eration with William H. Nelson, of "Fields of Glory: An Illustrated Narrative of American Land Warfare," 1960, and is the editor of other works.

Dr. Vandiver is presently engaged in writing a biography of General Pershing, and recently he traveled to the Philippines and interviewed Emilio Aguinaldo.

This statement from Dr. Vandiver is addressed to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], chairman of the Subcommittee on the Arts, of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

At the conclusion of his letter, Dr. Vandiver stated:

Without a counterpoise of art and humanism, science will lapse into barbarous technology. For this reason Government support of arts and letters is not wasteful; it is prudent patriotism.

This is a viewpoint deserving of the most serious consideration. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Vandiver's statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEPTEMBER 4, 1962.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Arts, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PELL: Mr. McClure has, I hope, told you of my varied efforts to reach Washington in time to appear before your Subcommittee on the Arts as a witness in the hearings concerning Federal assistance to American cultural activities. I deeply regret my inability to complete the trip, and avail mysef of the opportunity which you graciously offered to submit a statement by mail.

Let me say at the outset that I am heartily in favor of Federal assistance to cultural activities in the United States. Such aid is, I think, vital to the continued health of art, literature, music, theater, sculpture—indeed to all creative and learned areas. Consequently I am in favor of the pending bills, S. 1250, "To establish the U.S. Arts Foundation," S. 785, "To establish a program of grants to States," and S. 741, "To provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts." But it seems to me that they should go further and specifically include literary art on a par with the visual and performing arts.

But I would like to do more than voice support for the present bills. The fact of their existence, the fact of a long and continuing discussion of Government's role in fostering creative and liberal arts, indicates structural weaknesses in the national cultural life. This weakness is largely caused, I think, by a warping dominance of one section of the country in virtually all artistic and humane endeavors. Eastern domination is about to result in American culture becoming standardized, typed along Madison Avenue—Broadway lines into the chrome-plated "Shamism" so widely criticized abroad. More than that, this eastern domination is robbing America of an essential element in its culture—regionalism. The United States is too large to have a standardized national culture; myriad nationalities, sections, geographical areas all have something to add to the cultural pattern. Regionalism is a mainstay of American music, art, and letters. Regionalism will not flourish, of course, in a centralized atmosphere.

You have heard, I'm sure, that many artists, musicians, and writers fear Government assistance lest it grow into Government dictatorship. Although probably groundless, this fear is nonetheless real and must be considered in any proposed program of Federal encouragement. For this reason, local responsibility must be paramount in all efforts, and should do much to encourage regionalism.

I notice that through each of the three pending bills, a question persists as to just what the Government can do to help art, music, and letters without frightening their practitioners. Permit me to suggest that the creation of a U.S. Arts Foundation, or a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, or even donations to States will not answer the question. The proposed foundation will have to seek legitimate projects, presumably from the Advisory Council, but the Council might conceivably be composed of biased members whose advice ought to be ignored. Many States do not have either the interest or the money to participate in any comprehensive cultural development program.

Lack of public concern is perhaps the basic problem. And here the Government can make a vital contribution. In America culture in general is too often regarded as unimportant, "sissy," or possibly subversive in some inexplicable way. Artists, poets, writers, musicians, are frequently considered by their Calvinist contemporaries as drones, sponges on the workers of the country. They consume without giving anything in return. This attitude on the part of many Americans at home and abroad makes the rest of the world regard us as rich, gross barbarians. And this idea definitely hampers our attempt to persuade the world that our political perception is any more sophisticated than our artistic perception. Government encouragement of cultural activities can help change this attitude. Rewards, honors, concern for artists, writers, musicians, and poets will give prestige to their calling and dignity to their views. And something of the sort must be done if quality and high standards are to be maintained in the face of creeping Madison-Avenueism, or, in modern parlance, in the face of "kitsch."

