

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4257

stock market had its difficulties last spring, I got a good many letters.

I receive no mail, thanking me and expressing admiration for my economic wisdom when the market goes up, but when it goes down we all know who is wrong. Therefore, that being true, recognizing that the President of the United States and the Government will be responsible if we have economic difficulties, it seems to me that we have some right to present proposals which may lessen those economic difficulties.

We have some right, really, to be listened to. We are attempting to avoid those hazards which will inevitably be blamed upon us when they finally come, and people do look to Washington in all kinds of ways when difficulty comes across the country. It is also true of business and economic difficulties. So the matters we are now discussing, and the proposals we have made in regard to the budget, Federal expenditures, and the tax cut, are all representing our efforts to avoid the difficulties which, if they come, will inevitably be blamed upon the President of the United States.

The first 2 months of the 88th Congress have been dominated by discussions of fiscal and economic policy and the next several months will be dominated by the same facts. I think that is very wise. We are attempting to do something new, and that is to talk about a tax cut at a time when we have a deficit, and at a time when we have relatively good times, even though a disturbingly high rate of unemployment, so we are talking about, in a sense, something new, and it is appropriate that we talk about it in detail; and it is necessary that we get some understanding across the country of what we are trying to do because it is important and it does represent a change in previous policies enunciated by the U.S. Government.

The fact is, of course, these questions are all highly technical. To explain the difference between a family budget and the U.S. budget, to explain why we believe it difficult, if not impossible, and certainly unwise, to attempt to secure a balanced budget this year, which we believe would put us into a recession, which we believe would unbalance the budget, these are highly sophisticated questions, far more sophisticated than those questions which occupied our attention during the 19th century of free silver, trade, and all the rest. Balance of payments and the cyclical problems and debt management are all far more complicated and every solution raises new questions.

Three familiar questions of fiscal policy must be decided by the Congress:

The limit on the national debt.

The size of the Federal budget.

The desirability and extent of Federal tax reduction.

All three of these questions have faced legislative and executive branches before, and we have an obligation to learn the lessons of history if we do not wish to relive it.

In front of the Archives Building there is a statue, and under it is says "The past is prologue." Not necessarily, and it is because we do not wish to relive the past, because we do not wish to regard the past as necessarily a prologue in the 1960's that we have attempted to put forward our proposals.

Economic history, specifically the history of 1957-60, which produced two recessions from which the whole economy has never fully recovered, clearly warns us now that the wrong answers to each of these three questions would spell downturn for the American economy as a whole.

I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress during these crucial years have been acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight, but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same

problems that face our country at this time. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past. There is enough to go around for everyone. But we shall all be deserving of blame, we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future.

The Federal Government, and I shall speak here not of any one party or branch of the Government, but the Government as a whole decided in 1957 to keep the debt limit unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy, and to reject all efforts at tax reduction. The harsh results of those decisions are still with us.

In the decade previous to July 1957, unemployment had rarely exceeded 4 percent. In the 64 months since those decisions, it has remained above 5 percent.

In the earlier decade, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output. It has since that time fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

In the previous decade, our total output of goods and services, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent a year. Since mid-1957 the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

All three of these decisions were taken in the name of fiscal responsibility. But if that high-sounding label is intended to refer to budget and balance-of-payments surpluses, it was a name taken in vain.

The preceding 11 fiscal years had produced seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget, for a net cash surplus of \$20 billion. The 6 succeeding fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all in fiscal 1959, for a net cash deficit of \$30 billion. Had the economy been operating at full employment, there would have been no deficit.

The balance-of-payments problem became a problem only after mid-1957, with a total deficit of \$11.2 billion during the next 3 calendar years and a gold loss of more than \$5 billion during the same period. The fact that short-term interest rates had been increased 40 percent in 1955 and 1957 did not help to stem this balance-of-payments tide. As the OECD said last December:

"Confidence in the dollar depends in good part on a strong domestic economy; it is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies that keep the level of activity low."

