading for a worldwide system of invaluable long-range weather forecasting—with far greater accuracy and for much longer periods in advance. Some day you may know, with more than a sure guess, what the weather will be like weeks or even months ahead.

An important side effect of our space work is that—it operates a timing mechanism developed for an Explorer satellite—have been adapted for a wristwatch you can buy now. On the market may be a radio transistor the size of a small tomato. Tracy’s famous two-way wrist radio is not as incredible as it once sounded. A transistor radio of practically the same type is now being marketed. The word is that these “radio transistors” will can operate as long as the sun is shining. It can be used in a shelter with the “solar pack” already available, which can generate power on the roof, and will roll down a cable which also doubles as an antenna.

New battery-powered searchlights can be recharged by plugging them into a household outlet. Research by the General Electric Co. has led to the development of a self-recharging, or “miniaturized” battery now in production. This battery can be recharged simply by plugging it into an electrical outlet. At the moment, the current is produced by carbon batteries, but it is expected that by the end of the year a rechargeable flashlight will be available.

By taking advantage of long-range forecasts, farmers could plant and harvest during most advantageous periods, decide which crops to plant, prepare for special control of pests. But we’ve never been able to see in detail how these losses and increases are related to our knowledge. How the atmosphere behaves as a heat engine will hopefully be learned through satellite observations of reflected solar radiation and infrared radiation. The possibility of making long-range observation of weather conditions in areas which lack adequate conventional weather stations is one of the possibilities now being explored. How the atmosphere behaves as a heat engine will hopefully be learned through satellite observations of reflected solar radiation and infrared radiation. The possibility of making long-range observation of weather conditions in areas which lack adequate conventional weather stations is one of the possibilities now being explored.

Through such improved observations, our storm-spotting Tiros satellites have already saved farmers millions of dollars a year in property losses, according to a report to Congress by Dr. Francis W. Reifelder, Chief of the U.S. Weather Bureau.

Improved long-range forecasting depends on much more than better observations over areas that had hitherto been neglected. We must also understand more clearly just how the atmosphere operates and get the data necessary to improve routine weather observations. The initial values of our weather satellite systems may be used to determine initial values of our weather satellite systems. The initial values of our weather satellite systems may be used to determine initial values of our weather satellite systems.
to use. They'd get maximum yields and cut down their risks and losses from crop damage. Second, the area covered might be worth many millions of dollars to them, perhaps enough to pay for much of the cost of our space program.

Knowing the weather. Knowing the extent and conditions of our weather systems, and knowing just what progress has our satellites been making?

At present, meteorological observations from the ground and balloons equipped with radios can provide us with only a 20-to-30 percent coverage of weather phenomena, mostly from the Northern Hemisphere and the underside of the atmosphere. Only one-fifth of the globe is covered by any regular observational and weather reporting systems.

The extensive areas are not yet covered and they constitute regions in which storms can be generated and grow without detection before they move into inhabited areas. Now, guided flights can be flown for years by an ingenious satellite system that could photograph the whole panorama of weather, from the search of cold fronts to the birth of storms.

As the House Committee on Science and Astronautics reported: "An improvement of only 10 percent in accuracy could result in savings totaling hundreds of millions of dollars annually in agricultural losses."

Substantial progress has been made in NASA's development of meteorological satellites to provide worldwide observations of atmospheric phenomena and the data men must understand—what's going on in the atmosphere—in order to make accurate predictions.

The first step toward an operational system was made with the launching on April 1, 1960, of the bathtub-shaped Tiros I. Equipped with two TV camera systems, its primary source of power was solar cells which covered its top and sides. Its cameras photographed pictures taken over and near the United States, through tape recorders other pictures were stored that were taken over areas distant to the earth over the poles, the other would picture the whole earth at the cost of one area is obtained at the cost of a damaging storm somewhere else.

Toward this end, our weather satellites and the data they gather may be expected to play a vital role. But there will not be enough. All types of weather observations and many years of research and study will be needed in order to prevent catastrophic side effects, we must learn tremendously more about our atmosphere and the reason why it is today that predictions must first be close to perfection—otherwise we run the danger that good weather in one area is obtained at the cost of a...
The picture-phone is already a reality. The first letter to be processed (one above the Atlantic, a second satellite would have a speed identical to that of the earth's rotation and thus would appear to be in a fixed position in space. Three of these so-called "24-hour" satellites, suitably positioned in space, would span the entire earth. (As noted earlier, a LASER theoretically can carry as much information as our present television channels. (As noted earlier, a LASER has other important uses, as in eye surgery.)

Astronauts, obviously, has received a tremendous impetus from space era advances. They are not alone. automatic pilots, radar systems—all required to meet the high standards demanded by space travel—will have vastly improved over pre-spacecraft. New in the concept stage, new supersonic transports are based partly on the results of our X-15 research planes and other advanced aerospacecraft. These planes, which will have adapted some of the operating elements of space travel, are scheduled to coast an hour, at an altitude of 50,000 feet or more. "Aircraft manufacturers," says J. B. Dempsey of General Dynamics Astronautics, San Diego, Calif., "are already beginning to think about the feasibility and applications of space. In the next few years, improved air traffic, navigation and control devices will already be developed to an extent that will be based in large degree on navigation satellites and radio and inertial guidance systems originally built for missiles."
new plastics will give industry — ‘ightly dur- 
able, unbreakable products for a variety of 
purposes, such as plumbing and many per-
sonal uses.”

The Brookings Institution reports: “The development of new materials, in
ccluding synthetic rubbers and glass, 
composites of synthetics and metals, re-
jects a concentrated effort to meet the 
space program’s demand for nonferrous 
flight. Fabrics to be used must be light in 
weight, high in strength, resistant to tem-
perature extremes, noncorrosive and tolerant 
of rapid acceleration. 

“Reinforced plastics are being considered for increasing size use in missiles and other space devices. Epoxy resins, 
epoxyas, and phenolics reinforced with a 
variety of materials—asbestos, quartz fi-
bres, graphite cloth, glass fibre, etc.—show 
mechanical strengths far exceeding most 
common construction materials. A 
filament-wound glass reinforced epoxy 
resin has been developed with the ultimate 
strength of 130,000 pounds per square inch 
and density of 0.072 pounds per cubic inch, 
giving it a very high strength-weight ratio. 
To perform equally well, steel would have 
to have strength in the neighborhood of 
200,000 pounds per square inch.”

“Various plastics and new metal alloys 
could replace traditional fabricating 
metals, in addition to new materials, they 
prove to be competitive with the costs of 
steel, aluminium and the like. The long life 
of the material would substantially lower 
replacement requirements.”

With spacecraft pushing into strange new 
environments, materials research has been 
forced into new frontiers. “The metals in-
dustry,” says J. R. Dempsey of General 
Dynamics/Astronautics, “is currently under-
going a quiet revolution equal perhaps to 
the development of aluminum. While at first 
only a few aircraft materials were used, 
proven to be competitive, the metals of 
now in 1959 have been developed for 
common use, Mr. Dempsey predicts that 
they “the materials of astronauts may be put 
to work in consumer products such as 
the automobile.”

One example is PSC-Durock, a ceramic 
transistor material produced by Packard 
Bell Electronics of Los Angeles. Originally it 
was created to withstand the extreme heat 
generated by huge transistor units, later 
used as a high temperature and radiation-
resistant coating on inductor sensors em-
ployed in the search for an economically 
way to power for civilian uses.

Daystrom, Inc., a subsidiary of Schlum-
berger, Ltd., developed a metal film precision 
resistor. The carbon film resistor, is used in 
widely varies environmental conditions in space 
exploration. These same precision resistors are now 
commercially in analog computers, im-
proving their overall performance. This 
company feels that its aerospace products 
have potential in communications, weather 
reporting and forecasting, navigation, and 
food processing.

Another new developed a new hydraulic 
fluid for use in rocket launching systems where 
mixtures of regular hydraulic fluid and 
liquid oxygen are used to avoid explosion. This 
new fluid will not burn when exposed to the 
100 percent oxygen atmosphere. It is 
believed that this new hydraulic fluid will find 
much use in the industry.

E. C. Burkhardt, president of Genisco, Inc., 
Los Angeles, believes “the navigation of the 
future is the most vital to the survival of 
mankind as the exploration of the 
Vikings, Columbus, or Cortez was to our time. It 
is the problem of tomorrow.” His company’s 
products, oriented to many phases of the 
space research effort, have civilian applica-
tions. Example: the analog-to-pulse-width 
converter. The dual converter, operating 
and accelerometers for inertial navigation. 

Technical devices being applied outside 
the space effort. The Thiokol Chemical 
Corp., of Bristol, Pa., cites its solid propel-
lant rocket motors which are being used for 
auxiliary power units. Because of their 
transportation applications, auxiliary ob-
jects or supply a vast amount of electrical or 
mechanical energy for short periods of time. Another safety advantage is the high 
velocity of these motors. Furthermore, rocket 
motors for safety brakes to actuate hydraulic systems on runaway trucks or 
trains or to provide a retrobraking 
system.

Space vehicles must first be tested in giant 
vacuum chambers. Besides developing 
roofing techniques for use on space vehicles, the 
Consolidated Vacuum Corp., Rochester, 
N.Y., has been applying its coating tech-
niques, for example for the production of costume jewelry, mirrors, 
glasses, and similar products. Consolidated’s vacuum-coating techniques are also being 
utilized commercially for transistorized TV 
sets, radios, and other transistor products.

Some companies sit astraddle the space-
civilian markets. For example, Texas In-
struments, Dallas, produces a number of 
important devices for space research, including 
the thermionic electronic switches. Yet almost anything developed for this 
area can be adapted to the civilian market 
to the benefit of society. The same is true 
material computers. Conversely, items devel-
oped for the civilian market can also be 
adapted for the space effort.

Collins Radio of Cedar Rapids is another 
in this group. This company has developed 
certain techniques unique in its aerospace 
activities that, with modifications, 
have been applied to the latest commercial 
FM transmitters, which give better FM sys-
tem performance.

In mining of talcinite (very hard rock) 
iron ores, jet drilling—“captives rocket” 
that can make the holes as deep as 700 feet 
blasting charges. Experts estimate that in 
less than 20 year’s we’ll be getting a third of 
that first. 

Telemetry, so important in our space 
vehicles, is being utilized to collect 
information from inaccessible or dangerous 
locations. For example, the Bechtel Con-
struction Corp., building the traffic tunnel 
from San Francisco to Treasure Island, 
planted telemetry units deep in the hill along 
the route. Over a 2-year period, the units 
have monitored seismic and other earth 
movements in conjunction with information 
they must have. The Cater-
pilla Tractor Co., Peoria, III., installed a tele-
monitoring system to monitor rock is actual 
engines to broadcast their oper-
ating temperatures.

The trend toward improved, high-speed, 
lightweight computers has been accelerated 
by space exploration. Naturally, spacecraft 
necessary electronic computers to determine 
the moment of launch, for fixing orbits, naviga-
tion and onboard processing of collected 
data. Because space vehicles are limited in 
size and weight, the giant electronic brain 
will soon be replaced by equipment only 
a small fraction of its present size and cost 
using any other way.

The impact of this development will be 
tremendous on industry, business and the 
economy. For example, the release of 
materials currently being used in space 
computers is destined to become, 
more than ever, an integral part of our work-
ing lives.

The possibilities include an electronic 
computer so small that it will fit into a 
briefcase. Packard Bell’s SE-1000 system, 
the first field-servicable instrumented 
cockpit system built for space vehicle appli-
cation, has already been adapted to sched-
ule railcars for search and regulate 
refinery processes.

Remington Rand reports: “The Nation’s 
space program has resulted in the develop-
ment of the UNIVAC ADD series of space-
borne computers. These computers employ 
the latest in mini-microsanitization tech-
iques and are expected to perform calcula-
tions that were at one time limited to computing systems many times larger.”

Space-related projects at the Ford Mo-
tor Co., Dearborn, Mich., and Aerojet 
Glenoachemical, Mountain View, Calif., 
Beach, Calif., have developed three amazing 
computer projects. One, BLAX, is an ultra-
miniaturized computer, which can perform 10 million computer operations in the 
1time it takes to pronounce its name. In 
addition to satellite installations, the 
computer can be used in computing 
equipment for language translations, library 
searching and decoding. Another com-
puter, MIND, artificially duplicates parts of 
the human nervous system and carries out 
learning processes. A third type, blo-com-
puters, is leading to a new generation of 
computers capable of adaptive, or learning 
processes. All three programs have impor-
tant space-age application for development 
of machines with which scientists can 
investigate distant planets. They may 
lead to the development of space travel. 

“Everything is possible with the power of 
the sun.” What are the possibilities, as 
our scientists explore the new energies? 
Knowing this, it is possible that all life 
forms of this earth will be able to live and 
exist.

The possibilities of the power of the 

daylight and the sun’s power win the 
universe. The power of the sun may 
drive all the life forms of this earth 
and even the planets. 

The possibilities of the power of the 

daylight and the sun’s power win the 
universe. The power of the sun may 
drive all the life forms of this earth 
and even the planets.
DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THE BENEFITS FROM SPACE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AFFECT EVERY AMERICAN

"Perhaps the greatest economic treasure," says Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, "is the knowledge that America has developed in the fields of electronics and aerodynamics. This knowledge is required for more and more difficult space missions. This new technology is advancing at a meteoric rate. Its benefits are spreading throughout our entire industrial and economic system."

The needs of the space program, Representative Edwin Mitchell points out, "include opportunities in the space field. At the same time, the trade associations of American industry estimate that about 5,000 companies were involved in its portion of the project. The McDonnell Aircraft Co., which built the Mercury capsule, counted about 4,000 companies as participants in its manufacture, as subcontractors or as direct or indirect suppliers. Clearly, our space program is providing the incentive to American industry to remain in the technological vanguard."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, so that our colleagues may be notified that we are coming rather close to the conclusion of this brief session, I suggest the adoption of a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is there further morning business? The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in recess until the hour of 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as I indicated last Thursday, I think the time has come for the administration to begin to look not only to the future, but to the past. If you wish to believe that the American way of life has no future, then you must simply close your eyes to one of the most significant facts of American life, which is that we are a nation made up of free people. The American people are not a stagnant people. They are an ever-increasing people.

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Select Committee on Peaceful Uses of Space, recently underscored this point: "Our entire space program—even at the peak planned for 1962, at the peak—will cost only $6 billion, which is substantially less than your income taxes. It will be in the same neighborhood as the $8 billion we spend on face powder, lipstick, and nail polish. And it is estimated construction costs over the next decade will yield a return for every $1 invested, for every nickel we put into the shuttle, we will get a dime back. The real and legitimate goal of science is the extension of the life and the length of the life of our nation, our country, and our world with new inventions and new innovations and riches. That is the goal of our space effort today—to endow all of human life with new inventions and new riches."
the present deficit in our overall international accounts.

The remarks by the junior Senator from Tennessee apparently fail to give adequate consideration to the fact that if American investments were not made in areas with good market potentials, similar investments would be made by nationals of other countries. Should this occur, in the long run, there would be no net balance in our favor on investment accounts.

Mr. Donald C. Alexander, a partner in the firm of Mr. Taft, Suttlinus & Holister, discussed the balance of payments before the Committee on Ways and Means. He said:

Under present law the investment of U.S. corporations in foreign subsidiaries located and operated in the more developed countries creates a situation favorable to the generation of earnings. Although official figures show a substantial portion of such earnings is remitted each year as dividends, the remainder is reinvested in new, forward-looking positions, one that will outgrow any temporary advantage that could result from taxing the income of these foreign business operations, as earned, under the heavy burden of our tax structure. It is true even under the assumption that the foreign investments and the income from these foreign business operations continue with investment practices followed under current law; however, it seems apparent that the administration proposals will have an adverse effect on further investment in existing overseas companies, and a particularly adverse effect on new investment in new foreign business ventures. Thus the difference will be greatly magnified.

It should not be forgotten that the moneys invested and reinvested in the stable developed countries are in general, within the economic power of businesses controlled in the U.S. and the company's earnings represent assets of our country in the balance-of-payments picture and not liabilities.

Another witness, Mr. Harold D. Arneson of the Abbott Laboratories International Co., testified on this aspect of foreign investments. He said:

The suggested taxation would place our company at a distinct disadvantage in competing for business in Western Europe as well as in the developing areas of the world. Our foreign competitors are increasing the use of base company operations. For instance, the OTO in England. They would be pleased to see U.S. private investments overseas shrunk and we gave up the position we have in the world markets. This is just what would happen if our Government is allowed to penalize American industry overseas by taxing unremitted earnings.

Perhaps the best summary of the contributions of direct foreign investment by American firms to our economy may be found in the testimony of Mr. Ray Eppert, president, Burroughs Corp. He said:

Under the tax proposals, it seems to us, is a basic misunderstanding of the purpose and function of direct American investment abroad. American direct investments are made to take advantage of potential economic advance in certain areas where our competitors cannot be served through U.S. exports. Last, but not least, American business trades and invests in foreign countries abroad competitive with foreign competitors and to maintain and expand exports as part of a balanced worldwide marketing effort.

There is no alternative to American business investing abroad if we are to hold and expand markets for American enterprise. This is vital to the maintenance and expansion of the number of jobs in the United States and the attainment of a maximum export trade surplus. Stated differently, this overseas activity contributes greatly and directly to our domestic economy.

The tax proposals would treat American direct investment abroad much more harshly than foreign investments are treated by other countries with which we compete. This will weaken American business abroad since foreign-earned income is generally not taxed by other countries until returned to the parent company and in some instances not at all, as, for example, Canada.

Increasing the cost of doing business abroad would also seriously injure America's foreign trade and economic position, since it is in the interest of every country to maintain a balance of payments and not allow one to arise that will outweigh any temporary advantage that could result from taxing the income of these foreign business operations, as earned, under the heavy burden of our tax structure.

The true extent and potential of foreign investments in the U.S. oil industry was expressed concisely in a statement of February 19 that not only were the returns from foreign investment inadequate but that capital outflows exceeded the income generated.

The junior Senator from Tennessee expressed concern, in a statement of February 19 that not only were the returns from foreign investment inadequate but that capital outflows exceeded the income generated. He also made a statement regarding the significance of foreign investments in underdeveloped countries of Western Europe and that we were receiving a considerable net income from underdeveloped countries. He believes that this is unfortunate inasmuch as the underdeveloped countries are the areas of the world that we are trying to assist.

Again a careful review of the entire testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means is imperative. It is imperative to appraise American direct investment in developed countries with our foreign policy objectives to provide assistance to the underdeveloped nations. Mr. Collado also provided a table which compared the percentage of earnings in Western Europe subsidiaries of American oil companies from 1957 to 1968 which shows that in 1957, 47 percent of earnings were distributed and that they reached a high of 61 percent in 1969. During that period, U.S. corporations distributed between 50 and 60 percent of their earnings as dividends to domestic stockholders. Hence, there does not seem to be too great a disparity between the operations of foreign subsidiaries and the parent U.S. corporations.

Mr. President, another witness, Mr. Arneson of the Abbott Laboratories clearly demonstrated that in terms of his own company's investments in the developed countries that the principal source of funds to invest in underdeveloped countries was the profits in the developed countries. In many descriptions of foreign taxation, the term "tax haven" has been used in a manner that suggests tax avoidance for some.

There is a reason to believe that foreign investment denied outlet in Europe will seek outlet in the developing countries. The quantitative difficulties of the investment of so-called foodloose industries, that is, industries willing to shift their base of operations in response to marginal investment advantages, has often been exaggerated.

The location of the basic element of investment is determined by basic consideration of markets, costs, and sources of supply and the risk factors affected by marginal incentives. These foreign investments will not be made at all if tax penalties make them economically ineffective.

Foreign investment is also closely tied into a network of world trade which cannot easily be sliced into segments of developing countries and developed countries. This interdependence is seen clearly from the experience of the oil industry. Investments in the industrially developed countries provide the market for most of the crude produced in the developing countries. Let us make the experience of the last decade U.S. oil companies have spent in excess of a billion dollars to develop additional crude oil producing and transportation capacity in the Middle East. Without the markets in Western Europe assured by these investments in refining and distribution facilities, the American oil companies could not have justified such large investments in the Middle East.

A great deal of emphasis has been given to the changes to bring the income of foreign investments into line with income received and new funds invested over the past few years. It has been claimed that, over the period 1957 to 1969, this country shows a deficit in our foreign trade and developed countries and a surplus of $1.7 billion for the developing countries.