More than any other resource, it seems to me that our culture is an exportable item. Traveling exhibits, showing our modern art, models of our current architecture, touring theatrical groups, touring orchestras, itinerant lecturers—all of these help to show the health and strength of the American mind. Our greatest boast—and rightly so—is freedom of thought. There is no finer way to demonstrate this than to let the world see our artists and thinkers in action. The Government should certainly undertake to subsidize both foreign and domestic appearances and performances by artists and men of letters. I want to emphasize that domestic appearances are vital. Much of American culture is missed in the rural and isolated areas of the country. Too many Americans never have an opportunity to see a good play, hear good music, view an art exhibit, hear a stimulating talk. If our culture is to maintain its honesty, is to survive that current trend toward easy thinking and shoddy craftsmanship, it must draw strength from the whole Nation. To do that it must reach more people than it presently does.

Let me make a specific proposal, one which will, I hope, offer a means of stimulating all artistic and humanistic work, provide suitable national leadership for all cultural activities, afford dignity and honor to artists, writers, musicians, and preserve the essential regionalism. In brief, I respectfully urge the creation of a National Academy of Arts and Letters. This Academy might be patterned on the National Academy of Sciences, itself a Government-sponsored organization created during the administration of President Lincoln to serve as a scientific advisory body. The National Academy of Arts and Letters should be created for the same purpose—to serve as a national advisory body on cultural matters. Like the National Academy of Sciences, the Academy of Arts and Letters should be composed of members from all the performing and visual arts, and various elements of letters. These members should be grouped in sections, each of which would nominate its own members and overall membership in the Academy should be highly restricted. Election to the Academy would confer high distinction, since it would represent approval of an artist's or writer's peers.

The Academy could, it seems to me, perform all the functions of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts; it could also, through the advice of its various sections, give direction and advice to State and local cultural programs. In addition, it could provide extremely competent judgment on projects, performers and institutions.

A fund should be provided, possibly through some organization like the National Science Foundation, from which the Academy of Arts and Letters could channel money to individuals and organizations to stimulate creative and humane work. This is absolutely essential, since it is discouragingly difficult for artists, musicians, and writers to obtain financial help in a scientific age.

There are objections to this sort of academy. Some fear that it might degenerate into a sort of cultural dictatorship, an aggregation of intellectual snobs. The National Academy of Sciences has not followed that pattern, and I see no reason why a sister academy should depart from precedent. The key, I think, lies in self-government of the Academy, in the election of members and officers and in national representation.

I can think of nothing the Government could do which would more effectively aid and support cultural activities the country over than to create the National Academy of Arts and Letters and provide funds for projects it might deem worthy of subsidy.

In conclusion, let me emphasize something which I think is too often forgotten in the present concern for science. I live in a section of the country, Houston, Tex., which is about to be transformed by the NASA Manned Space Craft Center. This Center has attracted to Houston and the Houston area tremendously able scientists. It is reemphasizing the importance of all scientific activities and has vitalized scientific research on local campuses. Unfortunately it is not attracting to Houston comparable minds in art, music, or letters. Nor is the emphasis on science producing a concurrent emphasis on the humanities. This is not, of course, a problem peculiar to Houston—it is a national problem.

Most of our attention is focused on science and what science can do for the future, and very little attention is directed toward what science is doing to our culture.

And yet a scientist at Rice University, the eminent Dr. William V. Houston, understands thoroughly that learning is really indivisible. In a recent article he said, "One may also observe that although the sphinx and the pyramids of Egypt survive as historical monuments, the methods of thought, the philosophies of life that grew up concurrently in Palestine and Greece are now so basic to our philosophy and our mental activity today that we rarely pause to remember their sources. Although the monuments are impressive, the pattern of thought is more fundamental. It may well be that, when the 25th century looks back on the 20th, our tremendous engineering achievements will be superseded and our multiplicity of gadgets obsolete, but the influential and persisting element of this century of science will be striking new ways of thinking about the physical world, in thinking about our relationship to it, and, most

fundamentally, of thinking about ourselves and of our relationship to the other human beings in it." In this article Dr. Houston recognizes that if we continue to pursue an understanding of physical nature, we must pursue also an understanding of man and man's intelligence and character. Without a counterpoise of art and humanism, science will lapse into barbarous technology. For this reason Government support of arts and letters is not wasteful; it is prudent patriotism.