Unfortunately, the size of the deficits in our Federal budget and our international accounts led the Government in 1959 to adopt even more restrictive fiscal and monetary policies. The Federal cash budget during the first quarter of 1959 was operating at the level of \$17 billion deficit at annual rates. By the third quarter, this had become a \$2 billion deficit, and by the second quarter of the next year, 1960, a surplus of \$7 billion. These figures are from Arthur Burns, who served my predecessor as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and who call this, and I quote, "one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history."

At the same time, Dr. Burns pointed out, economic expansion was curbed by a tightening of both short-term and long-term credit. Long-term rates, in fact, "advanced faster," and I quote him, "than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years."

The result was another recession, more unemployment, more unused capacity, and another incomplete recovery. Today's output is \$30 to \$40 billion below our productive capacity. The rate of unemployment has risen to 6.1 percent of those actively seeking work. Corporate investment last year was—for the first time in any non-recession year since the war—below the level of gross retained earnings. And business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level than it was in 1957.

Now, in 1963, the Government once again is faced with these same decisions. I hope we will bear in mind the lessons of history. I hope we will remember the editorial in *Business Week* magazine, June 28, 1958, which pointed out the effects of an unrealistic debt ceiling and a harmful slash in expenditures, and I quote them:

"In the second half of 1957, the debt ceiling forced the administration to cut back programs needed for long-term national security. And," they said and I quote, "the resulting slash in defense expenditures was an important contributing cause of the recession."

An unrealistic debt ceiling or budget cut today would also cause a slowdown in contracts, a stretchout in payments, a cash drain on business, and ultimately another recession. Instead of balancing the budget, it would produce a budget deficit far greater than the temporary addition to the deficit that will come from a tax reduction. Let us remember that the \$12.4 billion deficit of fiscal year 1959 was the result of a recession which wiped out what had originally been conceived of as a surplus of \$500 million.

This administration is not asking for an unlimited debt ceiling, but a realistic one which will still keep the actual debt burden as measured by a percentage of our gross national product steadily declining. As you know, it has declined for 120 percent of our gross national product, 17 or 18 years ago, to 54 percent today, and will continue to decline both as a percentage of our population per capita and as a percentage of our gross national product.

We are not asking for uncontrolled budget increases, but for a prudent budget which, contrary to all trends in Government, both local and State, actually reduces civilian expenditures below their level of last year, a feat which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years, a hard defense budget which, interestingly enough, was increased by half a billion dollars yesterday in the House of Representatives. And we are not asking for an unprecedented tax cut because, while the total amount of the tax cut in calendar months beginning in July would take place over a period of 18 months for the fiscal year, it will result in a \$2.7 billion loss in this fiscal year.

Certainly it is clear that if we slide into another recession, the deficit without a tax cut will be far larger than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut. It seems to me that the logic of our problem and the past is so clearly before us that I sometimes find it difficult to understand why so many members of the business community who live with these problems day by day, who have lived through the last 20 years, are so reluctant to accept what are obviously the facts of life in our economy.

In addition, as you know, we are pouring into the labor market every year, at the very time when automation is becoming most sophisticated, millions of people who are looking for work. In 1960, 2.6 million Americans reached 18. In 1965, it will be 3.8 million reaching 18, which is this tremendous increase as a result of the war-baby boom of people looking for work in the 1960's.

So we have all of these things coming to a climax in 1960, automation, an increase in those in the labor market, and Number 3, a slow growth in our economy. That is what we are faced with in these years. I am hopeful that the lessons of history will be learned by us all, in and out of Washington, by those of us in the administration, and the Congress, and by all of you.

"The great advantage of Americans," wrote de Tocqueville in 1835, "The great advantage of Americans consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterwards repair." To this I would add the fact that the great advantage of hindsight consists of our applying its lessons by way of foresight.