Such a comparison ignores the complementary nature of much of foreign investments in the U.S. oil industry. It also ignores the substantial portion, perhaps as much as 40 to 50 percent, of the income attributed to U.S. operations in the developing countries which is actually earned in Europe and transferred largely through sales to affiliated enterprises in these countries.

The alleged regional imbalance of income received and new funds invested quite simply reflects a failure to take into account the interdependence of U.S. foreign investment and foreign operations in different parts of the world.

Mr. Collado also provided a table which compared the percentage of earnings in Western Europe subsidiaries of American oil companies from 1957 to 1968 which shows that in 1957, 47 percent of earnings were distributed and that they reached a high of 61 percent in 1969. During that period, U.S. corporations distributed between 50 and 60 percent of their earnings as dividends to domestic stockholders. Hence, there does not seem to be too great a disparity between the operations of foreign subsidiaries and the parent U.S. corporations.

Mr. President, another witness, Mr. Arneson of the Abbott Laboratories clearly demonstrated that in terms of his own company's investments in the developed countries that the principal source of funds to invest in underdeveloped countries was the profits in the developed countries. In many descriptions of foreign taxation, the term "tax haven" has been used in a manner that suggests tax avoidance for some.

There is a reason to believe that foreign investment denied outlet in Europe will seek outlet in the developing countries. The quantitative difficulties of the investment of so-called foodloose industries, that is, industries willing to shift their base of operations in response to marginal investment advantages, has often been exaggerated.
countries of the world, and 52 percent from the so-called developing countries. Upon analysis of these earnings, we have found that 82 percent of the base company's funds that have been reinvested abroad, have gone to these underdeveloped countries, and only 18 percent back into the industrial countries.

Mr. President, I purposely cited testimony relating to specific companies which include the qualifications and statistical problems involved by using Department of Commerce estimates of global activities. The House Ways and Means Committee testimony conclusively shows that American investments in developed countries are positive assets when we consider our balance-of-payments problem.

For example, Table B76 in President Kennedy's Economic Report sets forth our international statistics for the years 1956 to September 1961. When these data are consolidated for the entire period, we find that total U.S. payments for all accounts were $162,017 million. U.S. direct investments represented a net outflow of $2,727 million. During this same period our income return on direct investments totaled $12,598 million. Our total gold sales over the entire period were $3,889 million. The net excess of receipts from direct investments over new investments totaled $3,272 million. If private investments had not been made and these receipts had not been obtained, our international overall statistics would be far less favorable, and we might find that our gold supply was in serious jeopardy.

The junior Senator from Tennessee compares the dividends paid by domestic corporations in 1960 with new money going into them. He suggests that this ratio should be applicable to overseas subsidiaries. He said:

Taking our domestic operations as a guide, with the dividends paid by domestic corporations in 1960 amounted to $3,272 million. If private investments had not been made and these receipts had not been obtained, our international overall statistics would be far less favorable, and we might find that our gold supply was in serious jeopardy.

The junior Senator from Tennessee compares the dividends paid by domestic corporations in 1960 with new money going into them. He suggests that this ratio should be applicable to overseas subsidiaries. He said:

Taking our domestic operations as a guide, with the dividends paid by domestic corporations in 1960 amounted to $3,272 million. If private investments had not been made and these receipts had not been obtained, our international overall statistics would be far less favorable, and we might find that our gold supply was in serious jeopardy. We should like to comment also briefly on some principles of taxation which are being propounded by a few tax theorists and doctrinaires with little regard to our country's stake in international trade and the challenge of the industrial competition throughout the world. In many instances, by means of our Government's business that has been conducted in foreign areas on the respective costs of these and that American industry overseas should not be hampered by laws, rules, and regulations, including tax laws, which force domestic companies to make their investments elsewhere in the United States. It is a grave misconception to believe that U.S. companies overseas are being annually getting special tax incentives from our Government. Quite the contrary, in fact. For example, as long as an American industry abroad is not given full credit by our Government for income taxes that are waived by a foreign country, U.S. companies are being placed at a competitive disadvantage to competition of these foreign firms. What should be considered, too, is that income taxes in most foreign countries are a smaller part of the total burden on business than in the United States. On the other hand, sales taxes, turnover taxes, 25 percent in France, for example, transmission taxes, manufacturers' excise, capitalization taxes, property taxes, and a host of others are usually much higher in other nations than in the United States.

The U.S. manufacturer overseas is penalized by the fact that he allows credits for foreign income taxes only, not for the rest of these taxes. In other words, U.S. industry overseas pays all of the local non-income income taxes that have been levied, but only a total of 52 percent on the resulting net income, while our foreign competitors often pay a much lower total amount of tax. This situation, I can assure you, is a most serious threat to the future of our own company and portends a significant retreat of American industry in general to the benefit of foreign competitors in the world markets.

Mr. Robert R. Schorn, the tax counsel of American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp., showed that in the case of his company the American parent total investment in foreign subsidiaries is considerably less than its present net equity. In this instance it totals less than $7 million, but the total reinvestment was made after 1930. Through the reinvestment of earnings, at present, the net equity is $38 million and more than 60 million dollars are attributed to the United States in the last 10 years on which U.S. taxes were paid. All this was made possible by permitting an original investment of $10 million to grow under favorable conditions so that as other newer foreign investments mature, the dividends repatriated to the United States will grow.

Arguments against the administration's proposals to tax earnings of foreign investments are quite well stated by Mr. Schorn.

The proposals would not help to redress the balance of payments, but would actually adversely affect this balance to the extent that they would encourage an expansion abroad, which has the purpose and effect of bringing more dollars back to the United States than are invested in foreign countries. This point is more fully developed below.

No reason to assume that investment not made in or withdrawn from developed countries would be rechanneled to undeveloped countries, since this presupposes an interchangeability of markets, available resources, manpower, skills, etc., which in fact does not exist.

Since in many developed countries the combined effective corporate income and dividend withholding tax rates are not significantly higher than domestic income tax rates, the proposals would tend to produce no important additional revenue; on the contrary, they would tend to decrease the revenues. The additional expenses of compliance would be borne to the extent of 52 percent by the U.S. Treasury.

The proposals would in effect have to maintain an additional set of books for U.S. tax purposes and would have to submit their proposed executed transaction to scrutiny from a U.S. tax standpoint.

Complex problems of interpretation would arise in connection with the computation of a foreign corporation's earnings and profits by U.S. standards, as, for example, in the area of foreign exchange valuation.

The international implications, both economic and political, of the proposals, are unfortunate, both as to substance and as to timing.

The proposals tend to create the impression that the United States is financially successful in this world of new markets and world prestige and lessen the attractiveness of our leadership for neutral nations.

The fact that the United States will continue to give subsidies in many forms to many countries, including so-called developed countries, is unlikely to offset this damage to our worldwide image, although it will more than offset any revenue gain from the proposals. Indeed, the statement that the proposed list of developed countries is for use only for tax purposes and "is not intended to suggest whether or not U.S. economic assistance" may be "justified" indicates both the insincerity of the approach and the awareness of the difficulties inherent in it. The proposals may thus fairly be characterized as having as their theme: aid, not trade.

Similarly, they constitute an act of economic imperialism since their use will run financial benefits which such a policy could normally be expected to offer.

The proposals for the immediate taxation to the U.S. parent of undistributed profits of a foreign corporation in which it may own a very small interest will undoubtedly be interpreted by the foreign economic community and governments as an unwarranted interference in their affairs, particularly since the proposals disregard foreign corporate entities and are
to be implemented by onerous administrative requirements sought to be imposed by U.S. governmental agencies. Such a policy would also invite reprisals against U.S. enterprises wherever possible.

The proposal for the immediate taxation of undistributed profits of foreign subsidiaries, as well as those for the elimination of so-called tax haven companies and exclusion of earned surplus salaries, add up for the resounding Yankee go home. They will effectively take the United States out of the running for foreign investment, bringing capital exportation through trade, as distinguished from aid, and will leave the field to the more forward-looking countries with more forward-looking policies.8

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, in an address delivered in Pittsburgh on March 21, 1959, predicted the difficulties we are now facing because of our unfavorable overall international gold balance. He showed that this situation resulted from the activities of our Federal Government and not from normal private economic activities by investment in the world. He said:

On Friday, March 18, President Eisenhower requested the Congress to approve $4 billion in additional funds for the mutual security program. This is expected of us to assist our allies in strengthening their defenses to meet the onslaughts of atheistic communism; however, very few of our citizens comprehend the magnitude of the President's request.

Fortune magazine in its July 1958 issue ranks American industrial corporations in terms of their sales. On the basis of this list, I find that the taxes paid in 1957 by all of our largest industrial corporations do not equal $4 billion. In fact, they paid taxes to the Federal Government in the amount of $3.811 billion. These taxes in turn were predicated on sales of $91 billion worth of products. The production of these goods required the use of assets costing $73 billion. The production of these funds required the employment of more than 4 million employees. These taxes merely support the foreign aid program. Remember, this leaves nothing for our own defense expenditures, interest on the public debt, cost of social security, slum clearance, public housing, urban renewal, and the countless other programs needed for our own economic development.

I might add that the 44 corporations I have listed obviously include many whose heads are elsewhere. In this connection, I refer to such as the United States Steel Corp., Westinghouse, the Aluminum Co. of America, the Jones & Laughlin Steel Co., and Gulf Oil, as well as other leading firms such as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, General Electric, Du Pont, and the major oil companies.

The senior Senator from Maryland also stated:

American citizens are not permitted to convert paper dollars into gold; however, foreigners have this opportunity. In recent years we have been providing them with dollar resources to enable them to draw on our gold balances. Unless we maintain competitive prices in world markets and bring about a balance in terms of our international payments our economy is headed for disaster.

In 1948 U.S. gold stocks reached a postwar high of $24.8 billion. At the end of last year they stood at $20.8 billion, a decline of $4 billion. The reduction in 1958 alone totaled $2.5 billion. In fact, the monthly net outflow of gold for the year was every month since January 1958. While a $20 billion gold stock provides an adequate base for our currency, it must be self-evident that a gold stock of $20 billion or less, which we can no longer continue without completely destroying our own economic system. This, perhaps, is the price we will individually pay for the impact of unsound economic policies, since an excess of demands for dollar payments over resources available to discharge them will sooner or later be reflected in our monetary reserves.11

The great virtue of a free enterprise economy as compared with other economic systems is that it provides flexibility so that management may adopt policies which maximize profit opportunities.

This often entails foreign investment, export sales, and perhaps licensing arrangements. It is naïve to suggest that the management of any American firm is not aware of the necessity of providing adequate dividends to its stockholders to retain them as American citizens, this entails a flow of dollars to the United States which will, of course, be taxed by the Federal Government.

Testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee showed that a conscious effort is made on the part of most companies not only to reinvest their earnings abroad but also to repatriate the funds to the American stockholders in the form of dividends which of course are taxable.

Mr. Frank X. White, the president of Machine & Foundry International, a subsidiary of the American Machine Foundry Co., Mr. Collado of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and Mr. Harold D. Arneson of Abbott Laboratories, testified on this matter. Mr. White said:

Investment abroad is being conducted according to a long-range plan based upon deliberate capital expansion preserving a reasonable share of overseas markets for our products. The plan calls for the return of dividends to the parent company on a regular basis. The proceeds from the sale of this dividend stockholders in a reasonable period of time, and, at every annual meeting of the company, the management is reminded by the stockholders and employees who support the company's interest in international business, the wait for dividends cannot be and will not be indefinitely sustained.12

Mr. Collado said:

Thus, in 1950, we paid out $485 million in dividends, of which two-thirds was attributable to foreign income. You may be sure that many millions of dollars in U.S. taxes are paid by Jersey shareholders on such income.13

Mr. Harold D. Arneson said:

I wish to emphasize that our foreign earnings have always been reinvested abroad for the purpose of enabling us not to thwart collection of U.S. income taxes. Our company, in common with a vast majority of companies, is publicly held. The stockholders would not permit the indefinite retention of foreign source earnings.14

13 Ibid., p. 2672.
14 Ibid., p. 2686.

There is obviously no conflict between the long-term interest of parent-company stockholders and the U.S. Treasury. They both seek the maximum return on the form of investment income for every dollar which is sent abroad to expand our market position in competition with the well-organized firms throughout the world. Hence, only capital but also management skills and programs.

Those firms which through foreign investments are entrenched in local markets will enjoy the fruits of the expansion of the world's economy. Those who are timid and do not venture abroad or are prevented from doing so by restrictions imposed by their own governments will not be in a position to go forward. Of the leading countries of the world, the United States appears to be the only one that is even considering any deterrents to foreign investment.

In his testimony, Mr. Charles I. Derr, vice president of Machinery & Allied Products Institute, stated that:

A foreign subsidiary facilitates contacts with the United States for local identification for the U.S. company, and it permits the kind of market penetration that is not readily available to any one which does not have such identification. It leads to more extensive foreign distribution channels. Demand is created for U.S. manufactured products. Much of the initial investment, incidentally, is offset almost immediately by a demand for and export of American capital goods. And again our records would seem to bear this out.

I sum this all up by saying that this very substantial impact on American exports serves not only to assist in the adjustment of the balance of payments, but contributes materially to employment in the United States.

American business, at no cost to the taxpayer, can perform a task that can be achieved in no other manner in overseas operations. Mr. Derr also said:

The American business has attained a high level of U.S. technology, managerial skills, and resources to the development of industry throughout the world, and particularly in underdeveloped countries. Certainly the promotion of friendly relations on a people-to-people basis through the employment of American managers abroad. Third, it brings about a closer and a longer lasting relationship between American business and their foreign counterparts than is ordinarily possible in government.

Business leadership abroad is generally more stable than is government's, so that you have here a continuing relationship of very considerable value in our judgment. Furthermore, the presence of American business in underdeveloped areas has served largely to dispel the image of America as a race of dollar exploiters. I would suggest that in India, for example, in what might be called head-to-head competition with our Soviet rivals, American business has come off very well indeed. Much of this contribution and this last growth would be retarded, in our judgment, if the administration's proposals were to be adopted.15

Our balance-of-payments problem cannot be solved by deterring overseas investment or by an export drive.

8 Ibid., p. 2898-99.
10 Ibid., p. 3076.
11 Ibid., p. 2856.
12 Ibid., p. 3076.
Mr. President, recently there has been much discussion in this body and throughout the country about price increases and the imperative need of holding the line against inflationary trends. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Alerting Mr. Kennedy to a Price Rise," published recently in the Chicago Daily Tribune.

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

Alerting Mr. Kennedy to a Price Rise

Mr. Kennedy to a Price Rise," published recently in the Chicago Daily Tribune.

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

Alerting Mr. Kennedy to a Price Rise

The American dollar for many years has been one of the world's principal currencies. Without our seeking world responsibilities, we have been thrust upon us. The role of our private overseas investments over the long term was set forth in the June 1951 Monthly Letter on Business and Economic Conditions, released to the National City Bank, New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this bulletin be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In his tax package President Kennedy recommended overhauling the tax treatment of income earned by Americans abroad. Secretary Dillon presented the proposals before the House Ways and Means Committee and pressed for prompt enactment.

The principal and most controversial proposals would make a far-reaching change in the U.S. tax treatment of tax treaty countries. Such tax treaty countries were ordered to be printed in the Record at this point.

The new proposals therefore raise fundamental questions. One argument advanced for them is that they would reduce private capital outflows and bring about increased investment in the United States from abroad, thus helping to overcome the balance-of-payments deficit and win the battle to safeguard the dollar.
planned to adjourn to Monday next at noon. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

TREATY ON GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

Mr. Humphrey. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the subject of the basic provisions of the Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament as presented in Geneva, Switzerland, yesterday by the representatives of the U.S. Government at that disarmament conference.

As a longstanding advocate of disarmament under proper safeguards, I was greatly encouraged by the presentation in Geneva yesterday of a new U.S. proposal for a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. Any opined mind who reads this document can see that the United States has taken a giant step toward ending the arms race. Never before has a major power made such a concrete proposal for the reduction and elimination of the sources of its power—namely, its military forces, armaments, and weapons delivery systems—with such absolute assurance that as it disarms, its most likely adversaries will have to follow suit.

In other words, they will have to do as is required of us.

President Kennedy is perfectly justified, in describing this draft treaty as "the most comprehensive and detailed proposal in the field of general disarmament ever put forward by any government."

Some people may call this proposed treaty utopian, but only if they also consider "utopian" the goal of a world of law and order free from the menace of armed conflict and the terror of accidental or aggressive war and free of the intolerable burden of armaments.

The latest U.S. plan breathes the spirit of its principal author, President Kennedy. The United Nations General Assembly, President Kennedy challenged the world to end the arms race and to join him in a campaign that peace with honor and absolute security has the highest priority in American policy. Once again the President has proven that we shall never be afraid to negotiate and never shall negotiate from fear.

In the most literal sense of the word, we are negotiating from strength. Our arms are not alone. The disarmament agreement that Venezuela has signed at a time when the United States has unequaled strength, and when our rivals have shown that they respect our strength in areas of direct confrontation, is a strong nation that seeks to use its military, economic, and political might to lead the world in the paths of peace.

Finally, we have shown that we understand the nature of disarmament agreement that rests on something stronger than the thin reed of trust among the great powers. It would stand the test of arms if two men stand with pistols drawn at 10 paces, neither goes out of his way to prevent a suicidal duel through accident or mistaken identity. If both men have absolute assurance that the other will do the same. The best way to prevent a suicidal duel through accident or miscalculation is to have an impartial umpire in the event of an accident or miscalculation. If neither of the two antagonists will take advantage of the other's momentary weakness. This is why our plan gives us a partial third party to guarantee that both sides respect the proposals of a strong nation that seeks to use its military, economic, and political might to lead the world in the paths of peace.

The chief Soviet delegate to the Geneva Disarmament Conference apparently finds nothing new in the American proposals and calls them unacceptable. The Soviet plan does not dispute that disarmament is desperately needed, even though Soviet officials privately have expressed interest in our proposals. However, I can say that the U.S. plan contains several features never before seen in any serious disarmament plan.

The most striking new feature of the U.S. disarmament plan, Mr. President, is the verification function of the International Disarmament Organization. The purpose of the IDO is to be established early in stage I of disarmament. Not only should it be supposed to verify both the reduction and destruction of armaments, but it should have the task of inspecting all remaining forces and armaments as disarmament proceeds. This is the so-called spot-check feature. Now, this unique feature needs very careful examination. It may not be adequate inspection; nevertheless, it represents a constructive proposal.

Arms and the destructive power of armaments have increased, not diminished. In some respects the draughtsman has still prominent features on the international landscape. The best that can be said today is that for the first time in many months there seems to be an international atmosphere conducive to the discussion, if not to the solution, of our problems.

It is therefore sincerely appropriate that the President has chosen this moment to detail the details of the comprehensive program of disarmament that moves the United States into first place in the peace race. No longer can we sit back and watch the Soviet Government at that disarmament conference. That disarmament proposal before the Geneva Conference in so-called "treaty" form. We have firmly seized the initiative for peace. We have kept our pledge to the world to prevent a suicidal duel through accident or miscalculation. If the President has chosen this moment to detail his plan in the current disarmament negotiations, it is an indication of his belief that peace with honor and absolute security is within our grasp.

If the President has chosen this moment to detail his plan in the current disarmament negotiations, it is an indication of his belief that peace with honor and absolute security is within our grasp.
balked at the idea of opening up its territory to on-site inspections by foreign nations. This attitude has its roots in the traditional secretiveness and xenophobia of the Soviet Union. Ostensibly they argue that there can be inspection only of the weapons marked for destruction, not of the weapons that remain in their arsenal or the bases where they may be deployed elsewhere. I claim, would be a device for espionage. We should expect this response, for the Soviet Union treats every foreigner that crosses its borders as a potential or actual device for espionage.

One of the weapons marked for destruction, of the weapons which the highest authority in the country, the President, had the courage to tell the American people and the world. He had the courage to say that last September in the magnificent speech he made at the United Nations, and he had the courage to repeat it again yesterday, as he again discussed this subject.

There is a way, the Soviet Union has built its own monster, a monster of secrecy and fear. They have to live with that monster. It is suspicious of everyone else. Our task is to break down that suspicion. Our task is to penetrate the curtain of secrecy and to subject the arsenal or the bases where they may be deployed elsewhere to inspections, if our plans are meticulously and carefully designed, is the lesser of the two risks.

What is more, as the Senator from Oregon has said, the people of our political faith, the people of our ideals and our political system, are the humankind of our time, which history demonstrates must break the nuclear test moratorium, and study.