Thank you for the privilege of submitting this statement.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK E. VANDIVER.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11970) to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am informed that certain Senators have amendments to offer to the bill. I would hope they will come to the Senate and offer such amendments, so that the Senate can get down to the consideration of the pending business.

SOVIET NOW HAS CUBA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday there was published in the Washington Sunday Star an article by William L. Ryan, a very competent correspondent for the Associated Press. This was a special item, under the title "Soviet Now Has Cuba; To Stay Unless Ejected," with the subtitle "Review of Tight Grip Produces Shock; Red Pros in Charge, Castro Due To Go."

This is one of the most informative and complete articles on the Cuban situation I have seen in quite some time. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in its entirety as a part of my remarks.

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

SOVIET NOW HAS CUBA; TO STAY UNLESS EJECTED—REVIEW OF TIGHT GRIP PRODUCES SHOCK; RED PROS IN CHARGE, CASTRO DUE TO GO

(By William L. Ryan)

Moscow today just about owns Cuba—lock, stock, barrel and beard.

Inexorably, Soviet communism is closing its steel grip. Challenging the United States in the sensitive Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere, Moscow has given the world a lesson in imperialism.

When the Russians colonize, they colonize for good. Short of armed invasion, there seems little hope of prying the Communists out of a base 90 miles from U.S. shores.

The Soviet takeover will be complete when Fidel Castro is shoved aside, along with his 26th of July Movement revolutionaries. This will be a slow and cautious process, but signs of party conflict are clear.

Daily, Mr. Castro appears more and more in the role of a bumbling and confused man, loudly demanding everything his own way, but bowing to what he now calls the collective leadership. He has lost much popular support. Havana reports suggest only 20 percent of the people back him now. That is much more than the percentage backing the old guard Communists, but they do not need popular support. They have their tight, disciplined, spy-ridden organization—and they have Moscow on their side.

The Communists are patient. They can wait until popular disillusion and economic chaos make Mr. Castro no longer important. They are letting him shoulder the blame for Cuba's internal woes. They are letting his entourage of "New Communists"—men like Ernesto (Che) Guevara, Fidel's brother Raul Castro and others of his Sierra Maestre revolution following—hang themselves with ropes fashioned of their own confusion. The time will come when Mr. Castro can safely be removed.

A close examination of just how tightly the Soviet Communist grip has seized the pearl of the Antilles produces a sense of shock. From documents and official regime statements, and from reports of diplomatic travelers, this picture emerges of a Cuba as tightly bound to Moscow as is Bulgaria:

The rag-tag 26th of July army of bearded romantics who marched into Havana January 2, 1959, is no more. In its place is a force of about 300,000, made up of more than 50,000 trained regular and a heavily armed militia. The training is by Communist bloc officers. The equipment is modern. The discipline is strict and Soviet style. The facilities are installed and expanded by Russians and East Europeans.

Even now the army has political commissars, carbon copies of the "politruk" officers of east bloc armies, assigned to nail down party authority. One group of 750 "revolutionary instructors" was graduated this month from a special school and is being infused into the army. Mr. Castro says their mission is to "teach the class struggle character of the revolution" to the army.

Havana is ringed by military hardware, manned by Russians and Cubans. The Russians paid cash for former estates near Havana, and the belief is the areas will be used for antiaircraft batteries and rocket-launching site. Soviet radar, Russian-mannd, checks all flights. Dozens of Soviet Mig fighters have been shipped in and the number may reach 200. Cubans are trained to use them. A parachute corps will be sent to Russia to complete training. And military equipment pours in, along with thousands of "technicians."

THE ECONOMY

Moscow owns the economy. Fantastic numbers of trucks, jeeps and other vehicles pour in from the Red bloc, each batch making Cuba more dependent upon Soviet petroleum shipments.

Imports for 1962 from the U.S.S.R. include: Wheat flour, cereal grains, edible oils, canned, frozen and cured meats, condensed milk, baby foods, rice, butter, lard, peas, canned fish, beans, potatoes, fertilizer, rayon and other textiles, superphosphates, trucks, jeeps, buses, tractors, a petroleum tanker, rice harvesters, machine tools, power shovels, graders, bulldozers, compressors, rolled steel, tinplate, steel pipes, cast iron, cardboard, raw materials for soap manufacture, cement, lubricants, ammonium nitrate and even containers for sugar.