4258

If this Nation can apply the lessons and repair the faults of the last 5 years, if we can stick to the facts and cast out those things which really don't apply to the situation, then surely this country can reach its goals, and upon reaching its goals depends the security of the free world.

Thank you.

Anti-Semitism
**SOVIET DISCRIMINATION AGAINST
 RUSSIAN JEWS**

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, a news report from Moscow today discloses that Jews in the U.S.S.R. will again not be able to obtain matzoh for the Passover this year. For the second year, state bakeries, the only ones permitted to operate in the Soviet Union, will not supply the religious ceremonial wafers for the Passover. The news report adds that the chief rabbi of the only synagogue in Moscow told his congregation last Saturday that a new request had been rejected by the Soviet authorities. These same authorities have also refused to allow Soviet Jews to import matzoh for the religious observance this year as they did last year. At that time I acted on behalf of a group of American matzoh bakers who had volunteered to ship a planeload of matzoh to the Soviet Union in time for observance of the Passover.

This is a direct attack on the part of the Communists against Jewish religious practices, and it gives further credence to the charge so hotly denied by Chairman Khrushchev himself of discrimination by Soviet officials.

Chairman Khrushchev owes the world an explanation for this and other attacks on Russian Jews. The hundreds of words used by Khrushchev in his speech on March 8 to describe his attitude toward Jews and to deny the existence of a Jewish problem in the U.S.S.R. do not explain the repressive actions of the Soviet Government against Jews. The Soviet Union's action should be protested and an accounting demanded.

There has been international protest in these matters as well. I draw attention to the fact that at the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly Social Committee, on November 1, 1962, the Australian delegate, acting on the instructions of his government, specifically singled out Soviet discrimination against Jews during the committee's debate on manifestations of racial prejudice and national and religious intolerance. The Russians again hotly denied that that was so. But the Australian delegate stuck by his guns, and the record fully bears him out. I hope the protest of the world will again be directed at the Soviet Union for this act of discrimination, again shown by acts rather than speeches, which flies directly in the face of the position taken by Chairman Khrushchev in his speech of March 8.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notation of the Australian initiative and intervention that I have described and the news article to which I have referred, datelined Moscow, March 18, entitled "Soviet Forbids Making Matzoh in Red Bakeries."

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

INTERVENTIONS—AUSTRALIA'S INITIATIVE

International concern over the situation of Jews in the U.S.S.R. has been expressed in a number of interventions at the U.N. and in direct representations to the Soviet authorities. At the United Nations General Assembly Social Committee on November 1, 1962, the Australian delegate, acting on the instructions of his Government, specifically singled out Soviet discrimination against Jews during the Committee's debate on manifestations of racial prejudice and national religious intolerance.

Mr. White said that there had been violent and inflammatory examples of anti-Jewish conduct in a number of countries in recent years. "I feel that I must also mention specifically the fact that Jewish communities throughout the world have expressed concern at the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union," he added.

The Australian accusation in the General Assembly's 110-nation Social Committee touched off a series of sharp East-West exchanges. Vigorously denying the anti-Semitism charge, the Soviet Union characterized Australia's statement as "filthy calumnies" and referred to "rank racism" in the United States.

Mr. White cited official Soviet criticism directed against the Jews, restriction of Jewish religious observances, and action taken against individual Jews.

He referred specifically to the Soviet ban on the public baking of unleavened bread for the 1962 Passover observance and the unduly high proportion of Jews sentenced to death recently for economic offenses in the Soviet Union.

"Should the U.S.S.R. find difficulty in according Soviet Jewry full freedom to practice their religion, it should, we believe, permit them to leave the country," he added. "Indeed it has a moral obligation to do so under article 13, paragraph 2, of the universal declaration of human rights, which says: 'Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.'"

Exercising the right of reply, Mrs. T. N. Nikolayeva of the Soviet Union charged that Australia's accusation was a Western attempt to denigrate her country and distract attention from the racial discrimination imposed by colonialism.