One zone once inspected would "remain open for further inspection while verification was being extended to additional zones." Thus, beginning with approximately 5 percent of a nation's territory, disarmament and inspection would extend progressively to 100 percent of the territory by the end of stage II. In this way the most stubborn obstacle to a workable disarmament treaty—the conflict between international and national inspection concepts—would be scientifically overcome.

This spot-check proposal is an ingenious alternative to trust in international relations. I could never understand such a pathologically suspicious country as the Soviet Union could ever agree to disarmament without controls unless it really intended to cheat while the other fellow disarm—just as it cheated in breaking the nuclear test moratorium last fall.

At least, it is worthy of serious study, which, I am sure, will result in an improvement of the principle itself. Why
cannot the Soviet Union see that this procedure takes full account of its need for national security? It eliminates any possibility of a United States attack; it eliminates any time fulfills the responsibility of safeguarding disarmament.

Without examining every feature of the new disarmament plan, Mr. President, I want to mention one important new proposal which would let disarmament enter its first stage even without the adherence of Communist China. Our disarmament plan entails a reduction of 30 percent in categories and types of weapons which are produced in quantity only by the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States. These include missiles, missile-launching pads, heavy bombers, missile-launched submarines, and the like. Armed Forces personnel would be reduced in stage I to 2.1 million men each for the United States and Soviet Russia. But even if such reductions take place without corresponding reductions by China, none of the great powers would be militarily vulnerable to Chinese aggression.

For one thing, nuclear weapons would be frozen at their existing levels without, however, reducing United States or Soviet nuclear reactor production, and thus fulfilling the second stage. Limitations would be imposed on the production of armaments; the production or transfer of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons would be halted forthwith; and a nuclear test ban treaty under international control and inspection would go into effect if it had not already done so.

This is all in stage I. Plainly none of these measures would permit a shift of the balance of power in favor of Communist China or any other militarily significant state.

However, Communist China would have to adhere to the second-stage commitments. In other words, if the second stage is to be fulfilled, then it must include the militarily significant state having the most aggressive military power. For at this point, any meaningful disarmament agreement would have to include all nations, and particularly any aggressive military power such as Communist China. Because of its size and the fact that it has the most aggressive military power today, it is not merely a race between the War Powers. The arms race is not merely one between the United States and the Soviet Union; it is not merely a race between the Warsaw Pact countries and the NATO countries.

Every hour of the day, every day of the week, and every day of the month, Communist China comes closer to developing the nuclear weapons as she does, she also develops missiles and rockets. With more than 700 million people, with her aggressive leaders, with her apparently untethered for human life, and with her declared bitterness and hostility toward the West, I say that the day when Communist China gets nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them, not a single mortal will live in peace. China's acquisition of nuclear arms means that day for humanity, and will literally be a day of fear, suspicion, and distrust that will know no length or bounds.

Therefore, it seems to me to be imperative that every effort be made by intelligent and rational human beings to bring to a halt the expansion of nuclear weapons, the proliferation of those weapons, and the development of the means of their delivery by nations other than those which now possess them; and even those which now possess them must be willing to agree to inspection and control under effective and balanced controls.

It is very easy for us to talk about our military strength and to presume that it will always be very great. But, Mr. President, the fact is that in the world today there is a dangerous threat more belligerent and more aggressive than the Soviet Union, and that antagonist—even with all its problems and weaknesses of today—is Communist China. I warn the American people and the other free people of the world that China gets nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them, all mankind will live in the shadow of death.

That is why we are discussing disarmament. It is not an act of weakness—instead, I say it is an act of bravery and courage—to propose plans of disarmament; and only a great Nation such as ours, with the great power it now possesses, is capable of making this proposal in sincerity. We make it because we have the moral, the political, the military, and the economic strength to make it and because we believe we should be making it.

That is why I rise to commend the President, and all of us, and particularly any great statesmanlike act.

Mr. President, I have shown that the U.S. proposal is the world's first detailed blueprint for general disarmament on a global scale. It removes any ground for complaint by the Soviet Union that the United States stands for "control without disarmament" or "legalized espionage." It also removes any ground for fear that Communist China here at home that the U.S. disarmament proposals may weaken our security. The U.S. proposal is carefully designed with appropriate safeguards—inspection and controls at every stage and at every step.

I emphasize this point because in speeches made in the Senate and in speeches made elsewhere in the Nation it has been said that these disarmament proposals are unilateral and that they jeopardize our security and would weaken our military strength but would not stop an attack. But, Mr. President, I brand such arguments as false, as misrepresentations, and without any foundation in fact. We are not proposing a single thing which in any way would weaken our security. We are proposing staged, step-by-step reductions in disarmament and a slowing down of the production and accumulation of armaments, not only for ourselves, but also for others, and we look to others accept the inspection, control, and supervision that will guarantee fulfillment of the agreement beyond any shadow of doubt, there will be no agreement. Let us make that point clear before the discussion proceeds further.

Furthermore, in the event of disagreement or noncompliance, the matter could be referred to the United Nations Security Council where we, as well as the Soviet Union, have the power of veto. Although the first two stages are designed to be completed in 6 years, there is no time limit for completion of the third, and final, stage. Final compliance with the treaty could take from 9 to 15 years.

In other places, some have said that in 19 years we would be totally disarmed. But, Mr. President, such talk is irresponsible. There is no guarantee that even in 19 years either we or the Soviet Union would be totally disarmed. The agreement, declared on stage 1 and stage 2, in 6 years, certain things will be accomplished. But stage 3—the important one, which provides for final reduction of armaments—will come about only if certain conditions are fulfilled; and they require the establishment of an international disarmament organization of sufficient proportions and sufficient
quality so that we can be sure there will be no cheating, no avoidance of responsibility, and no way in which anyone could inaugurate a nuclear war without knowing of the agreement. It is clearly recognized that the Soviet Union does not trust us, and I am sure the United States does not trust the Soviet Union. Therefore, when a foreign representative, such as Dr. Henry Cabot Lodge, ex-Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, said in testimony before the United Nations that the Soviet Union will never accept a treaty, no one should think that this is a basis for agreement. Surely this is something as important to Chairmen Khrushchev as it is to President Kennedy.

Our press, our magazines, and our public documents have revealed for the world to see the many measures which have been taken by us to prevent accidental war, to prevent the detonation of a nuclear weapon, for example, that may be in a B-52 plane that crashes, to prevent the launching of a missile from a silo whose electronic device may be faulty and set off that missile. We have taken elaborate measures to prevent accidental war. My question to the world is, What has the Soviet Union done to prevent accidental war?

Last year I spoke here in the Senate urging our delegation to the U.N. to press a resolution in the U.N. to call upon the Soviet Union to list for the public, for the world, and for U.N. inspection itself, those measures which its military leaders and political officers had taken to prevent accidental war or war by miscalculation.

Every Member of this body knows there is a danger of such possibility every day, whether or not the bumpers on the alert, with our air fleet in the sky loaded with weapons, and with our ships at sea loaded with nuclear weapons, ready to go out at a moment's notice, the danger is there. The same is true of the Soviet Union, and perhaps more so. Our scientists and military leaders have built in an elaborate protective system to prevent the possibility of accidental war. We have told the world about it. In fact, we may have slowed down our retaliatory possibilities because of our concern over accidental war.

Has not humanity the right to know what the Soviet Union has done in that respect? What have the Russians done to prevent the possibility of this happening? Today we stand in ignorance of it.

None of these is beyond our grasp at this very moment. Again I call upon the United Nations Disarmament Commission to recommend an immediate special meeting between the United States and the Soviet Union on the means of avoiding accidental war. U.S. efforts in 1957 and 1958 to get an agreement limiting the danger of surprise attack, with special emphasis on the Arctic, were spuriously vetoed by the Soviet Union in the United States. The Security Council. Nevertheless, the time seems ripe to renew these efforts. The scope of any agreement along these lines should be expanded.

There is growing danger of war by mismanagement or escalation, and the world has a right to expect the two greatest military powers to control their weapons of mass destruction. These weapons have become so complex, so deadly, and yet paradoxically so simple and automatic to unleash, that they could destroy the civilized world in less than a matter of minutes. Procedures equally complex and equally extreme, must be developed for us to guard against the danger of war by accident. We have the technical means to destroy ourselves. We must develop and use the technical means to save ourselves from destruction. Surely this is something as important to Chairman Khrushchev as it is to President Kennedy.

I have been asked to introduce this proposal. We have presented this proposal to the United Nations and the International Court of Justice with progressively increasing power and confidence. With the withering away of the possibility of unilateral military action, nations will have to transfer the settlement of their differences to the national to the international level. It is for this reason that I have long felt we ought to strengthen the International Court of Justice and ought to re-examine the proposal we have presented, we have in the past proposed. If the Senate ratifies this disarmament agreement, it is a step I have long proposed. It is a step I have long hoped for.

We have no illusions about the success it will meet at Geneva, although I am glad to note that our proposals have produced a favorable impression upon many neutral delegates and even upon some Soviet representatives in their official moments.

I understand that the Soviet Union takes a negative attitude on this proposal. It is in a negative frame of mind. But I have never believed the United States should be afraid or should permit its actions to be determined by the actions of the Soviet Union. Let us establish our own standards, let us chart our own course. Let us lay down the principles in which we believe, and let us ask others to rally to those principles.

At long last we have come to grips with the problems of international destruction. We have done it fearlessly, courageously, and openly; and I will predict that many of the nations of the world will cheer and herald this initiative on our part. Mark my words, as nation after nation.
finds out that the Soviets are unwilling to negotiate, that they are afraid to negotiate, those nations will become our friends—and give sympathetic support to the extent we shall find possible.

This plan is a worthy embodiment of the principles of the peace race as enunciated by President Kennedy on September 25, and reiterated by Secretary Rusk at Geneva on March 15. It is a blueprint of which the United States can justly be proud throughout the negotiations that lie ahead.

If it is made in the spirit in which it is offered, if considered in the spirit in which it is offered, it could be a broad steppingstone toward peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Digest of U.S. Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," as prepared by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OUTLINE OF BASIC PROVISIONS OF A TREATY ON GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD


FOREWORD

The "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament" was submitted to the U.S. delegation in order to facilitate progress in the negotiations now taking place in Geneva. This document is an elaboration and modification of the September 25 proposals. If nations are to agree on a disarmament program, it will be necessary in negotiations to move from general proposals to discussion of more specific and detailed provisions of a disarmament treaty. The new document represents an effort to set forth in more specific terms an outline of the provisions which the United States proposes for negotiation of specific treaty obligations.

The new document is the most comprehensive statement on the field of general disarmament ever put forward, by any government.

The United States in proposing the new document is a free, secure, and peaceful world for independent states where force has been subjected to the rule of law, where change is peaceful, and where there is general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The objective stated in the "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament" is: "To strengthen peacekeeping arrangements in the United Nations Charter and also from indirect aggression by nuclear weapons and other means of further diminishing the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, or surprise attack.

The parties would agree to cooperate in the peaceful use of outer space and not to place in orbit weapons or other means of further diminishing the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, or surprise attack.

The party would be progressively strengthened until it had sufficient armed forces and armament so that no state could challenge it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to the following outline of basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, as prepared by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

OUTLINE OF BASIC PROVISIONS OF A TREATY ON GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

(Prepared by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency)

In order to facilitate verification of a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, the United States submitted the following outline of basic provisions of such a treaty.
A. OBJECTIVES

1. To insure that (a) disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument of national policy, (b) general and complete disarmament is accompanied by the establishment of a new world order, and (c) international disputes and by effective arrangements for maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. Taking into account paragraphs 3 and 4 below, with respect to the military establishment of every nation, for—

(a) Disbanding of armed forces, dismantling of military establishments, including bases, centers of production of arms as well as their liquidation or conversion to peaceful uses;

(b) Elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction;

(c) Reduction of the organizations and institutions designed to organize the military efforts of states, cessation of military training, and closing of all military training institutions;

(d) Discontinuance of military expenditures;

3. To insure that, at the completion of the program for general and complete disarmament, states would have at their disposal no munitions, armaments, forces, facilities and establishments as are agreed to be necessary to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

4. To insure that during and after implementation of general and complete disarmament, states also would support and provide agreed manpower for a United Nations Peace Force to be equipped with agreed types of armaments and where necessary for the United Nations to effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of arms.

5. To establish and provide for the effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations for the purpose of insuring that all obligations under the settlement of disarmament program would be honored and observed during and after implementation of the settlement of disarmament to this end to insure that the International Disarmament Organization and its inspection, verification, and control access without veto to all places as necessary for the purpose of effective verification.

B. PRINCIPLES

The guiding principles during the achievement of these objectives are:

1. Disarmament would be implemented until it is completed by stages to be carried out within specified time limits.

2. Disarmament would be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any state or group of states gain military advantage, and so that security would be insured equally for all.

3. Compliance with all disarmament obligations would be verified during and after their entry into force. Verification arrangements would be institutionalized to provide for procedures for settlement of differences. The process through which agreed levels of armaments and armed forces were not exceeded.

4. As national armaments are reduced, the United Nations would be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to keep the peace, to facilitate the development of international cooperation in common tasks for the benefit of mankind.

5. Transition from one stage of disarmament to the next would take place upon decision that all measures in the preceding stage had been implemented and verified that agreed allowances required for measures in the next stage would be ready to operate.

INTRODUCTION

The treaty would contain three stages designed to achieve the general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. The treaty would enter into force upon the ratification of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and such other states as may become part of the treaty. Stage I would begin when all military significant states had become parties to the treaty and other transition requirements had been satisfied. Disarmament, verification, and measures for keeping the peace would proceed progressively and proportionately, beginning with the entry into force of the treaty.

Stage I

Stage I would begin upon the entry into force of the treaty and would be completed within specified time limits.

During stage I the parties to the treaty would undertake:

1. To reduce their armaments and armed forces and to carry out other agreed measures in the manner outlined below;

2. To establish the International Disarmament Organization upon the entry into force of the treaty in order to insure the verification of global disarmament in the manner of the obligations undertaken;

3. To strengthen arrangements for keeping the peace through the measures outlined below.

A. Armaments

1. Reduction of armaments:

a. Special armament, as a first stage toward general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, would be limited to agreed allowances in each category listed in subparagraph b below. Except as adjustments for production would be permitted in stage I in accordance with paragraph 3 below, each type of armament in the categories listed in subparagraph b would be reduced by 30 percent of the inventory existing on the date of entry into force of the treaty.

b. All types of armaments within agreed categories would be subject to reduction in stages of 10 percent, in accordance with the stages and of types within categories, is illustrative:

(1) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of between 15,000 kilograms and 30,000 kilograms and on fixed launching pads; and submarine-launched missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater.

(2) All artillery, and mortars and rocket launchers having a caliber of 100 millimeters or greater.

(3) Armored cars and armored personnel carriers. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(4) All artillery, and mortars and rocket launchers having a caliber of 100 millimeters or greater.

(5) Tanks. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(6) All artillery, and mortars and rocket launchers having a range of 300 kilometers or greater.

(7) Airplanes, type A, with an empty weight of between 15,000 kilograms and 30,000 kilograms and on fixed launching pads; and submarine-launched missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater.

(8) Armored cars and armored personnel carriers. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

2. Limitation on production of armaments:

a. Those parties to the treaty which were subject to the reduction of armaments would submit to the International Disarmament Organization an appropriate declaration respecting inventories of their armaments existing on the date of entry into force of the treaty.

b. The reduction would be accomplished in three steps, each consisting of 1 year. One-third of the reduction to be made during Stage I would be carried out during each step.

c. During the first part of each step, one-third of the armaments to be eliminated during stage I would be placed in depots under supervision of the International Disarmament Organization. During the second part of each step, the deposited armaments would be destroyed or, where appropriate, converted to peaceful uses. The number and character of such deposits respecting their establishment and operation would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

3. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in a treaty annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would carry out reductions and would provide assurance that retained armaments did not exceed agreed levels.

3. Limitation on production of armaments and on related activities:

a. Production of all armaments listed in subparagraph b of paragraph I above would be limited to agreed allowances during stage I and, by the beginning of stage II, all parties to the treaty would have retained only within agreed limits of parts for maintenance of the agreed retained armaments.

b. The allowance would permit limited production in each of the categories of armaments listed in subparagraph b of paragraph I above. In all instances during the process of eliminating production of armaments:

(1) An additional armament produced within a category would be compensated for by an additional armament destroyed within that category to the extent of the 10 percent reduction in numbers in each category in each step, and the resulting 30 percent reduction in stage I, would be achieved; and further—

(2) In the case of armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of 15,000 kilograms...
or greater and of missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater, the destructive capability of any such armaments produced within a category would be compensated for by the destruction of sufficient armaments within that category to the end that the 10-percent reduction in destructive capability as defined in paragraph (b) of these categories in each step, and the resulting 30-percent reduction in stage I, would be achieved.

4. Flight testing of missiles would be limited to agreed annual quotas.

5. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the following measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that the foregoing measures were not conducted at undeclared locations.

6. Additional measures:

b. The system of safeguards to be applied to the treaty would be subject to the following limitations:

1. Not acquire, or attempt to acquire, manufacturing any nuclear weapons.

2. Not manufacture, or attempt to manufacture, any nuclear weapons.

3. Not transfer control over any nuclear weapons to a state which had not manufactured a nuclear weapon before an agreed date.

4. Not assist any such state in manufacturing any nuclear weapons.

5. Nuclear weapons test explosions: a. If an agreement prohibiting nuclear weapons test explosions and providing for effective international control would have come into force prior to the entry into force of the treaty, such agreement would become part of the treaty, and all the parties to the agreement would be bound by the obligations specified in the agreement.

b. If, however, an agreement had come into force prior to the entry into force of the treaty, all nuclear weapons test explosions would be prohibited, and the procedures for effective international control would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. The parties to the treaty would agree to examine remaining unresolved questions relating to the means of accomplishing in Stages II and III the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles. In the light of this examination, the parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements concerning nuclear weapons stockpiles.

6. Additional measures:

b. The parties to the treaty would agree to examine remaining unresolved questions relating to the means of accomplishing in Stages II and III the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles. In the light of this examination, the parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements concerning nuclear weapons stockpiles.

D. Outer Space

1. Prohibition of weapons of mass destruction in orbit: The parties to the treaty would agree not to place in orbit weapons capable of producing mass destruction.

2. Peaceful cooperation in space: The parties to the treaty would agree to support increased international cooperation in peaceful uses of outer space in the United Nations or through other appropriate arrangements.

3. Notification and prelaunch inspection:

a. With respect to the launching of space vehicles and missiles:

(1) All parties to the treaty which had launched space vehicles or missiles would provide advance notifications of such launchings to other parties to the treaty, and to the International Disarmament Organization together with the track of the space vehicle or missile. Such advance notification would be provided on a timely basis to permit prelaunch inspection of the space vehicle or missile to be launched.

(2) In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would conduct prelaunch inspection of space vehicles and missiles to establish and operate any arrangements necessary for detecting unreported launchings. Limitations on prelaunch inspection and on related activities: The production, stockpiling and testing of boosters for space vehicles would be subject to the agreed limitations. Such activities would be subject to the International Disarmament Organization in accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification.

E. Military Expenditures

1. Report on expenditures: The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization at the end of each stage a report on their military expenditures. Such reports would include an itemization of military expenditures.
2. Verifiable reduction of expenditures: The parties to the treaty would agree to examine the reductions related to the verifiable reduction of military expenditures. In the light of this examination, the parties to the treaty and the International Disarmament Organization would adjust the schedule for installation of posts, including the scale of observation posts, including the schedule for installation of posts would be progressively expanded in each successive stage of disarmament. Specific arrangements relating to this commitment, including the scale of movements and maneuvers to be reported and the information to be transmitted, would be agreed.

3. Observation posts - Specified parties to the treaty would establish agreed arrangements for verification of the conversion of depots or other agreed locations. Specific arrangements respecting such exchanges would be agreed.

5. Communications between heads of government: Specified parties to the treaty would agree to the establishment of rapid and reliable communications among their heads of government and with the Secretary General of the United Nations. Specific arrangements in this regard would be subject to agreement among the parties concerned and the Secretary General.

G. The International Disarmament Organization

1. Establishment of the International Disarmament Organization: The International Disarmament Organization would be established as a subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization to examine and make recommendations regarding further measures that might be undertaken during stage I or subsequent stages of disarmament to reduce the risk of war by accident, misinterpretation, failure of communications, or surprise attack. Specific arrangements for such measures as might be agreed to by all or any of the parties to the treaty would be subject to agreement among the parties concerned.