Czechoslovakia is sending textile yarns, artificial leather, steel products, chemicals, glass, foodstuffs, newsprint, buses, tractors, trucks, and tow trucks, machinery and tools, diesel motors, electronic units. Red China sends soybeans, rice, canned meat, medicines. Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Poland send food. The bloc also sends swarms of technical assistants.

Cuba's sugar goes to the bloc in part payment. The sugar industry, always the backbone of the Cuban economy, is dominated completely by the Soviet bloc. Bloc equipment runs the refineries.

The island, therefore, now is practically wholly dependent on world communism. JUCEI, the regime's "coordination and inspection board," is a central plan body modeled on the Soviet Gosplan—state planing board.

AGRICULTURE

In a May 1961 speech to farmers, Prime Minister Castro ridiculed the idea that farms would be collectivized. He said: "The revolution would never do such a foolish thing. * * * Although this is a Socialist revolution, the land will not be socialized. * * * If a farmer prefers to keep his bit of land, then the revolution will never try to socialize it."

An agrarian reform law a year before had broken up big holdings for distribution. Peasants, in order to make any economic sense of their production, had to form cooperatives, especially in such fields as sugar, coffee, rice, and cattle raising. The number of cooperatives grew to 622.

As late as 2 months ago, Mr. Castro repeated the pledge against collectivization. Then he changed his mind—or it was changed for him.

Last month, he told a sugar cooperative conference that distribution of land to the peasants would mean destruction of the revolution. Nor was the cooperatives' idea practical, either. The answer had to be "people's farms"—a copy of the Soviet state farm idea in which the government owns the land and the peasant becomes a sort of farm-factory worker. There were already 300 "people's farms." Mr. Castro indicated the regime would collectivize all the cooperatives so that, in his words, the farmer would be a real proletarian and get rid of his instinctive impulse to own land.

As in other Communist lands, production quotas are laid down. Norms are set for cattle and livestock reproduction, and as in the other lands, the big drawback is that the cattle cannot read instructions. The economy is prey to all the ills that afflict other Communist agriculture.

LABOR

Regimentation is on the Soviet model. The workingman is subject to production quotas. "Socialist emulation," the speedup device invented by Moscow, was formally introduced April 16. The speed up worker is known as distinguished worker.

The Cuban Workers Central directs 25 national unions and automatically approves what the regime orders. As in other Communist countries, it does not represent the labor force, but the state. Workers are subjected to lectures, work discipline, warnings about such things as a "formal bureaucratic attitude." They are punished for lateness or absenteeism. Directors are punished for failing to make quotas or for distorting figures.

Cards were issued August 15 to all workers over 18. The information about each worker took up 15 pages. Fourteen pages went into regime files. The workers got the 15th as his card. He cannot work without it.

Before the Castro era, few women in Cuba did heavy labor. Now they—along with workers, students and even aged people—

are dragooned into "socialist Sundays." They are supposed to be volunteers to save sugar crops. Women also cut hay, pick coffee and cotton and do other agricultural labor.

Mr. Castro announced a year ago plans for a system of "corrective labor" for prisoners, sounding much like the forced labor of other Red nations.

The regime constantly nags workers about greater production. There is even a board of "volunteers" supervising sports, called "Listo para Vencer" (Ready to Win). This copies the Soviet organization Gotov (initials standing for "Ready for Labor and Defense").

YOUTH

Cuba now has a Communist Youth Union, with the same cell structure which marks the Soviet Young Communist League (Komsomol). Its purpose, said Mr. Castro, is to "mold youth into a Communist attitude * * * war against intrigue * * * against gossip, against rumors behind the back * * * to correct errors of others."

There is an organization committee controlling all activities of students during both school and vacation time. It guards against absenteeism, watches student unions, mobilizes students for work in the fields, provides monitors to watch teachers, presides over sports and all student activities.

INTERNAL ENEMIES

All the ills of an emerging Communist regime afflict Cuba: shortages, hoarding, black marketing, clandestine slaughter of livestock. Those who complain are labeled "enemies of the people."