"In the Soviet Union," she asserted, "there is no discrimination against Jews or any other nationality or group."

She cited statistics to show that Jews held a high proportion of professional, artistic, and political positions in the Soviet Union.

When Mrs. Ronald Tree of the United States asked why Soviet passports identified Jews by religion, a Soviet spokesman asked why "armed forces" were needed to enroll a Negro in the University of Mississippi.

"You are sitting in a glasshouse yourself," the Soviet spokesman remarked.

Earlier in the week, the Israel permanent representative at the U.N., Mr. Michael Comay, had indirectly referred to Soviet Jewry when he asked the United Nations to condemn and seek an end to cultural discrimination which deprived a people of the freedom to "maintain their distinctive language, literature, and traditions" and used Jews as "scapegoats for economic difficulties." It is painful, he said, for Israel to state that a large section of the Jewish people had been singled out for such discrimination "in a land which officially recognizes the identity of each ethnic, national, and religious group within its borders—including the Jewish group, the members of which are formally described in their documents of identity as being Jewish in nationality."

"As a religious group, too, this community is deprived of the prerogatives which are still extended to other faiths, such as the production of sacred books and articles, the training of clerics and contact between the different local communities within the country, or between them and the Jewish communities elsewhere."

"In brief, the Jewish community of that country has been tragically cut off from its own rich religious and cultural heritage, as well as from its Jewish brethren in the rest of the world. Their helplessness is aggravated by the growing (though by no means original) trend to find Jewish scapegoats for economic difficulties."

TRADE UNION MEMORANDUM

Another intervention was the circulation recently of a memorandum among all members of the U.N. by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions which asserted that discrimination against Jews is "part and parcel of government policy in the Soviet Union." It called for a sweeping investigation of "government-instigated anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union."

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which has consultative status on the U.N. Economic and Social Council, demands an investigation and report similar to that which dealt with forced labor in Soviet Russia and eventually led to a U.N. convention on forced labor. Its representative, Mr. Irving Brown, attacked the "ever-expanding program of Soviet anti-Semitism, aided, abetted, encouraged, and legalized by the Soviet Government."

While the Soviet Union is "preaching the virtues of peaceful coexistence," the trade union memorandum states, it is engaged "in a program against a large defenseless minority of its citizenry which can only be characterized as cultural and spiritual genocide."

The 5,000-word International Confederation of Free Trade Unions memorandum points out that while Soviet Jews are officially considered as a nationality and are listed as such on their identification papers, they are "officially deprived of the fundamental rights accorded to nationalities in the Soviet Union."

"All Jewish newspapers, publishing houses, literary journals, repertory theaters and dramatic schools, cultural-communal associations, literary, and cultural research institutions, schools and other means of instruction in and perpetuation of Jewish cultural and historic traditions have been forcibly liquidated since 1948," the memorandum states.

"Not only are the Jews allowed no schools, they are not even allowed classes in Yiddish or Hebrew in general schools, or, for that matter, classes on Jewish history and culture in Russian."

WORLD PROTESTANTS INQUIRE

In New York on September 18, 1962, a six-man delegation of the Protestant World Council of Churches, which had returned from an official visit to the Soviet Union, said that they had questioned Soviet officials about the position of Judaism in the U.S.S.R. Leader and chief spokesman for the group was the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, the executive head of the United Presbyterian Church of America, former president of the World Council of Churches and chairman of the council's standing committee on Soviet religious affairs.

Dr. Blake stated that, in response to the delegation's expression of concern about the Jews, Soviet officials denied the existence of any problem, but nevertheless promised to look into it.