2. Cooperation of the parties to the treaty: The parties to the treaty would agree to cooperate promptly and fully with the International Disarmament Organization to assist the International Disarmament Organization in the performance of its functions and in the execution of the decisions made by it in accordance with the provisions of the treaty.

3. Verification functions of the International Disarmament Organization: The International Disarmament Organization would be authorized to verify disarmament measures in accordance with the following principles which would be implemented through specific arrangements set forth in the annex on verification:
   a. Measures providing for reduction of armaments and for the verification of the conversion of depots or other agreed locations. Specific arrangements relating to the amount of disarmament being verified by the International Disarmament Organization either at the agreed depots or other agreed locations.
   b. Measures halting or limiting production, testing, and other specified activities would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization. The treaty would include specific arrangements to be concluded by the parties to the treaty for possible violations.
   c. Assurance that agreed levels of armaments and armed forces were not exceeded and that activities limited or prohibited by the treaty were not being conducted treaty would not be revealed prior to its selection for inspection. This might be accomplished, for example, by an arrangement embodying such features as the following:
      (1) All parts of the territory of those parties to the treaty to which form of verification was applicable would be subject to selection for inspection from the beginning of stage I as provided below.
      (2) Parties to the treaty would divide their territory into an agreed number of zones, and at the beginning of each step or stage of disarmament, a declaration stating the total level of armament and forces would be submitted to the International Disarmament Organization. Periodic declarations stating the total level of armament and forces would be submitted to the International Disarmament Organization within a zone would not be revealed prior to its selection for inspection. This might be accomplished, for example, by an arrangement embodying such features as the following:
      (3) An agreed number of these zones would be progressively inspected by the International Disarmament Organization during stage I according to an agreed time schedule. The zones to be inspected would be selected by procedures which would insulate their selection by the parties to the treaty other than the party whose territory was to be inspected from the knowledge of any other party. Upon selection of each zone, the party to the treaty whose territory was to be inspected would have the opportunity to examine the verification of the conversion of depots, or other agreed activities within the selected zone. During the verification process, arrangements would be made to provide assurance against undisclosed movements of the objects of verification or from or to the zone or zones being inspected to any zone or zones outside of the zone being inspected. Insofar as agreed locations of inspection ceased, access within the zone would be free and unimpeded, and verification would be carried out on the basis of the full cooperation of the state being inspected.
      (4) Once a zone had been inspected it would remain open for further inspection while verification was being extended to additional zones.

4. Composition of the International Disarmament Organization:
   a. The International Disarmament Organization would have:
      (1) A General Conference of all the parties to the treaty;
      (2) A Control Council consisting of representatives of all the major signatory powers as permanent members and certain other parties as nonvoting members;
      (3) An Administrator who would administer the International Disarmament Organization and who would have the authority, staff, and finances adequate to insure effective and impartial implementation of the functions of the International Disarmament Organization.

b. The General Conference and the Control Council would have power to establish such subsidiary bodies, including expert study groups, as either of them might deem necessary.

c. Approving agreements between the International Disarmament Organization and the United Nations and other international organizations;

d. Approving the budget of the International Disarmament Organization;

e. Requesting and receiving reports from the Control Council and deciding upon matters referred to it by the Control Council;

f. Considering matters of mutual interest pertaining to the treaty or disarmament in general.

6. Functions of the Control Council:
   a. Recommending appointment of the Administrator;
   b. Adopting rules for implementing the terms of the treaty;
   c. Establishing procedures and standards for the installation and operation of the verification facilities described in paragraph 3 of this article.
   d. Providing for possible ratification of the Control Council and deciding upon matters referred to it by the Control Council;
   e. Recommending the International Court of Justice to give advisory opinions on legal questions concerning the interpretation or
application of the treaty, subject to a general authorization of this power by the General Assembly of the United Nations; 

b. Recommending to the Conference approval of certain secessions to the treaty; 

c. Allowing the signatories to the treaty to give up participation in the treaty, as determined by the Security Council.

3. Functions of the Administrator:

a. The Administrator would have the following functions, among others which might be agreed:

1. Administering the installation and operation of the verification arrangements, and serving as chief executive officer of the International Disarmament Organization and its staff and to the representatives of the parties to the International Disarmament Organization, and to the Secretary-General of the International Disarmament Organization, which the International Disarmament Organization should enjoy in the territory of each of the parties to the treaty, which should be specified in an annex to the treaty.

b. The Control Council, being established within the framework of the United Nations, would conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. It would maintain close working relationships with the Secretary-General, the Administrator of the International Disarmament Organization, and the Administrator of the International Disarmament Organization should consult with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on matters of mutual interest.

c. The Control Council of the International Disarmament Organization would transmit to the United Nations annual and other reports on the activities of the International Disarmament Organization.

d. Principal organs of the United Nations could make recommendations to the International Disarmament Organization, and the Administrator of the International Disarmament Organization would consider them and report to the united nations on action taken.

NOTE.—The above outline does not cover all the aspects of relationships between the International Disarmament Organization and the United Nations.

H. Measures To Strengthen Arrangements for Keeping the Peace

1. Obligations concerning the threat or use of force: The parties to the treaty would undertake obligations to refrain, in their international relations, from the threat or use of force of any type—including nuclear, conventional, chemical, or biological means—of the United Nations Charter.

2. Rules of international conduct:

a. The treaty would agree to support a study by a subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization of the feasibility of the development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament.

b. The treaty would refrain from indirect aggression and subversion. The subsidiary body provided for in subparagraph a. would determine any threat of aggression or subversion.

3. Peaceful settlement of disputes:

a. The treaty would utilize all appropriate processes for the peaceful settlement of all disputes which might arise between them and any other state, whether or not a party to the treaty, including nego-
tiations, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, submission to the United Nations Security Council, or the General Assembly of the United Nations, or other peaceful means of their choice.

b. The treaty would agree that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the treaty which were not settled by negotiation or by the International Disarmament Organization would be referred by any party to the Security Council of the International Court of Justice, unless the parties concerned agreed on another mode of settlement.

c. The parties to the treaty would agree to support a study of the General Assembly of the United Nations of measures which should be undertaken to make existing arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, whether legal or political in nature, more effective; and to institute new procedures and arrangements as needed.

3. Maintenance of international peace and security:

a. The parties to the treaty would agree to support the General Assembly of the United Nations of measures which should be undertaken to make existing arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, whether legal or political in nature, of their choice.

b. The parties to the treaty would agree to support a study by the General Assembly of the United Nations of measures which should be undertaken to make existing arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, whether legal or political in nature, more effective; and to institute new procedures and arrangements as needed.

5. United Nations Peace Force:

a. The parties to the treaty would undertake to develop during stage I of the establishment in stage II of a United Nations Peace Force. To this end, the parties to the treaty would agree on the following measures within the United Nations:

1. Examination of the experience of the United Nations leading to a further strengthening of United Nations forces for keeping the peace.

2. Examination of the feasibility of concluding an agreement, providing for an international structure, authority, and operation of the United Nations so as to improve its capability to maintain international peace and security.

6. United Nations Peace Observation Corps:

a. The parties to the treaty would agree to the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force in stage II, including definitions of its purpose, mission, composition and strength, disposition, command and control, training, logistical support, financing, equipment, and armaments.

b. United Nations Peace Observation Corps: The parties to the treaty would agree to support the establishment within the United Nations of a Peace Observation Corps, staffed with a measuring cadre of observers, who could be despatched promptly to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or a breach of the peace.

c. The Peace Observation Corps could also be stationed as appropriate in selected areas throughout the world.
standard displacement of less than 400 tons (declarations by types).

(7) Specified types of nonnuclear naval vessels (declarations by types).

(8) Specified types of small arms (declarations by types).

The following categories of ammunition for armaments listed in stage I, section A, subparagraph 1.b and in subparagraphs b, above, would be reduced to levels consistent with the levels of armaments agreed for the end of stage II.

3. Method of reduction: The foregoing measures would be carried out and would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization in a manner consistent with retained armaments (graph 2).

4. Limitations on production of armaments and on related activities

(a) The parties to the treaty would halt the production of armaments in the specified categories except for production, within agreed limits, of parts required for maintenance of the agreed retained armaments.

(b) The production of ammunition in specified categories would be reduced to agreed levels consistent with the levels of armaments agreed for the end of stage II.

(c) The parties to the treaty would halt development and testing of new types of armaments. The flight testing of existing types of armaments would be limited to agreed annual quotas.

(d) In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing measures were not conducted at undeclared locations.

5. Additional measures:

(a) The cessation of all production and field testing of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

(b) The reduction, by agreed categories, of specified types of small arms, and the production and stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, the parties to the treaty would undertake the following measures respecting such weapons:

1. (1) The cessation of all production and field testing of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

2. The reduction, by agreed categories, of specified types of small arms, and the production and stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, the parties to the treaty would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

(c) In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would therefore ensure that retained levels of chemical and biological weapons did not exceed agreed levels and that activities subject to the foregoing limitations were not conducted at undeclared locations.

B. Armed Forces

1. Reduction of armed forces:

(a) Those parties to the treaty which had been in agreement to measures providing for reduction of force levels during stage I would further reduce their force levels on the following basis:

1. Force levels of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be reduced to levels 50 percent below those existing at the beginning of stage II.

2. Force levels of other parties to the treaty which had been subject to measures providing for the reduction of force levels during stage I would be further reduced, on the basis of an agreed percentage, below the levels agreed for the end of stage I to levels which would not in any case exceed the agreed level for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the end of stage II.

(b) Those parties to the treaty which had not been in agreement to measures providing for reduction of armed forces during stage I would reduce their force levels to agreed levels consistent with those to be reached by other parties which had reduced their force levels during stage I as well as stage II. In no case would the agreed level exceed the agreed level for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the end of stage II.

(c) Agreed levels of armed forces would include all personnel in the categories set forth in paragraph 2, section A, of the treaty.

2. Method of reduction: The further reduction of force levels would be carried out and would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization in a manner corresponding to that provided for in section B, paragraph 2 of stage I.

3. Additional measures: Agreed limitations consistent with retained force levels would be placed on compulsory military training, and on refresher training for reserve forces of the parties to the treaty.

C. Nuclear Weapons

1. Reduction of nuclear weapons:

In the light of their examination during stage I of the means of accomplishing the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles, the parties to the treaty would undertake to reduce in the following manner retaining nuclear weapons and fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons:

(a) The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration stating the amounts, types and nature of utilization of all their fissile materials.

(b) The parties to the treaty would reduce the amounts and types of fissible materials declared for use in nuclear weapons to minimum levels on the basis of agreed percentages. The foregoing reduction would be accomplished through the disposal of surplus fissile materials to purposes other than use in nuclear weapons. The purposes for which such materials would be determined by the state to which the materials belonged, provided that such materials were not used in the manufacture of the treaty.

(c) The parties to the treaty would destroy the nonnuclear components and assemblies of nuclear weapons from which fissible materials had been removed to effect the foregoing reduction of fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons.

(d) Production or refabrication of nuclear weapons from any remaining fissible materials would be subject to agreed limitations.

2. Method of reduction: The further reduction of nuclear weapons from any remaining fissible materials would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

3. In accordance with arrangements that would be set forth in the verification annex, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would also verify that activities subject to the foregoing limitations were not conducted at undeclared locations.

4. Registration of nuclear weapons for verification purposes: To facilitate verification during stage III that no nuclear weapons remained at the disposal of the parties to the treaty, the declarations by types of nuclear weapons which possessed nuclear weapons would, during the last 6 months of stage II, register and serialize their remaining nuclear weapons and would register remaining fissible materials for use in such weapons. Such registration and serialization would be carried out within the International Disarmament Organization in accordance with procedures which would be set forth in the annex on verification.

4. Military bases and facilities

1. Reduction of military bases and facilities: The parties to the treaty would discharge or convert peaceful uses of protective bases and facilities subject to the foregoing measures and the sequence and arrangements for dismantling or converting them to peaceful uses would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

2. Method of reduction: The list of military bases and facilities subject to the foregoing measures and the sequence and arrangements for dismantling or converting them to peaceful uses would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

3. Additional measures: Additional measures would be set forth in an annex to the treaty on verification.

E. Reduction of the Risk of War

In the light of the examination by the International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War during stage I the parties to the treaty would undertake further arrangements which were agreed to promote confidence and reduce the risk of nuclear weapons:

(a) In accordance with arrangements which would be examined and approved by the Control Council would be carried out to examine extensions, improvements, or additional measures which might be undertaken during and after stage II.

F. The International Disarmament Organization

The International Disarmament Organization would be strengthened in the manner necessary to insure that the measures undertaken in stage II through an extension of the arrangements based upon the principles set forth in section G, paragraph 3 of stage I.

G. Measures To Strengthen Arrangements for Keeping the Peace

1. Peaceful settlement of disputes:

(a) In light of the study of peaceful settlement of disputes conducted during stage I, the parties to the treaty would agree to such additional steps as would be necessary to settle disputes, whether legal or political in character, throughout the world.

(b) The parties to the treaty would undertake to accept without reservation, pursuant to articles 36, paragraph (1) of the statute of the International Court of Justice, the compulsory jurisdiction of that Court to decide international legal disputes.

2. Rules of international conduct

(a) The parties to the treaty would continue their support of the study by the subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization initiated in stage I to study the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament. The parties to the treaty would agree to the establishment of procedures whereby an international body established by the subsidiary body and approved by the Control Council would be circulated to all parties to the treaty and would become effective 3 months thereafter unless a majority of the parties to the treaty signified their disapproval, and whereby the parties to the treaty would be bound by rules which were to be effective in this way unless, within a period of 1 year from the effective date, they formally notified the International Disarmament Organization that they did not consider themselves so bound. Using such procedures, the parties to the treaty would examine extensions, improvements, or additional measures which might be necessary to begin stage III.
b. In the light of the study of indirect aggression and subversion conducted in stage I, the parties to the treaty would adopt arrangements necessary to assure states against indirect aggression and subversion.

c. The United Nations Peace Force: The United Nations Peace Force would be established under the result of the agreement reached during stage I would come into being within the first year following its establishment. The UN organization would progressively strengthen during stage II.


5. National legislation: Those parties to the treaty which had not already done so would, in accordance with their constitution and in support of the treaty imposing legal obligations on individuals and organizations under their jurisdiction and providing appropriate penalties for noncompliance.

H. Transition

1. Transition from stage II to stage III would take place at the end of stage II, upon a determination by the Security Council that the following circumstances existed:

   a. All undertakings to be carried out in stage I and II had been completed;
   b. All preparations required for stage III had been made; and
   c. The remaining armed forces and armaments had become parties to the treaty.

2. During the last 3 months of stage II, the Security Council would review the circumstances respecting these circumstances with a view to determining at the end of stage II whether they existed.

3. If, at the end of stage II, one or more permanent members of the Security Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances did not exist, the agreed period of stage II would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

4. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods totaling more than 3 months for the purpose of bringing about the foregoing circumstances.

5. If, by a special session of the Security Council; transition to stage III would take place upon a determination by the Security Council that the foregoing circumstances did in fact exist.

Stage III

Stage III would begin upon the transition from stage II and would be completed within an agreed period of time as promptly as possible.

During stage III, the parties to the treaty would undertake:

1. To continue all obligations undertaken during stages I and II;
2. To complete the process of general and complete disarmament in the manner outlined below;
3. To improve the International Disarmament Organization and the Security Council; and
4. To adopt and further the arrangements for keeping the peace during and following the achievement of general and complete disarmament through the additional measures outlined below.

A. Armaments

1. Reduction of armaments: Subject to agreed arrangements for the protection of the ownership rights of all discoveries and inventions reported to the International Disarmament Organization, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that the only forces and organizational arrangements which existed were those necessary for agreed forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens and those for providing agreed manpower for the United Nations Peace Force.

2. Method of reduction:
   a. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements that would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.
   b. In accordance with arrangements that would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that they had been completed.

3. Limitations on production of armaments and armaments: The parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements comprising and supporting the establishment, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing arrangements.

B. Armed Forces

1. Reduction of armed forces:
   a. To the end that upon completion of stage III they would have at their disposal only those forces and organizational arrangements which existed upon completion of stage II, the parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements comprising and supporting the establishment, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing arrangements.

2. Method of reduction:
   a. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements that would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.
   b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that they had been completed.

C. Armament Piersons: Subject to the foregoing measures, the parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements comprising and supporting the establishment, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing arrangements.

D. Research and Development of Military Significance

1. Reporting requirement:
   a. The parties to the treaty would undertake the following measures respecting research and development of military significance for the protection of the ownership rights of all discoveries and inventions reported to the International Disarmament Organization.

2. Method of reduction:
   a. The parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements comprising and supporting the establishment, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing arrangements.

3. Other limitations: The parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements comprising and supporting the establishment, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing arrangements.

E. Reduction of the Risks of War

1. Reduction of nuclear weapons: In light of the steps taken in stages I and II to halt the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons, and in light of the stockpiling of nuclear weapons stockpiles, the parties to the treaty would eliminate all nuclear weapons remaining at their disposal for use in such weapons to purposes other than use in such weapons.

2. Method of reduction:
   a. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that no nuclear weapons materials for use in such weapons remained at the disposal of the parties to the treaty and that no such weapons or materials were produced at undeclared facilities.

F. Military Bases and Facilities

1. The parties to the treaty would undertake the following measures respecting military bases and facilities:

   a. In an agreed sequence except for such agreed bases or facilities within the territory of the parties to the treaty for agreed forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

2. Method of reduction:
   a. The list of military bases and facilities subject to the foregoing measure and the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that they had been completed.

b. The Control Council would establish such expert study groups as might be required to examine the potential military significance of such discoveries and inventions and, if necessary, to recommend appropriate arrangements. Subject to the light of such expert study, the parties to the treaty would, where necessary, establish and maintain arrangements comprising and supporting the establishment, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing arrangements.

g. The parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements comprising and supporting the establishment, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing arrangements.
note confidence and reduce the risk of war. The Commission would remain in existence to consider extensions, improvements or additional measures which might be taken during and after stage III.

2. Application of measures to continuing forces. The treaty would apply to national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens. Such forces would be subject to the measures undertaken in stage III, when all disarmament measures had been completed, inspection would have been extended to all parts of the territory of parties to the treaty; and (2) to provide continuing verification of disarmament after the completion of stage III.

H. Measures To Strengthen Arrangements for Keeping the Peace

1. Peaceful change and settlement of disputes. The parties to the treaty would undertake to negotiate arrangements, including the establishment of a Preparatory Commission, as necessary to provide a basis for peaceful change in a disarmed world and to strengthen the peaceful character of all international disputes, whether legal or political in nature.

2. Rules of international conduct. The parties to the treaty would confirm the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament, as provided in stage II and by any other agreed procedure.

3. United Nations Peace Force: The parties to the treaty would extend to the United Nations Peace Force established in stage II until it had sufficient armed forces and arrangements so that no state could challenge it.

I. Completion of Stage III

1. At the end of the time period agreed for stage III, the Control Council would review the progress made in determining whether all undertakings to be carried out in stage III had been carried out.

2. After a period or periods totaling no more than 5 months for the purpose of completing any uncompleted undertakings. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods, one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that such undertakings had not been carried out, the agreed period of stage III would be extended for the required period or periods, as determined by the Control Council.

3. After the completion of stage III, the obligations undertaken in stages I, II, and III would continue.

GENERAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL FORCES

1. Subsequent modifications or amendments of the treaty: The parties to the treaty would agree to specific procedures for considering, modifying or amending any part of the treaty which were believed desirable by any party to the treaty in the light of experience of implementing the treaty or any development concerning the reduction of the risk of war that had been applied to national armed forces before the application of the treaty.

2. Interim agreement: The parties to the treaty would undertake specific arrangements for an interim agreement in a Preparatory Commission, as necessary between the signing and entry into force of the treaty, to insure the initiation of stage I immediately upon the entry into force of the treaty, and to provide an interim forum for the exchange of views and information concerning the reduction of the risk of war that had been applied to national armed forces before the application of the treaty.

3. Parties to the treaty: The parties to the treaty would agree to signature and ratification, or accession, by all members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies.

4. Any other state which desired to become a party to the treaty could accede to the treaty with the approval of the Control Council.

5. The treaty would come into force when it had been ratified by—states, including the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and an agreed number of the following states:

- In order to assure the achievement of the fundamental purpose of a permanent state of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, the treaty would provide that the accession of certain militarily significant states would be essential for the continued effectiveness of the treaty or for the coming into force of particular measures or stages.

6. The parties to the treaty would undertake to exercise every effort to induce other states or authorities to accede to the treaty.