In a Catholic country, the regime goes slowly about cracking down on religion. Mr. Castro proclaims religious freedom, but church activities are curtailed and confined inside church buildings.

The regime carries on a gigantic indoctrination campaign. Hundreds of thousands of Communist manuals are distributed. Communist boss Blas Roca's "Fundamentals of Socialism in Cuba" was distributed in 700,000 copies—1 for each 10 or fewer persons.

THE APPARATUS

In prerevolutionary days, the Communists played ball with the Batista regime, entrenched themselves in the labor movement, and even opposed the 26th of July revolutionary movement. After the revolution, the Popular Socialist (Communist) Party was the only organized party allowed to operate. It infiltrated every department of the regime, up to the highest positions.

A year ago Mr. Castro announced—it seemed a bit reluctantly—all revolutionary organizations would be merged into one, the ORI (Integrated Revolutionary Organizations). This, he said, would eventually become the "united party of the Socialist revolution." The regime laid down plans for complete control of the economy and set up "committees of defense"—more than a half million strong. That meant 1 spy for every 12 Cubans, man, woman, and child.

The Communists now let it be known they regard the 26th of July movement as having been "the national liberation" phase, according to Khrushchev-era doctrine. The July 26 movement is defunct. The Communists hold that Cuba has entered a new stage of "building socialism." The ORI, for all pratical purposes, already is the single party. Organization is going forward on the time-tested pyramid-cell basis, which assures central control. When the united party emerges formally, membership will be limited to "those who fulfill Leninist conditions."

There has been conflict between the wily old guard Communists and the so-called new Communists recruited from Mr. Castro's original followers. The old guarders, under Red Chieftain Blas Roca, leave little doubt they intend to rule. Mr. Roca holds a dominating position in the ORI, although posts in the secretariat have gone to Mr. Castro's bearded Communists of the "new" group.

Havana radio this spring admitted there had been a struggle, calling it "a battle which culminated in the dismissal of (Anibal) Escalante as secretary of the ORI." Mr. Escalante, an old line Communist, was expendable to avoid outward signs of internal conflict. He is now in Eastern Europe.

The fight arose over Mr. Castro's loud determination to be more equal than his supposed equals in the collective. The old guard Communists have to live with him, since to many Cubans and Latin Americans he symbolizes national sovereignty. He is also the only man in the regime who commands any marked degree of loyalty.

THE OUTLOOK

On the surface, Mr. Castro still does not appear to have lost any of his authority, but that is only a surface appearance. The old guard Reds weave their power web carefully, move slowly. The time is approaching for the final phase of envelopment. When Mr. Castro's presence is no longer necessary, when he has taken all the blame for Cuba's economic disaster, he can safely be put aside, and that will be managed by men responsible to Moscow.

Right now, Blas Roca, Carlos Rodriguez and old guard Communists seem to be spending much of their time trying to outfox Mr. Castro. The bearded premier appears to flounder more and more in a morass of mixed-up ideology. Is he being insidiously undermined by the old guard? There is much evidence to suggest that he is, and he seems resentful.

A month ago, Mr. Castro addressed a congress of secondary school students and found himself embroiled in an incoherent wrangle with his audience. Mr. Castro had mentioned a revolutionary song in his speech and the students yelled demands that he sing it. Mr. Castro argued and cursed them obscenely.

"I don't know how to sing, I won't sing. That is final * * * it's impossible to speak here." He let out another string of profanity. There were "idiots" around, in spite of the revolution, he shouted.

Screams and laughter greeted his words. It was 8 minutes before the students could be quieted and Mr. Castro could get on with a rambling, sometimes incoherent talk. He may have been drunk—or he may have been confused and angered by the pressure of forces he did not fully understand, forces threatening him.

When Mr. Castro finally is shoved aside it will be small consolation for the United States. It will mean Moscow's domination is complete.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1962

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, last week on the floor of the Senate the mass transportation bill was discussed. I opposed that bill.