This is the first time that such a high-level Christian group has raised the problem of Soviet Jews with Kremlin officials. The significance of the delegation's intervention

is emphasized by the fact that the World Council of Churches has developed increasingly close relations during the past year with Soviet ecclesiastical bodies. Last December, at its international conference in New Delhi, the council accepted the Russian Orthodox Church, the U.S.S.R.'s leading denomination, as a full-fledged member. And this past August, the council's executive committee recommended acceptance of applications for membership from five more Soviet church groups: the Georgian Orthodox Church, the Armenian Apostolic Church, the Baptists, the Lutheran Church of Latvia, and the Lutheran Church of Estonia.

This prerogative of maintaining close relations and contact with coreligionists abroad is one of the many denied to Soviet Jews.

Dr. Blake added that the delegation had visited the one remaining synagogue in Odessa, where before the Revolution several score synagogues had thrived. He described the Odessa Synagogue as dreadfully run-down and in desperate need of repair and paint. Even this synagogue, in a city with a Jewish population of some 100,000, lacks a rabbi.

In general, Dr. Blake noted that, though the Soviet Government has stepped up its propaganda campaigns against all regions, it has not resorted to "administrative measures against the Christian churches. This stands in marked contrast to the harsh administrative steps taken against Judaism in the past year. In addition to the ban on matzoth-baking and the virtual closure of the Yeshiva, these measures have included the deposition of synagogue presidents in six major cities, and the trial and lengthy prison terms meted out to Gedalia Pechersky and other Jewish religious leaders in Leningrad and Moscow last October."

COLORED PEOPLE'S ASSOCIATION ASK CLEMENCY

A request that the Soviet authorities extend clemency to 15 people in the Soviet Union sentenced to die for economic offenses, at least 12 of whom were Jews, was made in April 1962, by the National Association of Colored People. The chairman of the association, Mr. S. G. Spillwood, wrote to the Soviet Ambassador in Washington, Mr. Anatoli F. Dobrynin, that: "Representing, as it does, a group which has long suffered the troubles of discrimination and segregation, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People considers with increasing concern the fate of Soviet Jewry. The shocking events of recent weeks within the Soviet Union have brought the situation to a pass which forces us to speak out in protest."

The letter points out that many of these sentenced to death by shooting "received their sentences for offenses committed at a time when the law did not call for capital punishment. In at least three cases a lesser penalty, meted out upon conviction, was increased to capital punishment on appeal by the prosecution after enactment of the death penalty decree. Most of the convicted are denied the right to appeal. These savage practices represent an unfortunate retrogression in Soviet law as well as new and disturbing indications of anti-Semitic persecution."

The letter asked for clemency and for commutation of the death sentences.

OTHER INTERVENTIONS

In May the International League for the Rights of Man sent an appeal, signed by 223 leading Americans, to the U.N. Secretary General U Thant asking him to intercede over the death sentences.

Some other interventions were: An appeal on August 12, 1962, the 10th anniversary of the murder of 26 leading Soviet-Jewish intellectuals, by the 7 leading Jewish organizations in America calling for the restoration to

Soviet Jews of "the full right to their own cultural life." The appeal declared that: "Official Soviet practice today continues the Stalin policy of depriving Soviet Jewry of continuity with its past and free expression in the present. The terror is gone, but the policy extinguishing every spark of Jewish consciousness and identity continues."

Under Soviet Premier Khrushchev, the organizations said, "the policy of cultural extinction remains essentially unaltered. There is no school, nor even a classroom, where a Jewish child may learn something of Yiddish or Hebrew language and literature. There does not even exist the opportunity for Jewish parents to have their children instructed in Jewish history and culture through the medium of the Russian language."

The statement concluded:

"Ten years after their execution, there is no way, except for public apology and full rehabilitation, that reparation can be made to the slain writers. But there is a way for the Soviet Government to rectify its crime against Soviet Jewry: To reverse this policy and to restore to Soviet Jews the full right to their own cultural life."