7. The treaty would be subject to ratification or accession in accordance with constitutional processes.

8. A depository office would be agreed upon which would have all of the duties normally incumbent upon a depository. Alternatively, the United Nations would be the depository.

9. Finance:

a. In order to meet the financial obligations of the International Disarmament Organization, the party responsible for the maintenance of the weapons of the Soviet Union would bear the International Disarmament Organization's expenses as provided in the budget approved by the General Conference and in accordance with a scale of apportionment approved by the General Conference.

b. The United States would exercise borrowing powers on behalf of the International Disarmament Organization.

c. Authentic texts of the treaty would consist of equally authentic versions in English, French, Russian, Chinese, and Spanish.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain newspaper items in the morning press relating to the proposal for a general disarmament, along with an editorial from the New York Times of this morning, be included in the record.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record.

The United States yesterday presented its most ambitious disarmament plan, to cut world military forces by two-thirds in 6 years and ultimately replace all armies by a United Nations force.
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The disarmament offer is not a package which must be accepted or rejected in total, officials said. It is negotiable in detail. While it provides a 30-per cent cut in all weapons in its first stage of 3 years, and a second cut of 35 per cent in the next 3 years, the time frame for the three stages of "general and complete disarmament" is unspecified. Officials said this might be anywhere from 5 to 10 years.

Stage I of the plan could go into effect without Communist Chins. But the participation of the British might be "significant". It provides a 70-per cent cut in second cut of 35 per cent in the next 3 years, necessary for "internal order," it would be the subject of rational discussion as well as elaboration of the nature, sequence and timing of specific disarmament steps. This stage could begin. For stage III to become effective, when nations theoretically would be able to "achieve a breakthrough on disarmament negotiations."

In brief, the new U.S. plan provides:

Stage I: In three 1-year steps, major categories of additional forces and armaments would be reduced 30 per cent. The United States, for example, in the top category, would reduce the B-52 and B-58 bombers. That is, the United States could choose to dispose of nuclear-carrying aircraft and keep its Polaris missiles in this stage. The same would be true in other categories of combat aircraft, tanks, artillery, etc.

Arms to be eliminated would be placed in depots and later destroyed or converted to peaceful uses, under an International Disarmament Organization, which would operate closely with the U.N. Military force levels of the United States and Soviet Union would be reduced to 2 million men each, and for other nations to corresponding levels.

Production of fissionable material for military use would be halted. Measures to reduce risks of war would be taken, and studies made of ways to eliminate nuclear weapons, including those of chemical and biological weapons. Participants would agree to cooperate in peaceful uses of outer space. Arrangements for a U.N. Peace Observation Corps would begin. (Officials suggest it might even be advisable to equip a U.N. force with nuclear weapons.)

To verify that disarmament was taking place, it is suggested that each participating nation would be divided into a number of zones, on a chessboard pattern. For example, there might be 20 zones each in the United States and the Soviet Union and each would declare in which zone some of its armed forces were in the zone.

**WILLIAM PENNEY**

In a major effort to achieve a breakthrough toward realizing man's ancient dream of beating swords into plowshares, the United States has submitted to the Geneva disarmament conference a complete and detailed draft treaty for total disarmament.

**THE PRESIDENT.** I have several announcements to make.

**DISARMAMENT**

The United States has today tabled at Geneva an outline of a provision of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World. It provides a blueprint for the implementation of total and complete disarmament as well as elaboration of the nature, sequence and timing of specific disarmament steps. This outline of a treaty represents the most comprehensive and specific series of proposals the United States or any other nation has ever presented. In addition to stating the objectives and principles which should govern agreements for disarmament, it provides for the grouping of individual measures in three balanced and safeguarded stages. We are hopeful that through the give and take of negotiations now in progress, we will be able to arrive at an agreement which will "achieve a breakthrough on disarmament negotiations."

This is a major effort to achieve a breakthrough on disarmament negotiations. We believe that the nations representing at Geneva have a heavy responsibility to lay the foundations for a genuinely peaceful and secure world starting through a reduction in arms.

**AMERICA'S DISARMAMENT PLAN**

In a major effort to achieve a breakthrough toward realizing man's ancient dream of beating swords into plowshares, the United States has submitted to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a complete and detailed draft treaty for total disarmament.

**The editorial also points out:**

The American disarmament plan is so sweeping and of such fateful impact on the life or death of nations that it must be subjected to the most searching scrutiny before final judgment can be passed on it.

With this I fully agree. That is the purpose of the discussion. Those of us who have said that the draft treaty should be the subject of rational discussion as well as the subject of such modification and adjustment as may be required following such discussion.

The final paragraph of the editorial is worthy of our attention:

This new control idea is a very great concession to the Soviet Union; and it is one more earnest of the American determination to reach a disarmament agreement with the Russians if it is possible for reasonable men to reach one.

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I just quote this one paragraph from the New York Times editorial which I think is worthy of our attention:

In a major effort to achieve a breakthrough toward realizing man's ancient dream of beating swords into plowshares, the United States has submitted to the Geneva disarmament conference a complete and detailed draft treaty for total disarmament.

The editorial also points out:

The American disarmament plan is so sweeping and of such fateful impact on the life or death of nations that it must be subjected to the most searching scrutiny before final judgment can be passed on it.

With this I fully agree. That is the purpose of the discussion. Those of us who have said that the draft treaty should be the subject of rational discussion as well as the subject of such modification and adjustment as may be required following such discussion.

The final paragraph of the editorial is worthy of our attention:

This new control idea is a very great concession to the Soviet Union; and it is one more earnest of the American determination to reach a disarmament agreement with the Russians if it is possible for reasonable men to reach one.

In other words, we have walked the extra mile. We have extended the hand of friendship in a spirit of trying to save the world from catastrophe.

I believe the President of the United States, in taking this courageous step—which will undoubtedly subject him to criticism, along with those of us who support him—has taken a necessary step. And I should like to join with the part of the President, his officers, the Secretary of State and the disarma-
ment agency. This is the kind of courage needed in the quest for peace.

Men who will go to the battlefield if there is a nuclear war will need courage, also. Their courage may be obliterated in the fiery furnace of nuclear destruction.

The President has asked the world to join hands in peace, for his leading. He has not been afraid to lead. He has marched out to the front of the forces, seeking a just and enduring peace, asking all to follow. This is a quality of strength. Those words are merited not merely for—indeed, at least the genuine friendly support—not only of the American people, but of all other peoples throughout the world.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished acting majority leader has discussed a topic that is most appropriately as we approach the Easter period. I was glad to hear him state that no action would be taken on the part of our Govern-

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as a part of my remarks the address by President Kennedy, United Nations General Assembly, on September 25, 1961.

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

LET US CALL A TRUCE TO TERROR

(Address by President Kennedy)

We meet in an hour of grief and challenge. Dag Hammarskjold is dead. But the United Nations lives. He gave his life in our service, but the task for which he died is at the top of our agenda. A noble servant of peace is gone. But the quest for peace lies before us.

The problem is not the death of one man; the problem is the life of this Organization. It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age, or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. We cannot, without its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn the future.

For in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war, and armed peace no longer serves to settle disputes. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer concern the great powers alone. For a nuclear war will be fought in our cities, and for our whole world. We cannot, without its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn the future.

For in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war, and armed peace no longer serves to settle disputes. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer concern the great powers alone. For a nuclear war will be fought in our cities, and for our whole world. We cannot, without its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn the future.

For in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war, and armed peace no longer serves to settle disputes. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer concern the great powers alone. For a nuclear war will be fought in our cities, and for our whole world. We cannot, without its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn the future.

But to give this organization three drivers, or any rotating authority, in the United Nations administrative offices would replace cooperation with anarchy, with paralysis, and confidence with confusion.

The Secretary General, in a very real sense, is now more vulnerable then ever. Diminish his authority and you diminish the authority of the only body where all nations, regardless of power, are equal and sovereign. Until all the powerful are just, the weak will be secure only in the strength of this Assembly.

The new, independent and independent executive action is not the same question as balanced representation. In view of the enormous change in the security situation, the United Nations is bound, the American delegation will join in any effort for the prompt review and revision of the composition of United Nations bodies. Whatever advantages such a plan may hold out to our own country, as one of the great powers, we reject it. For in our time, an age of self-determination, to world war, in the age of mass extermination.

PLAN FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

Men no longer debate whether armaments are an economic burden. The mere existence of modern weapons—10 million times more powerful than anything the world has ever seen and totally different from any target on earth—is a source of horror and discord and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes, for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men no longer maintain that the United Nations is a sign of weakness, for in a spiraling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking from its very foundation.

For 15 years this organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now that goal is no longer a dream; it is a practical goal. We must look forward to the day when the international community without law is but a shell. All that is to be destroyed by terror and disruption, whether the four winds of war can be tamed in time to free the cooling winds of reason, under the pressure of the present weapons, is to be fulfilled or defied—pledges to secure peace, progress, human rights, and world law.

In this hall there are not three forces, but two. There is one common goal that we must face—our collective future. We must try to build the kind of world described in the articles 1 and 2 of the charter. The others, in the open and in the closed door, are no genuine friends, and it is time to identify the principle of the United Nations' obligation to act. But he did not invent it. It was there in the charter. It is still there in the charter.

However difficult it may be to fill Mr. Hammarskjöld's place, it can be better filled by a man rather than by three. Either the three horses of the troika did not have three drivers, all going in different directions. They had only one, and so must the United Nations. For the presidency is not a mere honorific post, or any rotating authority, in the United Na-

the Secretary General nurtured and sharpened the United Nations' obligation to act. But he did not invent it. It was there in the charter. It is still there in the charter.
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I therefore propose, on the basis of this plan, that disarmament negotiations resume promptly and continue without interruption throughout the following year. We believe that a general and complete disarmament has not only been agreed but has been actually achieved.

PROPOSALS TO HALT TESTING AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The logical place to begin is a treaty assuring the end of nuclear tests of all kinds, in every environment, under workable controls. The British Government and the United Kingdom have proposed such a treaty that is both reasonable, effective, and ready for signature. We are still prepared to sign that treaty today.

We also proposed a mutual ban on atmospheric testing, without inspection or controls. In order to save the human race from the poison of radioactive fallout, we regret that offer was not accepted.

For 15 years we have sought to make the atom an instrument of peaceful growth rather than of war. But for 15 years our effort to end the peril of nuclear destruction, our patience by intransigence. And the pleas of mankind for peace have met with disregard.

Finally, as the explosions of others blocked the skies, my country was left with no alternative but to act in the interests of safety of our own and of humanity. We cannot endanger that security by refraining from testing while others improve their arsenal. Moreover, our allies insist on another long, unspecified ban on testing. For 3 years we accepted those risks in our open society while seeking a general and effective inspection. But this year production, testing, and development of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles are no longer a competitive advantage over another. It would place the ultimate responsibility for verification and control where it belongs—not with the big powers alone, not with one's adversary or potential enemy, but between nations, under effective international control.

The program to be presented to this Assembly consists of three elements: the complete disarmament of the superpowers, a steady reduction in forces, both nuclear and conventional, and the elimination of those aspects of national defense which inevitably result from the tests in the atmosphere.

But to halt the spread of these terrible weapons, to halt the contamination of the atmosphere, and to limit the testing of nuclear weapons, we remain ready to seek new avenues of agreement. Our new disarmament program thus includes the following elements:

First, signing the test ban treaty by all nations. This can be done now. Test ban negotiations have reached a stage and should not await general disarmament.

Second, stopping the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons and producing for fuel only for any nation now lacking in nuclear weapons.

Third, prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not own them.

Fourth, keeping nuclear weapons from causing new battlegrounds in outer space.

Fifth, gradually destroying existing nuclear weapons and converting their materials to peaceful uses, and committing the further unlimited testing and production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles and gradually destroying them as units.

WORLDWIDE LAW AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

To destroy arms, however, is not enough. We must create even as we destroy—creating worldwide law and law enforcement as we created the atom bomb. The United Nations has the power and the will to deal with the problem, but the international machinery of the Organization has not been sufficiently used. We need a United Nations' machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, for on-the-spot fact-finding, for trying breaches of the United Nations' charter, and for extending the rule of international law. For peace is not solely a matter of military or technical problems; it is primarily a problem of politics and psychology. We shall urge proposals extending the United Nations Charter to the limits of man's exploration in the universe, including the outer space, either for prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies, and opening them for peaceful purposes and for international and national. We shall further propose cooperative efforts between all nations in weather prediction and eventually in weather control. We shall propose, finally, a global system of communications satellites linking the whole world in telegraph and telephone and radio and television. The day may be far away when such a system will teleview the proceedings of this body to every corner of the world for the benefit of peace.

UNITED NATIONS DECADE OF DEVELOPMENT

But the mysteries of outer space must not divert our eyes or our energies from the harsh realities that face our fellow men. Political sovereignty is but a mockery without the means of meeting poverty and illiteracy and disease. Self-determination is but a slogan if the future holds no hope. Freedom and security are meaningless concepts of imperialism and sovereign claims. The cold reaches of the universe must not become the new arena of an even colder war.

That is why my Nation, which has freely shared its capital and its technology to help others to help themselves, especially designating this decade of the 1960's as the United Nations Decade of Development, the decade of social reconstruction. The United Nations' existing efforts in promoting economic growth can be expanded and strengthened, by regional surveys and training institutes can now pool the talents and resources of many. New research, technical assistance, and pilot projects can unlock the wealth of less developed lands and untrapped waters. And development can become a cooperative and not a competitive enterprise, to enable all nations, however diverse in their systems and beliefs, to become in fact as well as in law free and equal nations.

COLONIALISM AND THE PRINCIPLE OF FREE CHOICE

My country favors a world of free and equal states. We agree with those who say that colonialism is a key issue in this Assembly. But let the full facts of that issue be discussed in full. On the one hand is the fact that, since the close of World War II, a worldwide declaration of independence and self-determination has been achieved by more than 1 billion people and 9 million square miles to 43 free and independent states. Less than 1 percent of the world's population now lives in dependent territories.

I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism, notably in Africa. This body. Those problems will be solved, with patience, good will, and determination. Within the limits of our responsibility in
Such matters, my country intends to be a participant and not merely an observer in the peaceful development of nations, not from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That continuing tide of self-determination, which runs so strong, has our sympathy and support.

But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, but the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to whatever their conqueror, their class, or their color.

And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not reached the Communist empire, where a population far larger than that officially recognized lives. The free citizens of West Berlin, the free citizens of Laos and south Vietnam, the gates of which are interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks, are not on your crowded agenda but which cause solemn agreements are being treated with unilateral usurpation. Peaceful circulation has been interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks.

One recalls the order of the Czar in Pushkins' Boris Godunov: "Take steps at this very hour that our country, in the future, shall be free from the structure, the burden, the shame of any foreign domination," so-called "treaty of peace." The Western Allies are not concerned with any paper arrangement the Soviets may wish to make with a regime of their own creation, on territory occupied by their own troops and governed by their own agents. No such action can affect either our rights or our responsibilities.

If there is a dangerous crisis in Berlin—and there is—it is because of threats against the vital interests of the free commitments of the Western Powers and the freedom of West Berlin. We cannot yield these interests. If there is a threat of force, it must be rejected. We cannot surrender the freedom of these people for whom we are responsible. A "peace treaty" which carried with it the proviso that any future provision would be a fraud. A "free city" which was: of genuinely free would suffocate freedom and would be an infamy.

For a city or a people to be truly free, they must have the secure right, without economic pressure, to make their own choice and to live their own lives. And as I have said before, if anyone doubts the extent to which our presence is desired by the people of Berlin, we are ready to have that question submitted to a free vote in all Berlin and, if possible, among all the German people.

The elementary fact about this crisis is that it is unnecessary. The elementary tools for a peaceful settlement are to be found in the charter. Under its law, agreements are to be kept, unless changed by all those who made them. Established rights are to be respected. The dispossession of peoples should rest upon their own wishes, freely expressed in plebiscites or free elections. If there is a threat of force, they can be solved by legal means. If there is a threat of force, it must be rejected. If there is a threat of force, we must be a subject for negotiation, and if there is negotiation, it must be rooted in mutual respect and concern for the rights of others.

The very simple question confronting the world community is whether measures can be taken to save the peace and prevent attacks from such tactics. For if they are successful in Laos and south Vietnam, the gates will open wide.

The United States seeks for itself no base, no territory, no special position in this area of any kind. We support a truly neutral and independent Laos, its people free from outside interference, living at peace with themselves and with their neighbors, assured that their territory will not be used for attacks on others, and under a government comparable (as Mr. Khrushchev and I agreed at Vienna) to Cambodia and Burma.

But now the negotiation over Laos are reaching a crucial stage. The ceasefire is at last precarious. The rainy season is coming to an end. Laotian territory is being used to infiltrate south Vietnam. The world community, if all the elements that are involved—that this potent threat to Laotian peace and freedom is indivisible from all threats to the peace of the world.

Secondly, I wish to report to you the crisis over Germany and Berlin. This is not the moment for a United States—this is not the moment for a divided world. But the world community is entitled to know the very simple issues as we see them. If the American position is because an existing peace is under threat, because an existing island of free people is under pressure, because solemn agreements are being treated with unilateral usurpation, because established rights are being threatened with unilateral usurpation. Peaceful circulation has been interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks.

The very simple question confronting the world community is whether measures can be taken to save the peace and prevent attacks from such tactics. For if they are successful in Laos and south Vietnam, the gates will open wide.
all religions based upon belief in a divine being, for it has been my observation, as a 35-year public servant, that writings of authorities on comparative religions, that there is no question about the ultimate goals or the comity of the spiritual teachings of all faiths that believe in a divine being.

When we are dealing with the problem of disarmament, we are dealing with a subject that imposes a great spiritual trust on all governments, for I want to make it clear we are not dealing with a situation to rise above the limitations of human frailties and seek to lead mankind into a disarmament program that will bring an end of the scourge of war for future generations. As the Senator from Minnesota so ably pointed out today, when we speak on this subject, we must expect to be misunderstood, and we must be ready for criticism. But, Mr. President, and I have faced those circumstances for many years as members of the Foreign Relations Committee, as we have been willing to warn the American people time and time again that unless an international body is established, man's mad, immoral nuclear armament race that now plagues mankind, the best of civilization as it has developed so far in the history of mankind will be rendered forever fruitless— and I think the Russians know—that there will be no victors in a nuclear war. The antagonists in this great armament race have gotten themselves into a position in which they will bring about a mutuality of destruction. I would have those who are still trying to convince others— if in fact they have convinced themselves—that we must use American military might to bring about an end to the world, that there will be no permanence in the world, that it will not work. If we eliminate for a moment in such a discussion the moral principle involved in that proposal, the reality is that American military might cannot establish a system of permanent peace in the world.

The exercise of American military might would lead to world destruction, so far as I see, as a position in which the United States has made perfectly clear that he recognize there cannot be disarmament unless all the powers are disarmed. That is a nonpartisan motivation today. As I have said before, I speak as a disciple of a great Republican in the field of foreign policy, who was my leading teacher when I first came to this body in 1945. I refer to Senator Arthur Vandenberg, with whom I worked very closely on a series of foreign policy issues. In my judgment, there is no answer to the tenet that great man when he said so many times in those historic speeches on the floor of this Senate, that disarmament in the field of foreign policy must stop at the water's edge.

There is great need for a reeducation to the policy makers in our country today. Speaking nonpartisanship, I wish to pay a deserved tribute to our great President, who has shown not only courage, but an enlightened understanding of this issue unexcelled in our Republ ic or in our world today.

Would that we could come back 25, 35 or 50 years from today, provided there is anything to come back to, to read the evaluation that history will place upon the magnificent speech of President Kennedy at the United Nations last September. In that great speech our President laid down the case for disarmament. He laid down the blueprint for the substitution of the rule of law for the law of the jungle. He had the courage to refer in that speech to the willingness on the part of our Government to adjudicate differences. However, the important point in that speech, I believe history will record, is that he laid down an unanswerable challenge to the Communists. He made perfectly clear the willingness of the United States to engage in a full-scale disarmament program. It was the effective answer to the demagoguery of Khrushchev. As Khrushchev, in his preamble to his endeavors, seeks to convince the people of the underdeveloped areas of the world that Russia stands for total disarmament, he of course completely ignores the essentiality of enforceable disarmament. Unless there is enforceable disarmament there will be no disarmament at all. Essential to disarmament, of course, are the inspections. They are completely absent from the Russian program or, more accurately described, the Russian propaganda about disarmament, because if we are to attribute to it the real goal of Russia to establish a permanent world peace, within its provisions the procedures for enforcing it. Up to the moment that I speak the Russians have made very clear time and time again that they will not go along with the doctrine of enforceability of disarmament. The President of the United States, in his disarmament program, as he announced it in September at the United Nations, and as he brilliantly presented it again yesterday in stating his position on this subject, has made clear to the world that we stand ready and willing to enter into a disarmament program which would result in enforceability, which would provide for inspection and control, and which would utilize the United Nations to enforce it.