I wish to call the attention of Senators to what the proposal has already done in Cleveland, Ohio. In Cleveland, Ohio, there is a publicly operated system, managed and directed by a transit board. The Cleveland Transit Board definitely had in mind building an extension of the transit system from downtown Cleveland to the Cleveland Airport. The plan was in the making and in the process of being executed. Then came word from Washington that Congress might enact a law that would make available gifts of $2 by the Federal Government for every $1 put up by the local people for the improvement of mass transportation. As could have been expected, the Cleveland Transit Board, learning that a largess was to come from Washington, decided to postpone the development of their plan.

I now wish to read what was published by the Cleveland Plain Dealer with regard to the subject:

EXCUSES EXPLODED

When Allen J. Lowe and Charles P. Lucas recently switched their position on carrying through with their proposal to extend the CTS rapid transit to the airport, we indignantly demanded the real reasons for their switch.

So far they have given none.

Not only that, but the feeble excuses which Lowe gave at the meeting have broken down.

Lowe said that he was pinning his hopes for financing the CTS part of the project on the Federal transit subsidy bill.

This multimillion-dollar grab bag is another attempt by the Federal handout kings to invade the field of local authority and to load us with new mountains of debt.

* * * * *

Even if the thing should lamentably be passed there's no promise that Cleveland would get allocations from it. Every large city in the country will be at the trough for the gravy if transit subsidies ever are poured out.

The malignancy of the Federal subsidy system, whether subsidies actually are given or not, is seen in what has happened here. The mere talk of a possible handout is used as an argument against doing something locally that should be handled locally.

Lowe's other explanation for his switch, in which fellow CTS Board Members Lucas followed, was that until 1970 the CTS couldn't have enough funds for its part of the extension costs, even with the special economies that they had supported earlier. But he admitted last week that he had forgotten that the CTS could help its financing through equipment trust certificates.

Again we call for a rescinding by Lucas and Lowe of their September 6 action so they can put the rapid transit extension back on the track.

The editorial clearly and properly describes what the ultimate impact of the proposed Federal handout will be. Here is a community that contemplated the extension of its rapid transit system without Federal aid. They were in the process of going forward. A plan had been developed. The objective sought was clearly in mind. But along comes the Federal Government with the proposal: "We will give you money for which you will have to pay nothing."

What do Senators expect the transit board to do? Perhaps the board could have risen to high patriotic levels by

saying to those in authority in Washington, "We will not ask for your largess. We will build the system ourselves."

But two of the members of the board thought that it would be best for Cleveland and the country to wait, thus giving encouragement to the Federal Government to begin the proposed new plan of buying buses, trolleys, and terminals for every crossroad community in the United States.

Where will it lead? If the Federal Government intends to give money to governmental bodies for the development of their transportation systems, in my judgment there will be only one end, and that is Federal governmental ownership of the system.

What a frightening, dampening, depressing impact. Here are people who wish to be independent. They wish to solve their own problems and to do things in the true American way. They are dissuaded from following that course by the bait held dangling by the U.S. Congress and the administration. They are told, "Do not be independent. Do not be self-reliant. Wait and the Federal Government will give you things for nothing."

How can we compare that philosophy with the philosophy of the men who, 175 years ago, on the 17th day of September, wrote the Constitution of the United States?

Did they contemplate this policy of largesse and gifts by our Government? Were they cringing persons who depended upon gifts, or were they courageous individualists who believed in the free enterprise system and that our Nation would triumph, and that the welfare of our people would be promoted?

The questions answer themselves.

What we are doing today is in complete conflict with everything that was done by those men who signed the Constitution on September 17, 1787.

I regret that this is happening in my city of Cleveland, but I am pleased to note that the chairman of the Cleveland Transit Board has announced his willingness to appear before the Committee on Commerce and there to oppose the bill.

A "chocolate drop" was held out. It is sweet on the outside, but within there is poison—poison to our system. It will be swallowed by many. They will take it with great glee, but the ultimate price to be paid, in my judgment, eventually will be a loss of every right and liberty that our forefathers had in mind 175 years ago when they signed the Constitution.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11970) to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I rise today to call to the attention of the Senate that soon this body will have the opportunity to vote on the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962. This measure generally is just referred to as the trade bill.