Signers of the statement were Dr. Joachim Prinz, president, American Jewish Congress; Label Katz, president, B'nai B'rith; Adolph Held, national chairman, Jewish Labor Committee; Theodore Brooks, national commander, Jewish War Veterans; Lewis Weinstein, chairman, National Community Relations Advisory Council; Rabbi David Hill, president, National Council of Young Israel, and Rabbi Israel Moshowitz, president, New York Board of Rabbis.

On July 15, the president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, Sir Barnett Janner, appealed for mitigation of the severe sentences meted out to Jews in the Soviet Union charged with economic offenses, and asked the Soviet Government to conduct "a campaign of enlightenment against anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R."

On June 24, 1962, the Central Conference of American Rabbis deplored the "unique discrimination and persecution" of Jews and Judaism in the U.S.S.R. They said that Soviet authorities were attempting to "liquidate religious and cultural Judaism and to assimilate Russian Jews by coercion."

An American assemblyman, Bentley Kasal, asked the U.S. Mission at the U.N. to demand U.N. action on behalf of Soviet Jews in May 1962. He said that on a visit to the U.S.S.R. in December 1961, he had noted the disruption of Jewish communities, despite denials by Soviet officials.

In June 1962, 40 American and Canadian trade union leaders condemned anti-Jewish excesses in the U.S.S.R. A resolution passed by the meeting in Pennsylvania criticized death sentences for so-called economic crimes, and the second-class treatment accorded to Soviet Jews in every facet of Soviet life."

SOVIET FORBIDS MAKING MATZOH IN RED BAKERIES

Moscow, March 18.—Jews in the Soviet Union have been told again this year that state-operated bakeries will not supply them with traditional matzoh bread for Passover ceremonies next month.

Yehuda Leb-Levin, chief rabbi of the only synagogue in Moscow, told his congregation last Saturday that a new request had been turned down and that if they wanted matzoh this year they would have to bake it at home.

Last year was the first time the state bakeries have refused to supply matzoh in Moscow and Leningrad. Matzoh supplies have been cut off in a growing number of provincial Soviet cities over the last 5 or 6 years, however, and the policy now is understood to be nationwide.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the winter 1962-63 issue of American Judaism entitled "The Dilemma of Soviet Jewry," written by Rabbi Judah Cahn, spiritual leader of the Metropolitan Synagogue of New York City.

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

THE DILEMMA OF SOVIET JEWRY (By Rabbi Judah Cahn)

One of the tragic results of recent developments in the Soviet Union is the dilemma which now faces the 3 million Jews in that nation. The roots of the dilemma are deep and complicated. It begins with the fact that within the Soviet Union, Jews are regarded not as a religious body but as a national minority. This was not always true. During the early years after the revolution, the Soviet Government had denied this status to the Jews.

The reversal of this decision was based ostensibly on the four-point definition of a nationality as promulgated by Stalin. He said that a nation or ethnic group should possess four characteristics: A common land, a common language, a common culture, and common economic interests. Within the framework of this definition it would have been logically impossible to give the Jewish population of the Soviet Union the label of a national group.

Biro-Bidjan, a region in East Siberia, was established as an autonomous Jewish Republic. This was an attempt by Soviet authorities to make the Jews in the Soviet Union conform to their definition. Of the approximately 20,000 Jewish inhabitants who were there during the early days, over 11,000 had left by 1934.

This so-called Jewish Republic turned out to be an admitted failure. All the other republics had been created on the same lands already occupied by the people who were designated as citizens of that republic. The situation with the Jews was quite different. A piece of land in Siberia which did not even have a trace of previous Jewish occupation was turned into a Jewish "homeland." The fact that the Jews of the Soviet Union were located in the great cities of Western Russia and played a very important part in the cultural and economic life of the country, made no difference. Did the Soviet authorities seriously expect these thousands of teachers, scientists, poets, actors, and musicians to leave the cultural centers of the U.S.S.R. and migrate to Biro-Bidjan?