I can well imagine some of the articles that we shall read about that part of the President's statement, on the part of a Russian who might think those provisions for American military might be used to enforce peace. I shall refer to some of their specific suggestions before I finish this discussion.

However, the President of the United States has made perfectly clear that he recognize there cannot be disarmament unless all the powers are disarmed. That includes the United States, of course. In my judgment there will be no permanent peace until that happens; and, as Senator Vandenberg used to point out, until the nations of the world are willing to set up a system of procedures, under an international body such as the United Nations, for the application of the rules of law to every problem of peace in the world, for final and binding decision in accordance with the principles of international law, each decision to be enforced by an international body such as the United Nations.

In this closing hour of the session before Easter, I dissociate myself from all the recent attacks on the United Nations, in its body and elsewhere, and from the downgrading of the United Nations, and the attempt on the part of some to substitute NATO or any other military alliance for the United Nations. I am bound to say that, as Senator Vandenberg pointed out yesterday, the alliance for the United Nations will lead us directly to a nuclear war.

I would imagine any degree of survival from such a war, we would have to start all over again, because ultimately we would have to set up an alliance of all the nations of the world; not a military alliance, but an alliance of all the nations of the world who are willing to pursue a course of peace under such a challenge and a charter as is set forth in the San Francisco Charter.

In my judgment there is a great, statesmanlike speeches in September, 1945. In my judgment there is as much need for putting into practice the ideals of the San Francisco Charter as there was at the very critical time that that charter was signed. Many leaders of the world played a noble part in bringing about the birth of the United Nations. However, Americans can take great pride in the part played by Franklin Roosevelt, ably assisted by Members of Congress. I know of no one who gave him greater assistance than did Senator Vandenberg. Franklin Roosevelt did not live to see the United Nations established. However, the interesting thing is that the first act that President Harry Truman did after he was sworn in as President was to make the announcement that the San Francisco Conference would go on. What a great record he made as President of the United States in support of peaceful procedures for the settling of disputes, confronted as he was, time and time again, by the actions of the Russians, which were anything but peaceful. Standing for disarmament, and urging the substitution of the rule of law for military might as an answer to problems for settling disputes among nations, does not mean that we cannot support the President of the United States in his great, statesmanlike speeches in September, 1945. In the two days that have passed since yesterday; it does not mean that we shall be a party to weakening the defenses of our country.
some inconsistency in the position we take. We sit in the Senate and vote billions of dollars for the defense of our country, knowing that if we do so in- decency and law, the results for domestic purposes from all the Presidents under whom I have had the honor to serve in the Senate, but I have voted for more money for defense than each one of those Presidents. We voted more money for defense than Franklin Roosevelt recommended on some occasions; I voted for more than Harry Tru- man recommended; for more than Dwight Eisenhower recommended; and already on one occasion I have voted for more than President Kennedy has recommended, and I may do so again if I think the facts warrant my doing so.

Inconsistency? I think not, unless one wishes to reject my major premise. Of course, if one disagrees with my major premise, then my argument, so far as that major premise is concerned, falls to the ground. But my major premise, based upon my work on the Committee on Foreign Relations and based upon my work as a U.S. Deleg­ate to the United Nations in the 15th General Assembly, convinces me that if Russia ever thinks we are weak enough to enable her to make a nuclear war, Earl Harbor type of attack on us, she will not hesitate to do so. There­fore, by keeping ourselves as strong as I have voted to do by way of military appre­ciations, I have tried to make it clear that we are buying time. It is im­portant that we have time to seek to ar­rive at the blueprint for disarmament, about which the President has spoken; and to devise procedures for the settle­ment of these disputes by the applica­tion of a rule of law.

It is necessary to have faith that the Russian people and the Russian lead­ers recognize and honor peaceful and peaceful purposes and motivations. We must have faith that sooner or later the masses of the people of the countries of the world will come to understand our peaceful purposes as we, in turn, will eventually be adopted. I do not know what the alternative is because, as I have said before, war is an un­thinkable alternative.

Speaking in regard to the major prem­ise to which I have referred, this con­viction of mine explains why I have taken certain courses of action during my many years of service in the Senate, which sometimes have been misunder­stood or criticized or rejected by many of my liberal friends. How well I re­member speaking in the Senate as a mem­ber of the team, together with the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] being the others—of the bill now before the Senate, the Humphrey-Morse bill to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States. We were subject to much attack then; but if one will check through the CONGRESSIONAL RE­cord—and I handled the legal argu­ments—under an arrangement for a division of work in the debate—he will see that I pointed out that I had no doubt that the Communist Party, as it operates in the United States and elsewhere in the world, is a criminal, subversive, and con­spiratorial organization. There is no doubt that the party and its apparatus seek to use whatever means they can to destroy the United States and the principles on which we base the United States. It is not necessary to wait for the conspirator to take direct, overt action in order to carry out the objec­tives of the conspiracy. Individual rights were protected in the Kennedy-Humphrey-Morse bill to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States, because we made it a mens rea crime. We made it perfectly clear that there must be a finding of knowingly, will­ingly, and intentionally being a party to the conspiracy. We made it very clear that if a defendant in one of those cases could not prove that he was acting on a jury that he did not know the kind of organization to which he belonged—in other words, that he was unaware of the goals of the conspiracy which had succeeded in spinning its web around him—he would not be guilty un­der the law; the jury would have to find specific intent. It was not a malum prohibendum crime which was set forth in the bill outlawing the Communist Party; it was a malum in se crime; but we knew its essentiality so far as check­ing the Communist conspiracy in this country was concerned.

One law enforcement official after an­other has assured me that it has been a very effective legislative tool in car­rying out the obligations and the trust of the law enforcement agencies of the country.

But I stress, as we talk about disarmament today, that enforceability, inspec­tion, and control are its essentials; and the President has made that clear over and over again in his brilliant statements on the subject. To those sincere, dedi­cated, deeply religious people—and I re­ceive much mail from them these days—who are members of various peace groups in the United States, and who say, "We are somewhat at a loss to under­stand your position in this whole mat­ter," because I refuse to accept their pro­posal for unilateral disarmament, I say again, as I said to them last Saturday in my home State, and as I have said to many of them who have visited my office in Washington, D.C.

"Where we part company is on this premise: You seem to think that the United States could unilaterally disarm and still survive. You seem to think that Russia would not commit a nuclear at­tack upon us if we got ourselves into a position so defenseless that we could not wage the war. I don't know if that is true, but I know that war would destroy both coun­tries."

So there is a complete failure to have any meeting of minds on this subject even now—although I do not think they are wonderful, and I always have great admiration for those who are motivated by sincerity of purpose, even though I think their case is completely un­sound; nevertheless, they stand by their premise with me, insofar as the crux of the problem is concerned, although I certainly share all their ideals, and I certainly agree with them on the great moral principles for which they stand. But as a Member of this body, I have a trust to perform which they do not have. As I said to them the other day, I really wonder whether they would vote or take the position they are asking me to take, if they sat in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as groups—not only the U.S.-based peace groups composed of very dedicated men and women, but also others, including some scientists—who are very much alarmed and disturbed because of the possibility and, with each passing day, the increased probability, that once more the United States will engage in at­mospheric testing.

But that leads me to discuss another aspect of this problem. There are many groups in the United States who are opposed to the nuclear testing. They are arguing in favor of atmospheric testing because they say it is a rather sad re­flection on today's level of civilization that we are even confronted with the problem of nuclear testing. Yet it leads us into another paradox. In this in­stance I wish to state that in my judg­ment Senators are put in the position of having to make a choice between de­grees of immorality, for let the record clearly show that I support the position the President has taken in regard to atmospheric testing. I reluctantly sup­port it. I know more has been reached his decision. I am in support. I am in support of the President's program's being very highly limited in scope, by our country. The last part of the President's program is very easily overlooked by many per­sons, but I can assure the members of the committee, that to follow such a course of action would certainly guaran­tee the destruction of the United States. Under such circumstances, I wonder whether they would cast such a vote or take such a position.

Mr. President, there can be no meet­ing of minds on this question. As I am concerned, I am and have always been, with those who propose unilateral disarm­ament. I will not run the risk, I will not make the gamble, I refuse to take that chance, because I believe I have a great responsibility to the people of the United States to resolve all doubts in this field in favor of adequate defense which will make clear at all times—day and night—to Khrushchev that he has everything to lose and nothing to gain by a nuclear war.
is not proposing wide-open atmospheric testing. He is acting on the basis of an accumulation of evidence, which has been submitted to him as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of this Country, regarding what was accomplished by the Russians when they broke faith and engaged in the ignominious deception of the group meeting at Geneva for the purpose of trying to reach some agreement on nuclear weapons testing. Nevertheless, even while they were meeting, the Russians were proceeding, as we now know, with atmospheric testing—preparations which required a minimum of 30 days for any bomb they would test, and for the larger ones—and most of them were larger—required from 90 to 120 days.

To some of my friends who find it most difficult to believe that the leaders of any government, such as Russia, could possibly be as amoral as they demonstrated themselves to be at the Geneva conference in regard to nuclear testing, I say that it is only necessary to consider the evidence. The Russian delegates were testing in that international conference, complete deceivers, planning—even while they pretended to be trying to work out such an arrangement—again to endanger mankind, by engaging in atmospheric testing of nuclear clear weapons.

All I can say in a public address such as this is that I am satisfied, as the President has tried to make clear, by the use of language which I think so clear that those who read cannot possibly misunderstand, that the evidence clearly shows that in their last atmospheric testing the Russians made great headway in regard to perfecting the delivery of nuclear warheads.

We do not know how much progress they made in regard to the development of an atmospheric bomb, but again all we can do as members of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I understand the same is true insofar as the briefings received from the members of the Armed Services Committee are concerned—is to operate as jurors on the evidence submitted to us when we come to pass judgment in regard to the policy to be followed in the steps left for doubt in my mind, and I know of not one member of the Foreign Relations Committee who does not share with me this point of view. I think this is one point on which there is complete unanimity—as there is, to the surprise of many persons, but not to the surprise of those of us who serve on the committee, on both the Democratic and Republican sides, on the Foreign Relations Committee, once its members receive briefings by the experts, scientists, and diplomats who bring to that committee information which, for security reasons, cannot be brought to the country as a whole.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Time and time again they find themselves unanimous, or with only a small number of minority votes.

I am proud to say to the Senator from Idaho that in the Foreign Relations Committee I never think of the Democratic or Republican side of the committee table, and I do not think any of my colleagues do; but there is general recognition that there is a common trust in that committee, decisions are based on where the facts lead. Very often, on both sides of the table, we find ourselves practically unanimously in favor of a recommendation, as practically unanimous in support of a recommendation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. Time and time again.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator’s mail from back home, as is true of mine, is extremely critical of some of the policies and programs sponsored by the State Department, particularly in handling the aid program and in operating measures in South America, for example, where the Senator from Oregon is vitally interested. I wonder, in such cases, the Senator’s committee makes any steps involving remedial action to correct what may be abuses or ineptitude on the part of the State Department.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. Time and time again.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator’s mail from back home, as is true of mine, is extremely critical of some of the policies and programs sponsored by the State Department, particularly in handling the aid program and in operating measures in South America, for example, where the Senator from Oregon is vitally interested. I wonder, in such cases, the Senator’s committee makes any steps involving remedial action to correct what may be abuses or ineptitude on the part of the State Department.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. Time and time again.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator’s mail from back home, as is true of mine, is extremely critical of some of the policies and programs sponsored by the State Department, particularly in handling the aid program and in operating measures in South America, for example, where the Senator from Oregon is vitally interested. I wonder, in such cases, the Senator’s committee makes any steps involving remedial action to correct what may be abuses or ineptitude on the part of the State Department.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. Time and time again.
I happen to believe in a career Foreign Service corps with checks in it. It is a good thing to have a considerable number of noncareer ambassadors. It is a good thing to have a good many of our missions composed not entirely of career service people, but of persons taken from a cross section of American life.

I shall not go into the subject now, but I hope later to discuss at some length in the Senate, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America, the fact that the most important technical assistance that has been rendered for years in Latin America has been the technical assistance provided by American businessmen. The technical assistance provided by American businessmen, both in quantity and quality, has been far superior to any Government program we have been able to inaugurate thus far. Having raised the question I think it ought to document it with at least one example.

I made a video tape yesterday on a subject matter I shall discuss later in my speech. It was one of these roundtable gatherings. This subject matter later came up in respect to our technical assistance program to Latin America. I pointed out that the story is not known as to how long a great technical assistance program has been going on in Latin America on the part of American business concerns.

On that telecast I said, "Let us consider the work of the McGee Construction Co. of Ohio." Who knows about the technical assistance it has rendered in Latin America? I can cite two of its great pieces of construction, and they are only two of many: the great steel plant of the Argentine and the great steel plant of Brazil. How many people know that those steel plants now are being operated, so far as supervisory staff is concerned, by the people of those countries for the most part? Of course, that is even more true with respect to those below the supervisory staff. From this supervisory staff up perhaps 90 percent of the supervisory staff members the employees come from the indigenous population. It took the people who built the plant and invested in the plant a long time to understand the technical background which made it possible to turn the operation of those plants over to the Brazilians and to the people of Argentina. In my judgment that is the most worthwhile type of technical assistance. I could cite legions of examples.

It was interesting to note, as I went through Latin America and talked to American chambers of commerce, their reaction. As the Senator knows, in all principal cities there are U.S. Chamber of Commerce groups, composed of American businessmen who operate in the area. I have always been pleased to find very little criticism from those men in regard to our Embassy staffs and in regard to our Government policies in regard to our commercial relations with Latin America. They have many suggestions for improved policy. Always they will have those. But one does not run into criticism of efficiency, of cooperation, of high standards of personnel.

I am in favor of a career service, with a check upon it by having people out of the career service participate in it to a degree, yet I look at foreign service personnel as the core of our all. Let the technical people decide if I do wish to substitute the British system for the American system. I do not wish to substitute the Canadian system for the American system. I only wish to learn from them the lessons of value they can teach us.

As the Senator knows, those are outstanding career services, by and large. The American Chamber in America could cite legions of examples. One who I think good-naturedly refers to himself—and I refer to Her Majesty's Ambassador in Washington, D.C., at the present time—has not been a career servant; but he is a pretty able one. He climbed up the political ladder in Great Britain. By and large the embassies are operated by men who, as young men, went into the career service and were trained in diplomacy.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Last November I was a member of a senatorial group which made an inspection tour of South American countries. I recall that in every instance there was a group with whom we did confer, the so-called American chambers of commerce, to receive suggestions, advice, and complaints if there were any.

As I recall, on the trip, there was probably a quite limited criticism of the operation of our Embassy offices in the various countries. However, I recall there was very much alarm and apprehension in regard to the hostility which was becoming more apparent on the part of some of the governments in Latin American countries. Some of the governments were proposing punitive measures. Expropriation of American business properties was occurring.

While it was the general consensus of the members of the American business community with whom I was able to confer, every effort should be made to help develop those countries and to stabilize their economies, there was an apparent concern and doubt in regard to whether the American businessmen could accomplish much toward bringing greater stability to those countries.

Does the Senator recognize the threat of expropriation in these countries?

Mr. MORSE. There was a great deal of concern about it in the Committee on Foreign Relations. In fact, the committee discussed it as recently as day before yesterday with State Department officials.

It happened to be my responsibility to ask for it, but as chairman of the subcommittee I asked for the preparation of a memorandum, to be followed by a conference, in respect to the problem in Brazil, about which we have all been hearing or reading so much in the newspapers. We will get that detailed memorandum, and we will be briefed in respect to what steps are being taken by way of negotiations in respect to the problem.

This is one of the most troublesome of all the issues confronting us in Latin America. I shall comment upon it very briefly.

The Senator may recall that in 1960 the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ALEXIS] and I filed a report with the Senate in respect to what our policy should be in connection with the so-called government monopolies in Latin America. I only wish to learn from them the lessons of value they can teach us.

As the Senator knows, those are outstanding career services, by and large. There are a few exceptions. One who who good-naturedly refers to himself—and I refer to Her Majesty's Ambassador in Washington, D.C., at the present time—has not been a career servant; but he is a pretty able one. He climbed up the political ladder in Great Britain. By and large the embassies are operated by men who, as young men, went into the career service and were trained in diplomacy.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Last November I was a member of a senatorial group which made an inspection tour of South American countries. I recall that in every instance there was a group with whom we did confer, the so-called American chambers of commerce, to receive suggestions, advice, and complaints if there were any.

As I recall, on the trip, there was probably a quite limited criticism of the operation of our Embassy offices in the various countries. However, I recall there was very much alarm and apprehension in regard to the hostility which was becoming more apparent on the part of some of the governments in Latin American countries. Some of the governments were proposing punitive measures. Expropriation of American business properties was occurring.
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As the Senator knows, those are outstanding career services, by and large. There are a few exceptions. One who who good-naturedly refers to himself—and I refer to Her Majesty's Ambassador in Washington, D.C., at the present time—has not been a career servant; but he is a pretty able one. He climbed up the political ladder in Great Britain. By and large the embassies are operated by men who, as young men, went into the career service and were trained in diplomacy.
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As I recall, on the trip, there was probably a quite limited criticism of the operation of our Embassy offices in the various countries. However, I recall there was very much alarm and apprehension in regard to the hostility which was becoming more apparent on the part of some of the governments in Latin American countries. Some of the governments were proposing punitive measures. Expropriation of American business properties was occurring.

While it was the general consensus of the members of the American business community with whom I was able to confer, every effort should be made to help develop those countries and to stabilize their economies, there was an apparent concern and doubt in regard to whether the American businessman could accomplish much toward bringing greater stability to those countries.
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is not the feeling of the Senator from Oregon that during all those years, particularly since shortly after the end of World War II, when Senator Vandenberg exercised such great leadership in bringing about this nonpartisan feeling, the Committee on Foreign Relations has acted in that respect with reference to all questions before it?

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt of it. The point I want to make is that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], our present chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], who is the ranking Democrat on the committee next to the chairman, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], who are the ranking Republicans on the committee—and I shall say something further about them in a moment—has given us the assurance that in the committee we shall follow the Vandenberg policy of which I have just referred, I do as "unpartisanship," and which I refer to as "nonpartisanship."

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield to me further, I would particularly like to call your attention to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Dworsshak] a point of which he knows, I am sure, but one that is pertinent at this time. The Senator from Wyoming has talked about some of the various forces that play upon the final determination of an issue involving our international relations with any particular country.

Iowa by Vermont omitted one particular force. It is something that I think has played a very great part in international relations over the last several years. That has been the frequent consultation between the executive branch—sometimes the President and sometimes the Secretary of State—and the Foreign Relations Committee, and particularly the subcommittees of that committee. Elaborating upon that subject, there is a pulling in of congressional representation in connection with international consultation.

I remember when the OAS Conference was held at Punta del Este in connection with the Cuban situation. The distinguished Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Latin American subcommittee, and the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], who was the ranking Republican member of that subcommittee, were invited from the Senate to accompany the Secretary of State. The delegation that went there included two Representatives from the House. They were my colleague from Alabama, Representative Robert L. Meek, and Mr. Hickenlooper, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the House of Representatives, and Representative Chester E. Merrow, from New Hampshire, who is the ranking Republican member of that committee. The four of them went down to Punta del Este. I was particularly interested in the reports that came back from that conference during the time of that conference.

I do not know whether the point has been called to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, but from time to time during the course of that conference we received reports that the delegation had exercised a great influence on that conference. I had the pleasure of being at the White House when the delegation returned. I heard the President pay his respects to the work that had been done. He called the names of the four congressional representatives who went to that conference and paid his respects to the work that had been done.

Later, when Secretary of State Rusk was making his remarks, he likewise called the names of the four representatives and said that the work had accomplished. At times the part that has been played by the fine cooperation and coordination between the executive and legislative branches of our Government has been overlooked.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have the comments of the Senator from Alabama. I wish to say a word about my Republican colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee. I do not think has played a very great part in the American people by and large recognize that fact. At the same time, as a religious people we feel that in some way, somehow, resolution will come to prevail in the Russian minds and that they will be willing to sit down with us and negotiate the kind of disarmament agreement that the President so nobly and eloquently presented once again to the American people yesterday.