To call it the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962 is truly an appropriate name for it is an adjustment in every true sense of the word. It means that America is adjusting its thinking to modern day living, and is looking to the future for her people to insure more jobs, more business, and a stronger all-around economy.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that some of the ideas in this Trade Adjustment Act proposal are not necessarily new, in that recommendations were made in March 1960, when the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems submitted its report to the Senate. This committee, of which I was proud to serve as a member, was chaired so ably by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. One of the aspects of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962 which some have widely discussed with possible apprehension is the adjustment assistance section of the bill.

I point out at this time that if it had not been for the able cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that this section probably would have been stricken from the bill. The administration owes him a special vote of gratitude and commendation because I know the struggle he went through in order to make it possible to report the bill in its present form.

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

Mr. HARTKE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am indeed grateful for the generosity of my friend the able Senator from Indiana. As the Senator knows, in general I have been in full and strong support of the Kennedy administration in the field of foreign policy, in the field of international economics, and in the field of mutual assistance with our allies and friends of the free world.

Upon occasion, conscientious conviction has led me into opposition to the position of the administration on domestic affairs. Perhaps it is in recollection of some of these events that my distinguished friend now expresses this gratitude for my cooperation in this case. I appreciate it very much. I thank him.

Mr. HARTKE. I say this in full recognition of the manner in which the Senator conducts himself not only in committee, but also on the floor of the Senate in protecting the rights of the people of the United States in every aspect and on every subject of legislation.

I know that the President of the United States appreciates the fine cooperation of the Senator, and realizes that in this case the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962 would not have reached the floor in its present form if it had not been for the singular cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

I have no apprehension about this part of the bill. Our Special Committee on Unemployment Problems made this same recommendation in 1960—during the 2d session of the 86th Congress—and I quote from the committee report, page 124, No. 6(b):

> Enactment of adjustment legislation to relieve the impact of international trade policies on employees, business, and communities adversely affected.

I am proud that the authors of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962 have seen fit to incorporate the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems recommendation, for the adjustment assistance section of the Trade Adjustment Act does just this.

In his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee and like testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, the Honorable Luther Hodges, our able and distinguished Secretary of Commerce stated during the House hearings:

> I have explained why I do not expect many firms or workers to be adversely affected by trade agreements negotiated under the Trade Expansion Act. But realism requires that we be prepared for local instances in which firms or workers suffer hardship as a result of increased imports.
>
> The Federal Government has a special responsibility to such firms and workers. For their hardship can be directly traced to a specific action undertaken by the Government for the good of all—the lowering of trade restrictions in order to open up new markets for our goods abroad. As the President has said, no industry or work force should be made a sacrificial victim for the benefit of the national welfare. No small group of firms and workers should be made to bear the full burden of the costs of a program whose great benefits enrich the Nation as a whole.
>
> Tariff relief is not always a satisfactory or sufficient remedy for the import problem. I believe that trade adjustment assistance can and will be a most effective, supplementary device. Tariff relief without positive action may protect an inefficient company that cannot compete. Escape-clause relief should be only a short-term remedy, used only in extraordinary circumstances to allow time for adjustments to foreign competition. Adjustment assistance is designed to help firms to adjust on a more permanent basis.

Further, Mr. President, Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, former Secretary of Labor, accompanied by the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, testified as to the need and the reasons for the adjustment assistance phase of the Trade Adjustment Act. In his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee—hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, 87th Congress, 2d session, on H.R. 9900, part II, page 726—Secretary Goldberg said:

> The reasons for proposing a trade adjustment assistance program: The United States has traditionally recognized that some protection should be given to American firms and workers who are faced with serious import competition. However, until now that protection has been exclusively supplied by tariffs or other import restrictions which had the effect of restricting foreign competition and generally subsidizing inefficient domestic producers.
>
> There are situations where such restrictions are still appropriate. As Secretary Hodges and Under Secretary Ball have testified, the proposed act retains these traditional protective features—the reservation of items from tariff negotiations, the adjustment of imports which threaten national security, and where no other solution is possible, the increase or imposition of duties or restrictions on imports which are found to be causing or threaten to cause serious injury to an industry.