The results of these actions were inevitable. The Jews became a national minority group within the Soviet Union without possessing any of the advantages of such a designation. When choices were made for national posts in the many areas of Soviet life, the Jews could be designated only after all others who were citizens of that particular republic had been given the opportunity. The only place where it was possible for a Jew to receive preference over others would have been in Biro-Bidjan and in this barren spot there existed none of the institutions which permitted such participation. This also applied to college admission, professional training, and opportunities, which all depend on national identity.

Thus, the Jews became subject to the whims of the dictator. When Stalin thought it desirable, he utilized a literal interpretation of the law. When he thought it expedient, he utilized a loose interpretation.

During the life of Stalin, academic life was circumscribed by political expediency. The best of the Soviet academicians were harnessed to justify and rationalize the policies of the state. With the elimination of Stalin, this academic straitjacket was, for a time, loosened and matters heretofore forbidden for discussion were now brought into the open. At a meeting with Prof. Alexi Leondyev, a member of the Presidium of the Academy of Special Sciences and chairman of the Department of Psychology at the University of Moscow, and Prof. Fidore Savatkin, vice director of the Institute of National Schools and professor of methods of teaching language in the professional school, this subject was first raised by me in the summer of 1958. Neither professor made any serious attempt to justify the designation of Jews as a national minority. In the course of the discussion, I pointed out that in my contacts with Jewish university students, musicians, and government officials who were under the age of 35, I had found that they had either no knowledge or a sparse knowledge of Yiddish, which was supposed to be a national language for Soviet Jewry.

I indicated to Professor Savatkin that though he had organized schools and staffs for the teaching of approximately fifty languages, there were neither teachers nor texts for the teaching of Yiddish. A call was immediately put in to the Lenin Library and this point was confirmed. Though there were texts in Yiddish concerned with the teaching of other subjects, there wasn't a single text dealing with the teaching of Yiddish. As far as Hebrew was concerned, both men refused to recognize it as a spoken tongue and referred to it as a language of prayer which was the concern and responsibility of the Jewish religious community. They claimed that they would neither help nor hinder such activities. When it was further charged that Jews were not permitted to create prayerbooks for the teaching of the language, this fact was attributed to the disinterest of Jews themselves: a common excuse among Soviet officials. Finally, both professors suggested that this was a vastly complicated question and that the complete assimilation of Soviet Jewry would be the desirable goal. Upon further discussion they admitted that the Jewish national group alone seemed superfluous in the eyes of the Soviet authorities.

The matter was then pursued with Prof. Ivan Podedkhin, director of the Institute of Ethnology at the University of Moscow. This institute is responsible for the designation of national identities. After many hours of argument, it was finally divulged that the subject of Jewish identity was just then coming before the Institute of Ethnology for restudy. However, the research and discussions had not yet reached the stage where they could be made public. The latest information on this subject which we have been able to secure from the Soviet Union, indicates that the problem of Jewish identity is now very much alive in Soviet academic circles.

This creates the dilemma for Soviet Jewry: whether to be or not to be a nationality. If national identity is taken from them, all that will be left will be a religious identity. In view of the fact that only a small minority of Soviet Jewry maintains identity with the synagogue and that members of this minority, for the most part, are well advanced in years, it would mean the virtual disappearance by assimilation of this vast segment of world Jewry. Hitler destroyed 6 million Jews. The Soviet Union is suggesting to 3 million more the possibility of mass

cultural suicide. The other alternative is to seek to maintain Soviet Jewry as a national minority. This would mean the continuance of certain disabilities, and perhaps an intensification of the current antisemitic wave now prevalent in the Soviet Union. But it would make possible the maintenance of identity for these 3 million people and the hope for their eventual freedom. These millions of Jews also recognize that even cultural and religious suicide may not necessarily destroy the virus of antisemitism. Among those who were liquidated in the Stalin purges were many men and women who had not only relinquished their Jewish heritage, but had become the enemies of those who insisted on retaining it.