Every indication is that they are not. I have made clear that I support the President's program for the resumption of limited atmospheric testing if the Russians are not willing to accept an enforceable control system. Every indication is that they are not taking the paradoxical situation in which we find ourselves in respect to the resumption of atmospheric testing. I had made the point that we must make the choice among degrees of immorality. That is difficult. I have made clear that I support the President's program for the resumption of limited atmospheric testing if the Russians are not willing to accept an enforceable control system. Every indication is that they are not taking the paradoxical situation in which we find ourselves in respect to the resumption of atmospheric testing. I had made the point that we must make the choice among degrees of immorality. That is
is also a speech the premises of which must be accepted by the leaders of the nations of the world if we are to leave to our grandchildren the heritage of freedom.

Some say to me, "Mr. Senator, you keep on saying that we have got to do this to buy time."

Some, not so kind, have said to me, "Mr. Senator, you keep saying that we have got to have more time, but will you tell us how much time we can risk?"

I cannot answer that question, other than to say that as long as there is hope, no other course is open to us.

I cannot imagine our making the mistake of changing this course of action which is giving so much hope to so many millions of people in the so-called weaker countries. They themselves recognize the fact that their hope for survival is for the United States, eventually with our Western allies, to lead the nations of the world to an enforceable disarmament agreement.

Once in a while I hear critics of the United Nations deplore the fact that many smaller nations and more underdeveloped nations than the United States have an equal voice in the United Nations with the United States. They seem to think that some great danger lurks in that fact.

I have sat in the United Nations. I wish to say that in the General Assembly the doctrine of equality, as far as votes are concerned, is one of the greatest achievements. I am not one of those who would give to the militarily mighty in the United Nations a greater voice than I would to smaller nations. I have seen those smaller nations operate. They recognize that their only hope for survival is putting into international practice the ideals of a Roosevelt and a Vandenberg and the program of a Truman.

We have a cause that stands upon its merits. When we talk on these international problems in the United Nations, we do not have to worry about the acceptance of the merits of our case.

I sat there during the session when Khrushchev came to the United Nations in a rage, because he had to leave the Council Chamber that he had occupied by the United Nations. The great Dag Hammarskjold made perfectly clear to the Russians, when they were trying to move into the Congo, that unless they moved out they would be moved out. I have always thought that was one of the main reasons for Khrushchev's high state of rage when he came to New York and made his famous speech. He had been so powerfully which attempted to hamstring the effectiveness of the General Assembly.

I close this section of my speech by saying that I want the Record to show that I support the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Humphrey), and give full and complete support to the President of the United States in regard to his program both in the field of testing and in the field of disarmament.

There are other developments in American foreign policy that concern me very much in these hours. So I close my speech with the last section, which deals with some problems of Latin America.

I speak in the capacity of my chairmanship of the Subcommittee that deals with Latin American affairs.

There are thousands of Cuban exiles in the United States who one could give greater support to their admission to the United States than the senior Senator from Oregon. In keeping with the spirit of the words engraved on the Statue of Liberty, we once opened our doorways to the oppressed. We have become a great refuge and escape asylum for them. I am proud of it as an American. I am in favor of continuing to give them this haven of freedom. I speak respect most respectfully when I say that they, too, have responsibilities and obligations, which they in turn owe to the United States.

Therefore, I am concerned, when I pick up the New York Times and read a headline: "Ex-Castro Officers Build Force in the United States."

The article reads, in part:

WASHINGTON, April 16.—A compact guerrilla force built around former officers of Premier Fidel Castro's army is being organized in Florida and Puerto Rico for eventual action against the Cuban regime.

According to Cuban informants, this force has been in preparation since last summer and may be ready for action as early as a result of the deterioration of the island's economic and political situation.

The group's recruiting headquarters is in Miami, and most of its training is conducted in Florida on an individual basis. The new guerrilla force has no direct connections, however, with the invasion group.

The bulk of this force is made up of officers and men who were prevented for political reasons from participating in the rebel invasion of Cuba a year ago yesterday. The Central Intelligence Agency was in charge of that invasion attempt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the Record.

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

Ex-Castro Officers Build Force in the United States

WASHINGTON, April 16.—A compact guerrilla force built around former officers of Premier Fidel Castro's army is being organized in Florida and Puerto Rico for eventual action against the Cuban regime.

According to Cuban informants, this force has been in preparation since last summer and may be ready for action as early as a result of the deterioration of the island's economic and political situation.

The group's recruiting headquarters is in Miami, and most of its training is conducted in Florida on an individual basis. The new guerrilla force has no direct connections, however, with the invasion group.

The bulk of this force is made up of officers and men who were prevented for political reasons from participating in the rebel invasion of Cuba a year ago yesterday. The Central Intelligence Agency was in charge of that invasion attempt.

The group's recruiting headquarters is in Miami, and most of its training is conducted in Florida on an individual basis. The new guerrilla force has no direct connections, however, with the invasion group.

The Central Intelligence Agency was in charge of that invasion attempt.

The objection against these men last year was that although they were violently anti-Castro, they favored certain aspects of the Cuban socialist revolution. Many of them had broken out of Cuban prisons to reach the United States.

A large segment of the new force is made up of men identified with the People's Revolution Movement, which is headed by Manuel Ray, who, during the 1961 invasion, belonged to the Cuban Revolutionary Council. The abortive attack was staged in the name of the United Nations. However, an estimated total of 170 volunteers from the Revolutionary Movement were killed in the abortive action.

The United Nations deplores the fact that the United States grant them freedom of movement to aid them at a later stage, should the need arise.

Recently, informants said, Col. Ramon Barquin, a Cuban regular army officer and forced in flighting to Miami in 1959, announced to Senator Bay, agreed to head the new force.

Colonel Barquin, who now lives in Puerto Rico, where he operates a boys' military academy, just finished a lecture tour of South America.

His top aids are reported to be Col. Martin Helena, who was chief of staff of the 1961 invasion army until he was deposed by a rightwing revolt in the Guatemala training camp, and Capt. Jose Pison, who was head of the movement's military camp in Florida.

Another contingent participating in the new force is the so-called Huber Matos Garrison group. This force is made up of officers of Premier Castro's "Rebel Army," the former name of the Cuban military establishment—who served under Maj. Huber Matos in Cumanagui Province in 1959.

At one time, Khrushchev tried to resign his post in protest against the Communist infiltration in the army. He was arrested by Dr. Castro and sentenced to 30 years in prison.

Officers Escaped

Most of his officers were jailed, but succeeded in fleeing to Miami in 1960. Although they offered their services to the invasion army, they were kept out, reportedly on orders of the CIA. Their leader is Capt. Napoleon Becker.

The main advantages of the new group are that most of the members have guerrilla experience, and that there are many Cubans among the officers in Dr. Castro's rebel army in Cuba.

Intelligence reports have indicated that numerous officers and men in the Cuban army—and even in the militia—are in sympathy with anti-Castro movements. But the reports say they must be given to join the ranks of an active opposition.

The new guerrilla group rules cut political ties with any Cuban refugee group and plans to operate primarily as a military entity. Some of its men are civilian underground specialists in sabotage.

Castro for Blank

KEY WEST, Fla., April 18.—Havana radio said today that Premier Castro's force had shot down a counterrevolutionary in an abortive attempt that was made under instructions from U.S. Intelligence Agency agents at the Guantanamo Naval Base.

The announcement of the death of the counterrevolutionary, Herberto Rodrigues Pena, followed a report by the Havana radio that Dr. Castro and ten anti-Castro agents had taken refuge at the U.S. Naval Base and were agitating for weapons to fight the Cuban Government.

Intelligence agencies have been circulating this report in as many days of action against counterrevolutionaries.

The Havana broadcast said Senor Rodriguez was shot several days ago in Santiago.
de Cuba. The city is an important port about 40 miles southwest of Guantanamo Bay.

Yesterday the radio reported the slaying of Osvaldo Ramirez Garcia, a top counterrevolutionary leader who had participated in the armed struggle against the Castro regime since mid-1959.

FREE PRISONERS ARRIVE HERE

Seven Cuban prisoners arrived at New York International Airport yesterday and made an emotional appeal for funds to liberate the 1,119 Cuban prisoners still being held by Premier Castro.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I have checked with the State Department, as was my duty upon a reading of that article, which has been assured that there is no U.S. involvement in or knowledge of such training operations in Florida. I made it perfectly clear that I intended to make a statement today in regard to what was meant when Premier Rector initiated the good-neighbor policy.

But the fear by Latin America of American intervention has plagued us for decades. I think we must make it perfectly clear that at this hour that the Cuban exile leaders, who, in my judgment, are betraying the obligation they owe their sanctuary, are presenting propaganda that is no part of American foreign policy. Yet I am concerned at how many persons seem to think—for I get their letters—that the way to handle Castro is to go in and conquer his country with American military might.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, let me make clear that if any aggressive course of action were to be taken against the United States by Cuba or, through Cuba, by Russia, Red China, or any of the other members of the Communist bloc, it would be no question as to what our position then would be. However, there is a great deal of difference between belligerent nations and a country becoming an aggressor, regardless of the nature of the political sovereignty against which a country engaged in such aggression, whether it be Communist, Fascist, or of some other political ideology. The Cuban exile leaders who are advocating an American invasion of Cuba are proposing that the United States become an aggressor, in violation of all its treaty commitments—those under the OAS Treaty, the Rio Treaty, the Caracas Treaty, and the other treaties to which our Nation's signature has been affixed.

Yesterday at the Foreign Relations Committee a statement by the Honorable Spruille Braden, a member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. I wish to comment briefly on it, because I want the Record to leave no room for doubt that I reject and repudiate any thought or proposal of U.S. invasion of Cuba. I have some right to speak on this subject, because I led the fight in this body some years ago against U.S. support of Batista, that the public hearing held by my subcommittee in January 1958, as the Recomp will show, that brought out the admission by the State Department that Batista could not remain in power without outside help. We, who knew anything about Latin America knew that that was true. Some of us had for some time dared to challenge such aid by this military might. Problems in Latin America have been caused by too much exportation of bullets rather than bread to that area of the world. Many of the problems in Latin America have been caused by the American military interventions of the past, and we have been decades in living it down. Only in recent years has there developed a better understanding of how many persons seem to think—for I get their letters—that the way to handle Castro is to go in and conquer his country with American military might.

Mr. President, not one more hour should be allowed to pass without our registering a protest, here in the Senate, against the propaganda activities in this country by some of the Cuban exile leaders. But such activities are not limited to the Cuban exile leaders.

Yesterday, there was submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a statement by the Honorable Spruille Braden, a member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. I wish to comment briefly on it, because I want the Record to leave no room for doubt that I reject and repudiate any thought or proposal of U.S. invasion of Cuba.
I read the following from the Washington Star of yesterday:

BRADEN URGES CUBA INVASION

Spruille Braden, a former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba, said today an all-out invasion of the island would be the only way to rid the Caribbean country of communism. "If we wipe out the Communists in Cuba," Mr. Braden said, "we will fail everywhere else in the Americas."

Mr. Braden told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this week that approval of President Kennedy's 10-year, $20 billion Alliance for Progress program of aid to Latin American countries would be "a criminal waste of the taxpayers' money."

"The first, imperative, and for the moment the only thing to do," he said, "is immediately and quickly to drive communism out of Cuba and then out of the rest of the hemisphere, including our own country."

That is completely irresponsible talk by Mr. Braden.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

GOVERNOR EGAN'S CORRECT COURSE IN SEIZING JAPANESE FISHING VESSELS IN ALASKAN WATERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, upon the recommendation of Governor A. Egan, of Alaska, the State of Alaska has seized two Japanese fishing boats that were fishing in Shelikof Strait, located between Kodiak Island and the Alaskan mainland.

The invasion of Alaska's fishing grounds by foreign vessels—Japanese and Russian—in recent months has been a very sore point with the people of Alaska. The fisheries—salmon, halibut, herring, king crab—have been and are Alaska's principal economic resource to the people of Alaska, and Russian-in recent months has been a very sore point with the people of Alaska.
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The invasion of Alaska's fishing grounds by foreign vessels—Japanese and Russian—in recent months has been a very sore point with the people of Alaska. The fisheries—salmon, halibut, herring, king crab—have been and are Alaska's principal economic resource to the people of Alaska, and Russian-in recent months has been a very sore point with the people of Alaska.

Mr. President, let us consider for a moment that hypothesis. Let us assume that utter madness overcame our judgment, and that as madmen followed such a course of action, what would be our justification in terms of international law, or in light of our commitments under the OAS Charter and the Strategic Alliances with Britain, France, and the Republic of China, the Eisenhower Treaty, and the other treaties to which we are signatory; and what would be our answer in the United Nations when a resolution to that effect was introduced, and when it was asserted that we had violated treaty after treaty under which we had pledged ourselves to follow a nonaggressive course of action?

The Braden philosophy—and let me say it is held by too many persons in this country—is the philosophy of a return to the point of view that might make right. It never has, and never will.

I am satisfied that the information I have received in my capacity as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee is correct when I have been told by our military that it is an attempt at such an invasion in its early stages would cost a minimum of 40,000 lives of American boys.

When the cause is just and right, there is no question about the courage of man and the military and other experts that an attempt at such an invasion in its early stages would cost a minimum of 40,000 lives of American boys, in the early stages of the invasion, when that cause would be unjust and wrong so far as American foreign policy is concerned.

I think the time has come when we no longer can take in silence the insidious and invidious propaganda program going on in our country to sell the American people the proposition that we ought to seize Cuba.

In closing, let me say that we can seize Cuba. But there would be sacrifices that cannot be justified in such a course of action, and in the history of international outlawry. And would we be ready, Mr. President, to face the consequences in the rest of Latin America? Would we be ready to lose the support of the masses of Latin America, if we concluded such a course of action? Would we be ready to face the great crisis that would mount as one government after another toppled in Latin America?

The Bradens and their ilk are strengthening the Communist cause in Latin America by the irresponsible sponsorship of an aggressive course of action on the part of the United States of America. I commend the President and the prevailing American foreign policy in Latin America. It is a policy of statesmanship and reality. It is a policy of avoid keeping faith with our ideals and inconsistent with our glorious history."

Mr. President, I have made myself unequivocally clear that, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin-American Relations, I shall continue to stand out against those who aid and abet communism in Latin America, however unwillingly and unknowingly, by advocating American unilateral military action against Cuba.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
be the mistaken views and assumptions expressed in an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, April 18, which was highly critical of Governor Egan's action. I state my opinion that this editorial be printed at this point in my remarks. There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ALASKA ON ITS OWN

Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska apparently needs to be reminded that Alaska joined the Union as an independent nation. His seizure of two fishing vessels during the last few days in Shelikof Strait and the arrest of the captain of another Japanese boat on charges of fishing without a license were undertaken without the advice or consent of the State Department. The Governor took upon himself the responsibility for creating an international incident that appears to be beyond his jurisdiction.

In defense of his action Governor Egan contends that Shelikof Strait between the Alaska Peninsula and Kodiak Island is international waters, but that seems to be in conflict with the view of the Department of State. The Government has asserted no claim that these waters vary from 3 to 30 miles, constitutes inland waters, and it would doubtless be very difficult to get such a claim recognized if it did so. Of course, Alaska has no standing to assert independent claims on questions of this sort.

The State does have authority, under an act of Congress, to control fishing off its shores out to the traditional 3-mile limit of sovereign jurisdiction recognized by the United States. Some reports are to the effect that one boat was seized 1 mile inside these territorial waters, and the controversy over whether that place may happen to be settled in court. Apart from this, however, Governor Egan has handled the problem with little regard for its delicacy.

Mr. Egan did protest to the State Department against what he regarded as illegal fishing from a Japanese fleet in Shelikof Strait. Both the State and Interior Departments sent men to consult with the Governor and the Federal authorities violated the protest instead of waiting until they could report their findings in Washington. Governor Egan acted against the Japanese fishermen without so much as an official Department of his intention. Whatever the final outcome may be, it needs to be taught a lesson to the effect that national relations are handled by the Department of State.

Mr. GRUENING: Mr. President, it is Governor Egan's view, which I share, that he felt compelled to act because of the inability to get appropriate and timely action by the State Department.

I telephoned Governor Egan Wednesday morning to read him the Post's editorial. Governor Egan informed me, first things first, that Shelikof Strait has always been considered Alaskan waters. He stated to me categorically that in territorial days these waters had been subjected to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government charged with that responsibility—the Fish and Wildlife Service. Since statehood these functions have been assumed by the State government, specifically the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

When the Japanese fishing fleet began invading these waters, Governor Egan wrote the State Department on March 30 and April 2. Hearing nothing, he telephoned Acting Secretary George Ball on April 9. To the Governor's surprise and consternation. Acting Secretary Ball had no inkling of the previously sent letter and telegram. At Governor Egan's insistence, the State Department sent a representative to Alaska which, however, this representative said it would require some 3 weeks for him to make up his mind whether the Japanese fishing was illegal.

By that time, Governor Egan naturally feared that the Japanese boats would have secured their catch of fish and departed, or, if succeeded by other fishing vessels in the absence of any restraint, they would be permitted to contact with Alaskan fishermen, who would be reaching these areas in their own boats, with possibly unfortunate consequences. It should be noted that our Alaskan fishermen are subject to strict regulation in the interest of conservation. Foreign vessels can and do flout those conservation regulations, and, can, in a few weeks, destroy the livelihood of a considerable number of our own fishermen, and the efforts of our regulatory agencies.

Certainly by Governor Egan's prompt action he eliminated the possibility of violation of our laws and regulations, which in past decades has occurred between Alaskan and Japanese fishermen in analogous circumstances.

In addition to that, it was clear at least one of these boats, if not more, had actually been fishing within the 3-mile limit.

I would say that I had a similar experience which may be pertinent, some months ago.

On that occasion I was informed by Governor Egan that Russian fishing vessels were in Alaskan territorial waters and that he had sent a telegram to the Secretary of State, asking the Department of State immediately to notify the Navy and the Coast Guard to send out appropriate vessels or planes in order to observe these operations and see whether they were of law and treaty arrangements. This took place on a Tuesday. On Thursday, wishing to satisfy myself as to what was going on, I telephoned Admiral Caldwell at Kodiak, Alaska, commanding of the 17th Naval District and of the Alaska Sea Frontier. In reply to my amicable request to send word whatever from the State Department, and my phone call was his first apprision of the situation.

I immediately telephoned the Acting Secretary of State, but was unable to reach him for a few hours. It was only upon my very urgent insistence that I finally was able to talk to him by phone. The Acting Secretary said that Alaskans are genuinely disturbed about what they consider to be encroachments by Japanese—and Russians as well—in the state's territorial waters. Under these circumstances the State Department ought to sound an alarm bell when and if future tries for help from Alaska are needed here.

Mr. GRUENING: Mr. President, I am happy to report, however, that the State Department appears now to be taking a much more conciliatory attitude. I was informed yesterday by Secretary Ball that the prosecution in the Alaska courts will proceed without objection by the State Department and that an emphatic demand will be made of the Japanese to keep out of Shelikof Strait until a legal determination may be made as to the rightful— which the government of Alaska affirms—ownership of these waters to be domestic, and not international, waters.

In my view that Governor Egan deserves commendation for acting as and when he did. In the circumstance I was the only way to bring an intolerable situation to a head and to clarify the issues. It is my hope that the State Department will now insist vigorously on the protection of our American interests in Alaska.

I would like to say, also, that I am hopeful that the Japanese, with whom Governor Egan has been in contact, will maintain a pattern of useful and mutually beneficial commercial relations, will take a reasonable view.
of this situation and accommodate themselves to Alaska's position. We in Alaska appreciate Japan's problems. Japanese capital has, in part, financed a most useful enterprise, a pulp mill in Sitka. But the Japanese are exporting Alaskan lumber and are further interested in the acquisition of various of Alaska's raw materials, minerals, oil, and other products which belong to Alaska, and which Alaska would be willing to sell. We hope that this developing commercial intercourse and an otherwise friendly relationship will not be jeopardized.

However, it is, in my opinion, the almost unanimous view of Alaskans that the invasion of our traditional Alaskan fishing grounds by foreign vessels would be intolerable. I heartily support that view. Shelikof Strait is only one of these fishing grounds.

What really should be secured, besides an extension of these rights, is the extension of our fishing grounds to a 12-mile limit. The 3-mile limit is an obsolete provision dating from days when 3 miles was the approximate distance between the shore and the fishing grounds.

The seizure of the vessels and the arrests brought immediate reaction from the Japanese Government in Tokyo. Officials there called on the U.S. Government to make an affirmation of these rights, is the extension of our fishing grounds to a 12-mile limit. We are confident no violation is involved.
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STATE TAKES TWO VESSELS, ARRESTS THREE CAPTAINS

KODIAK—A second Japanese fishing boat has been seized and the captains of three Japanese fishing vessels charged in Alaska Superior Court with poaching in Alaska waters.

The seizure of the vessels and the arrests brought immediate reaction from the Japanese Government in Tokyo. Officials there called on the U.S. Government to make an affirmation of these rights, is the extension of our fishing grounds to a 12-mile limit.

In Tokyo, the Japanese Foreign Office said it had cabled the Embassy in Washington to ask for a full report from the U.S. Government. Officials said the Japanese Government would protest if it found the Japanese ships had not violated territorial waters.

Also in Tokyo, a spokesman for the Taiyo Fisheries Co., which owns the vessels, commented:

"We have ordered the fleet to operate at least 5 miles off the coast of the United States, 2 miles outside the accepted territorial waters. We are confident no violation is involved."

Shelikof Strait, varying in width from 50 to 100 miles, separates the Alaskan Island and the Alaska Peninsula. Alaska claims it as inland waters, reasoning that it is an extension of the Alaskan land mass off the southern tip of the Kenai Peninsula, which forms the eastern shore of Cook Inlet.

Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska said the strait traditionally has been an inland body of water. "He said it had been regulated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service before Alaska was a State and by the State ever since statehood."

Egan wrote and wired George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, asking the Federal Government not to let it be first sighted. He said this week's action was taken without notification to Federal authorities, because he had not received any satisfaction from them.

The Governor said he was in telephone contact yesterday with the Departments of State and Justice. In Washington, neither Department would comment.

Alleged poaching by Japanese fishermen has been a hot issue in Alaska for at least 25 years. In 1938, the Alaska delegate in Congress, Anthony Dimond, even suggested the State's department of fish and game should seize Japanese boats encroaching on Alaska waters.

Tension continued until and after World War II, but this is believed to have been the first time arrests were made.

TWO CAPTAINS PROMISE TO RETURN

KODIAK—Two Japanese fishing vessel captains arrested Saturday night in Shelikof Strait for alleged violation of Alaska fishing regulations were released following their arraignment here yesterday on condition they return when further court proceedings are scheduled.

Capt. Mongoo Hansasaki, master of the mother ship, Banshu Maru, and the captain of a catcher boat seized Saturday night by the State, Tadao Higashama, were arraigned here before Superior Court Judge Edward V. Davis who had been flown from Anchorage in an Alaska Air National Guard C-123 for the proceeding.

The two captains speak no English and an interpreter located in Kodiak had an insufficient grasp of English to permit Davis to communicate with them and that they had a right to counsel before further proceedings are undertaken against them.

Hansasaki, wearing a blue uniform with four gold stripes on each sleeve, rose to his feet each time a question was asked by Mrs. Kinuko Perleke, interpreter at length, with great dignity. Davis understood him to say that he believed he had been operating in international waters.

"He can't understand why he came here," Mrs. Perkins told Davis.

Assistant District Attorney Dick Bradley, who with Clarence Weberg, Director of the Division of Protection in the Department of Fish and Game, have been directing the vessel seizure operations from Kodiak, appeared for arraignment.

Upon Bradley's recommendation, the judge set bail in the case at $25,000 and ordered the men to return seized Saturday held in lieu of the bail.

Davis said the captains would be released if they promised to return when their presence was required. The captains made the promise but said he would not leave his ship "if a storm comes."

"I say so;" the promise, saying he understood that men have no control over the acts of nature.

Hansasaki was being returned to his ship by the State today. Higashama returned to his boat at anchor in Kodiak Harbor.

The captain of another vessel boarded by the State last night is expected to be arraigned here late today before Superior Court Judge James Fitzgerald who will fly from Anchorage.

Davis yesterday ordered Bradley to contact the nearest Japanese consulate and ask for a legal assistance for the men under arrest.

ALASKAN NAUT SCRAMBS SUCCESS

(Exclusive)

Everything could have gone wrong—but the Alaskan navy in its first action Saturday night, against a foreign fishing vessel off Kodiak Island was eminently successful.

For more than a week the state's department of fish and game had watched from a helicopter a fleet of the 1,772-ton Japanese mother ship, Banshu Maru and her five smaller catcher boats encroaching on Alaskan waters. They are not sleek fast patrol vessels, the Japanese fishermen have greater cruising speed. They are not sleek fast patrol boats. One is a power barge, the Widgeon, that can do 8 knots, and the other the Teal, looks more like a fishing boat but is armed with .50-caliber machine guns, 8mm guns armed with 400 rounds of ammunition for each gun.

On Saturday, a Japanese catcher boat, the Ohtori Maru No. 5, was spotted at anchor off Uganik Bay, and Gov. William A. Egan decided to seize it.

Shortly after 5 p.m. Saturday the two Alaskan vessels got underway from anchorages in two different bays—the Teel from Uyak Bay and the Widgeon from Port Bailey in Kupreanof Strait—and converged on the Japanese fishing boat at near maximum speed.

The weather was clear and the water unusually smooth.

On each Alaska vessel were several National Guardsmen, State police, and agents of the fish and game department. The guardsmen had been issued ammunition for their weapons, which included automatic fire power.

No one was sure just how the operation would be concluded, but there was no antici-

pation of trouble with the Japanese. Abroad the Japanese Government is supposed that a shot probably should be fired across the bow of the Japanese vessel but wasn't sure how you do that.
But Egan had given explicit orders—the Japanese vessel was to be seized and nothing should be allowed to interfere with the operation.

When the two patrol vessels approached the Ohtori Maru it was riding at anchor. No one on board the Japanese vessel for Menard had any intention of running. It was de­cided the guardsmen, in their battle dress, could be more effective by going below and staying out of sight.

The Widgeon, skippered by Lynn Crosby, was the first vessel to come out on the deck of their vessel and appeared to be a bit puzzled as to what was going on. The Test, under the command of Howard Marks, was coming up on their port side.

Widgeon crewmen heaved some lines over on the Ohtori Maru and the Japanese made them fast. It was 8 p.m. and growing dark. Crosby was elated at having gotten his hogs to the Japanese vessel first.

"For an old fish like this that's pretty good," he grinned. "I could have taken the guardsmen off the engines and got 400 more rpm's. If I was in a hurry I would."

State Police Capt. E. L. Mayfield, W. B. (Buck) Storer, ares protection supervisor for the Game Department, and Sueman Moon, a Japanese-speaking Kodiak cannyery employee, went aboard the Japanese vessel. Howard Marks, skipper of the Widgeon, was under arrest for commercial fishing without a license and failing to obtain a vessel and fishing gear licenses from the State.

Higashama was asked to come to Kodiak to answer the charges against him. The State representatives emphasized there was nothing personal about the arrest—the State wanted only to assert its right to inland and territorial waters. He was arraigned Friday morning. Hanasaki, captain of the mother ship, which was about 6 miles away. Hanasaki con­fessed to the guard and told them of his plight. Hanasaki said he would bring his ship over and confer with the officers. The Test went alongside her when she arrived off Ugulik Bay, and the same officers went aboard. After nearly 2 hours of dis­cussions, Hanasaki agreed to go into Kodiak with the Test and the Ohtori Maru.

In Kodiak harbor yesterday morning, while awaiting the arrival of U.S. Public Health Service Officer M. K. Lindburg from Anchorage to conduct a quarantine inspection, Hanasaki said he was surprised Alaskans were so upset over the presence of his boat in their harbor. His fleet was prospecting for herring but had not yet begun to fish, he said. He said he believed he was operating in international waters.

He had been charged by Alaskans with oper­ating a commercial fishing enterprise with­out providing the Department of Fish and Game with a written statement of intention to operate in State waters.

On April 1, the date of the alleged viola­tion, the Japanese had caught some herring but did so only for subsistence he said. A ship he kept, between Ugulik Bay, and drifted into a Kodiak island bay and a larger vessel went in to retrieve it, he said.

Department of Fish and Game agents said the Japanese had been spotted within the 3-mile limit around Kodiak on several occasions.

They finally calculated the Ohtori Maru was 1 mile within the limit in 50 fathoms of water off Ugulik Bay when seized by the State.

AN EASTER PRAYER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as we enter the concluding days of Holy Week, we enter the last observance of the Lenten and paschal Friday, and we approach Easter Sunday with hope, light, and life.

This gives us strength and courage to carry on in a world that is fraught with distrust, unrest, and deep trouble.

God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore, we will not fear, though the earth be removed and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea. He maketh wars to cease unto the ends of the earth.

At this Easter season we pray that the glory of the Lord may shine on Thy people of every name; make them strong in the dark days ahead, rooted in the stability of faith until peace and rest shall be won. Oh, lead the struggle to eman­cipation all people in bondage and redeem the sacrifice and toil of the noble living and the noble dead.

Dr. James Shera Montgomery, a for­mer Chaplain of the House of Representa­tives, whom we all loved, concluded one of his prayers with the following:

Break every weapon forged in fires of hate, Turn the tocsin that would assail Thy gate, Where fields of strife lie desolate and bare Take Thy sweet flowers of peace and plant them there. Come, blessed peace, as when in hush of eye God's benediction falls on souls that grieve. As shines the star when weary day departs, Come, peace of God, and shine in every heart.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe there is no further business to come before the Senate. Therefore, pursuant to the previous order, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the previous order, until Monday, April 23, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 19, 1963:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Stephen J. Roth, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Clifford O'Sullivan, elevated.

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

Walter M. Kotelny, of Maryland, to be the Representative of the United States to the 17th plenary session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3294 and 3299.

To be lieutenant colonel

To be major

To be first lieutenant

Ahagos, Kenneth, M. O1493.
Ahrell, Louis, H. O08461.
Aboe, Kenneth H., O180767.
Alh, Frederick T., O17044.
Adams, Collins W., O213001.
Adams, Billy J., O169933.
Adams, Charles M., O59126.
Adams, Baxter W., O22447.
Adams, Earl R., Jr., O25288.
Adams, Marvin L., O06122.
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To be Major, Chapman
Brady, John C., O76859.
Dolan, Francis J., 073444.
Dyer, Robert H., 071917.
Farrow, Alpha A., O71668.
Rutchen, Gordon E., 072313.
Ketchenad, Corbin W., 063343.
Kettel, Earl C., O76832.
Killing, Joseph G., O71687.
Kittermann, Henry O., O75223.
LeBlanc, Paul J., O71694.
Hutchins, Gordon E.
Yerkes, Walter E.
Yerkes, Charles
Yepsen, John H., 069667.
Younger, Ralph K., 070873.
Zirger, Walter B., 066665.
Zohn, Jerome, O69220.
Zollfiffer, Marion B., O68184.
Zumwald, Charles B., 066769.

To be major, Dental Corps
Aderson, Thomas I., 070665.
Alexander, William N., 075666.
Andrews, James L., 076466.
Buck, Lynden L., 076580.
Crowe, Patrick D., 078045.
Davis, Quince B., 078059.
Davis, Thomas H., 076661.
Graham, William E., 084686.
Horkowitz, Gabriel W., 085573.
Hove, Michael J., 076677.
Jaggers, Joe W., 078059.
Jones, Rex D., O81911.
Lee, Leslie M., 068660.
Legg, William H., 084603.
Morgan, Samuel C., 078104.
Paul, Parks S., 081747.
Seibert, James B., 070867.
Smith, Duncan M., 072299.
Steele, Richard A., O86813.

To be major, Veterinary Corps
Brown, Heyward G., O75664.
Grippen, J. Jr., 071479.
Powder, James L., 072669.
Hays, William L., 071868.
Lorenzen, Kay W., 068375.
Mack, Robert, 070763.
Watson, Robert W., 073250.

To be major, Women’s Army Corps
Bray, Lydia M., L00574.
Buzziotti, Hildi Helen J., L00297.
Kilthner, Martha C., L00384.
Hill, Georgia D., L00388.
Lee, Allie B., 076884.
Long, Alice A., L00464.
Stier, Helen D., L00390.

To be major, Medical Corps
Akers, William A., 073485.
Austerman, Worthington, O73121.
Baker, Floyd W., 071051.
Barrett, O’Neill Jr., 072321.
Baugh, Joseph H., O76494.
Berbery, Maurice S., O73126.
Boyd, Howard A., O72387.
Bridges, Berry E., O76669.
Burkett, Earl E., 071897.
Carey, Philip O., O72328.
Cecarelli, Frank E., O76299.
Chambliss, Stuart A., Jr., 071459.
Conrad, Marcel E., Jr., 071658.
Cox, Dana D., O76472.
Cox, Robert A., Jr., 076473.
Crudo, Frank J., Jr., O72665.
Dalton, James B., O74671.
Dixon, Leon M., Jr., O76490.
Edwards, Leon C., O75610.
Fenstermacher, James M., O73054.
Ford, George W., O75558.
Fulton, Nolen W., Jr., O74666.
Guenter, Kenneth E., O75164.
Hanssen, Thomas A., 075687.
Hansen, Charles W., Jr., O76380.
Johnson, Walne C., O71816.
Kent, Alfred H., O71866.
Kimbrugh, Edward E., 076959.
Kortis, Edward V., 071099.
Longfellow, Don W., O70695.
Louro, Jose M., O72312.
MacNell, Donald S., O76699.
Mandel, John 0., O76667.
McAuliffe, Archbishop W., O71702.
McGregor, John G., O72688.
Mendelsohn, Rabin B., O75301.
Morse, Dwight E., Jr., O73076.
Murphy, Thomas B., O76453.
The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be second lieutenants, Chaplain Corps

Sather, Donald R., D-2952868

To be captains, Dental Corps

Adams, Herbert P., Jr., D-20453293
Andrews, D. M., D-20453647
Beecher, Robert H., Jr., D-20451108
Betta, Allan F., D-20451105
Cal, Thomas H., D-20451115
McNeill, Thomas J., D-20452679
Morton, Charles B., D-20451165
Proctor, Robert F., D-20452199
Rieman, Raymond L., D-20451125
Swartz, Harold M., D-20451150

To be captains, Medical Corps

Anschauer, Rudi, D-20451165
Blizard, Eugene B., D-20451170
Coffey, John J., D-20451180
Dinaham, Ralph J., Jr., D-20451205
Edgell, Joseph W., D-20451180
Coppola, Ralph J., D-20451215
Eller, Jimmie L., D-20451125
Fortner, Robert H., D-20451135
Garcia, Luis F., D-20451128
Helmy, Robert F., D-20451160
Howland, Austin, D-20451155
Kislal, John J., D-20451175
Lowe, Reginald S., D-20451185
McDonald, Robert H., D-20451190
McNaney, Joseph W., Jr., D-20451200
Miehr, Michael F., D-20451195
Pike, William E., D-20451110
Ramey, Norman L., D-20451170
Riemann, Raymond L., D-20451145
Seyler, Gerald P., D-20451195
Stonebush, Frank D., D-20451185
Swartz, Harold M., D-20451205
Tabor, Joseph W., Jr., D-20451150
Thomas, Walter L., D-20451180
Walter, Daniel L., D-20451135
Will, Franz J. P., D-20451190
Wood, Luther W., Jr., D-20451125
Yadon, Lowell D., D-20451190

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Chlunick, Orell C., Jr., D-20455477
Wycok, George H., Jr., D-20455485

To be lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Kaiser, John L., D-20455486
Lee, Linda, N2927010
MacTaggart, Eunice, N2927071
Scott, Robert L., N5407192

To be second lieutenants, Chaplain Corps

Beaver, Rehnard W., D-20451165
Breton, Thomas F., D-20451180
Clark, Donald D., D-20451165
Hilton, Gerald E., D-20451180
Matthias, Charles B., D-20451115
Rivers, Daniel L., D-20451125
Thomas, Elmer E., D-20451125

To be second lieutenants, Medical Corps

Ellison, Noris, D-20451190
Schafer, Charles E., D-20451195
Sprengelmyer, James T., D-20451195
Wagner, Clyde W., Jr., D-20451190

To be second lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Mittal, Norma, J-2927010

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Marsh, Carolyn J., N5407342
Schumacher, Carol Y., N5411223
Scott, Carolyn M., N5411223

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Aulick, Louis H., D-20451170
Bell, George T., D-20451180
Bowman, Robert W., D-20451190
Brittain, Boy C., Jr., D-20451175
Clark, Thomas H., D-20451185
Cunningham, Jerry A., D-20451190
Davis, Charles T., D-20451160
Ervin, Edward L., D-20451170
Fortune, Rex C., D-20451180
Grady, Milton J., D-20451190
Hartman, Paul M., Jr.
Hill, Thomas R., Jr.
Hildebrand, William H., Jr.
Kaplan, J. H., D-20451200
Maddock, Donald E., D-20451180
Mehl, Michael P., D-20451190
McDonough, George F., D-20451170
McNary, William H., D-20451180
Merritt, Louis H., D-20451190
Morgan, John E., D-20451200
Morgan, Charles J., D-20451180
Moran, Robert E., D-20451175
Mumford, Jack D., D-20451180
Murphy, William H., D-20451180
O'Brien, James P., D-20451170
Owens, John H., D-20451190
Peabody, Charles H., D-20451180
Peck, John J., D-20451190
Petersen, Donald G., Jr.
Roberts, Daniel C.
Rogers, Bobby E.
Scott, Donald L., D-20451170
Seale, Thomas A., Jr.
Thornton, Joseph A., D-20451180
Tolman, Joseph B.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be second lieutenants, Chaplain Corps

Aulick, Louis H., D-20451170
Bell, George T., D-20451180
Bowman, Robert W., D-20451190
Brittain, Boy C., Jr., D-20451175
Clark, Thomas H., D-20451185
Cunningham, Jerry A., D-20451190
Davis, Charles T., D-20451160
Ervin, Edward L., D-20451170
Fortune, Rex C., D-20451180
Grady, Milton J., D-20451190
Hartman, Paul M., Jr.
Hill, Thomas R., Jr.
Hildebrand, William H., Jr.
Kaplan, J. H., D-20451200
Maddock, Donald E., D-20451180
Mehl, Michael P., D-20451190
McDonough, George F., D-20451170
McNary, William H., D-20451180
Merritt, Louis H., D-20451190
Morgan, John E., D-20451200
Morgan, Charles J., D-20451180
Moran, Robert E., D-20451175
Peabody, Charles H., D-20451180
O'Brien, James P., D-20451180
Owens, John H., D-20451190
Peck, John J., D-20451190
Petersen, Donald G., Jr.
Roberts, Daniel C.
Rogers, Bobby E.
Scott, Donald L., D-20451170
Seale, Thomas A., Jr.
Thornton, Joseph A., D-20451180
Tolman, Joseph B.
CONGRESSMAN FROM NEW YORK:

J. Herbert Holcomb, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be commandant

James C. Brown

James Balz

Rodman W. Vaughan

Arnold J. Larson

Baldwin F. Thatcher

To be lieutenaut commander

Alvin J. Boxwell

To be lieutenant

Clement H. E. Kerans, Jr.

To be ensigns

Harry Andrew Allen

John Knight Andrews

George Eddings

Asher, Jr.

William Leon Avory

Albert Frank Baker

Clifford Eugene Banner

Robert Andrew Bastek

Peter Michael

Raymond Demetrius

Rand

Robert Kent Blaschke

Thomas Walter

Harold Lanson

William Andrew

Robert Frederick

Boyen, Jr.

John Wentworth Brittain

Leroy Dennis Brooks

Philip Jeffrey Bull

Carl Henry Burchart

David Kevin Carey

Lous Michael Casale

George Anthony Casimiro

David Raynor Condy

Walter Melbourne Coburn

Richard Vincent Crolli

Joseph Lawrence

Crowe, Jr.

Laurence Joseph

Dailaire, Jr.

John George

DeLong, Jr.

Joseph Patrick Dibell

Joseph Henry Dennis

Lance Arthur Edgar

Joseph Robert Finelli

Arthur Richard Gandhi

David Shaw Gonzelli

James Franklin

Greene, Jr.

Richmond Dear

Greenough, Jr.

William Scott Haight

Glenn Edgar Haines

David Wade Haggard

William Colbert

Hemming

Arthur Eugene Keen

Peter Christian

Hennings

Stephen Henry Hines

Eugene Horsnstein

Raymond Jerry

Housieck

Kwong Hing Hsu

Norman Henry Huff

Herbert Miller Hurst

Harry Nelson

Hutchins III

Thomas Patrick Keane

Anthony John Sultry

William James Wal-"