No other Jew in the world can make this decision for Soviet Jewry. Of course, it may be that Soviet Jewry will have little voice in determining its own destiny. But where shall they, as a community, apply the little strength that they may have?

NATIONAL WILDLIFE WEEK— MARCH 17 TO 23, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that this week is National Wildlife Week throughout the Nation.

Held during the first week of spring every year since first proclaimed by President Roosevelt in 1938, National Wildlife Week has served to focus public attention on the importance of conserving our natural resources and to spotlight specific conservation problems through the years. This year the Wildlife Week's theme is "Chemical Pesticides Are Poison—Handle With Care."

This theme is especially appropriate this year in view of the nationwide impact which has been made recently by Rachel Carson's controversial book, "Silent Spring," which has detailed how man has abused and misused chemical pesticides in his attempt to control insects and other pests. The issues raised by Miss Carson's book have stressed general agreement that steps should be taken to acquaint the public with the potential dangers and hazards involved in the use of these chemical pesticides. With the protection of the public and our Nation's heritage of abundant fish and wildlife in mind, the National Wildlife Federation-sponsored Wildlife Week has devoted itself to this important educational task.

WOOLEN TEXTILE IMPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the question of imports of woollen manufactures and their effect on the U.S. industry has again become a matter of public and governmental concern. The President's Cabinet Committee on Textiles met recently on this problem and the President has promised an answer to a group of distinguished colleagues from wool producing and wool textile manufacturing States on what action, if any, will be taken.

There has been much dispute, however, concerning the actual facts regarding imports and the performance of the domestic industry. This is because of the great difficulties in obtaining, analyzing and evaluating statistical material both on an overall and category-by-category basis. The U.S. industry contends that

imports represent something like 20 per cent of domestic consumption of wool products. Importer groups dispute this figure and contend that the statistical basis for the computation is erroneous. The U.S. industry points to a rising trend of imports. Importer groups emphasize the greatly expanded domestic consumption of woollen products, the firm market for such goods, and the satisfactory performance of the domestic industry.

Mr. President, last year the Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which provides the machinery for evaluating such claims and testing out the arguments and facts submitted by opposing interests before an independent tribunal, the U.S. Tariff Commission. My investigation of the statistical material submitted to me by various groups has convinced me that this is a case for which the machinery set up by the Trade Act could well be used.

The press reports that the Cabinet committee has recommended to the President that a section 332 investigation or an escape-clause investigation by the Tariff Commission be initiated. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of these reports but would endorse such a course of action on the following grounds:

First. Contradictory and incomplete data relating to woollen textile imports and their effect on domestic industry should be evaluated and fully brought to light by the agency created by Congress for this very purpose.

Second. Governmental responsibility to the consumer, who would bear the brunt of increased import restrictions in terms of prices, requires that a full and impartial investigation be conducted before any such restrictions are put into effect.

Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point both the public statement of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers and the letter to the President from the wool products group. I believe that the obvious differences in the data and arguments presented by these two interests clearly indicate the need for an informed judgment in the consumer interest.

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

PUBLIC STATEMENT BY EDWIN WILKINSON,
PRESIDENT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL
MANUFACTURERS, FEBRUARY 14, 1963

President Kennedy's Cabinet Textile Advisory Committee could not give him worse advice than that reported in the press today. According to these reports, it has suggested that the President order still another study of the wool textile-apparel import crisis.

The Cabinet Committee, in our view, is asking the President of the United States to close his eyes to the grave peril he long has recognized and to draw back on administration commitments to limit imports of wool products which in 1962 soared to record levels. For example, imports of woven wool cloth rose to about 65 million square yards in 1962 compared with 42,921,000 in 1961. Imports of cloth in the form of apparel were equal to 20 million yards. The combined total, 85 million square yards, was equal to about 18 percent of U.S. production of woven wool apparel cloth.