

problem for all the states of this hemisphere.

If the Cuban regime is sincere in its request for negotiations, and wishes to lay its grievances before the appropriate forum—the Organization of American States—I would suggest the Cuban Government might start by some action calculated to awaken the confidence of the Inter-American system. The obvious place to begin would be the severing of its multiple ties to the Soviet bloc.

Let no one mistake the impact of this Soviet intervention in Cuba on the hope we all share for world peace. If the Soviet Union persists in the course it has chosen, if it continues to try to prevent the peaceful social revolution of the Americas, it will increasingly excite the deep indignation of the people of my country and of other American States. The result will be to make the resolution of issues far more difficult in every other part of the world. A consequence of this gratuitous Soviet initiative is to postpone even further the hope for world stabilization. I cannot state this point with sufficient gravity.

The tragedy of Cuba is still unfolding. How short has been the time since the two countries of the Western Hemisphere acclaimed the downfall of the Batista dictatorship and hailed what promised to be a democratic and progressive revolution. How quickly that promise was replaced by a reign of terror, confiscation, and the suppression of political, intellectual and religious freedom.

Just as fear is the first price of oppression, it would also have been the final price, if the Cuban oppressor had not been saved from the Cuban people by the Soviet Union. How many times in history has fear of the people's wrath driven tyrants to sell their nation to more powerful tyrants?

Can the Cuban electorate send the Russian forces home? Do the Cuban leaders dare face their people without these alien protectors? A country bristling with Soviet missiles and protectors is your answer.

We will constantly work to reassure the Cuban people that they have not been forgotten or abandoned, and make clear to freedom loving Cubans, both within and without that country, that they can count on the sympathy and support of the American people in their efforts to escape the grip of Soviet domination and recapture their own revolution. We did this for those who sought the overthrow of Batista. We can do no less today.

The Foreign Ministers meeting at Washington voiced the fraternal affection of all American peoples for the people of Cuba, and fervently wish to see them embraced again in the American family of nations. The United States joins wholeheartedly in this desire.

If the Cuban regime wishes to establish normal friendly relations in this hemisphere, let it return to the concepts and obligations of the Inter-American system; let it cease its subservience to the Soviet Union—let it cease to be an avenue of intervention, which threatens the fundamental principles and the peace and security of all its neighbors with an alien doctrine.

The way is clear, and the choice is Cuba's.

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, the Lippmann article and the Stevenson statement make perfectly clear to the American people that we have no intention of following an aggressive course of action against Cuba, in spite of the lies spoken yesterday by the President of Cuba at the United Nations, but that we intend to stop any aggression on the part of Cuba against either the United States or any of our allies in the Western Hemisphere.

That is American policy. That is sound policy. It is within the framework of international law. I highly commend the President of the United States for his statesmanship in the field of foreign policy.

#### USE BY STATE AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS OF DOSSIERS FROM TRUJILLO FILES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the September 18, 1962, issue of National Review Bulletin there appeared a certain article from which I quote:

According to reliable sources, the State and Justice Departments are making good use of dossiers taken from the files of the Trujillo regime. These dossiers show that the late Dominican dictator had a regular price list for U.S. legislators: \$10,000 for a congressman, \$25,000 for a senator or committee chairman, more for those with real political muscle. The names of those "on the take" are known, and it is charged that they reach very high in the congressional hierarchy. This information, if blasted out, could create a first class political scandal, but so far it is being used to condition the thinking of those involved when they become obstreperous over "must" legislation.

This is a rather serious charge, and recognizing it as such I forwarded a letter to the Attorney General under date of September 20, incorporating this charge, and asking him to look into it and to comment.

I ask unanimous consent that both my letter and the Attorney General's reply thereto, as received by me on October 2, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SEPTEMBER 20, 1962.

HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,  
Attorney General,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In the September 18, 1962, issue of National Review Bulletin, there appears on page 5 the following paragraph, which is quoted in full:

"According to reliable sources, the State and Justice Departments are making good use of dossiers taken from the files of the Trujillo regime. These dossiers show that the late Dominican dictator had a regular price list for U.S. legislators: \$10,000 for a Congressman, \$25,000 for a Senator or committee chairman, more for those with real political muscle. The names of those "on the take" are known, and it is charged that they reach very high in the congressional hierarchy. This information, if blasted out, could create a first-class political scandal, but so far it is being used to condition the thinking of those involved when they become obstreperous over 'must' legislation."

It seems to me that this is a most serious charge to have published in a nationally circulated publication and it should not go unchallenged. I ask you, therefore, to advise me as soon as possible whether the information contained in the paragraph quoted above is or is not true.

I cannot overemphasize the seriousness which I attach to these charges and believe that if they are not true a prompt denial should be made public.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., October 2, 1962.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your letter of September 20, 1962, re the paragraph in the National Review Bulletin of September 18.

I know of no list or information, such as that referred to in the article mentioned. Whether or not there is such a list is one of the matters being looked into in connection with the current investigation of the Galindez case. Up to this time, no such information has been developed.

I appreciate your interest in bringing this to my attention.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,  
Attorney General.

#### CRITICISM OF DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP IN THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this week some of us hope to bring to a close what has been one of the longest, most quarrelsome, and most frustrating peacetime sessions of the Congress.

Adjournment has been unduly delayed as the result of a series of revolts of the Democratic membership against the leadership of the Senate and their own President. It is ironical that this revolt stems, not from the opposition party but, rather, from within its own ranks.

For instance: First, appropriation bills were held up months as the result of a picayunish dispute between the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees as to who should sit at the head of the table during the conferences. Now two subcommittee chairmen are feuding, which means more delays.

Even the secretary of the Democratic conference committee of the Senate is leading a revolt against the President and threatening to hold Congress in session indefinitely in an effort to force him to sign or veto a pet bill before adjournment. This is a bill which had been on the Senate Calendar for more than a year, and no one was even interested enough in the legislation to move for its consideration until a couple of weeks ago. In fact, less than a month ago the sponsors of this same bill voted against it when it was offered as an amendment to the regular tax bill.

Suddenly this bill assumes great importance, and one wonders whether it is the bill that is so important or whether some of the Democratic Members of the Senate are just using this as an excuse to show their resentment against some of the arrogant demands which the President has made on this Congress.

With a 2-to-1 majority in the Senate and a 3-to-2 majority in the House one would think that they could have finished the business of the Congress on schedule.

To make the situation even worse, the President, rather than staying on the job in Washington, has just been using the White House as a stopover between weekend vacationing at Hyannis Port and political junkets around the coun-

1962

patrol boats and anti-aircraft equipment would be just exactly what he would need to repel another landing by Cuban exiles.

The present Cuban military buildup is not only not capable of offensive action, but also it is not capable of defensive action against the United States.

Let me read the final paragraph:

It follows that as long as there is no direct military aggression by Cuba, as long as we are limiting ourselves to measures short of war, one of the best responses is to force the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc to carry the whole burden of Cuban reconstruction. That is the intent of the shipping measures now being formulated. They will not destroy the Castro regime now. But they will make it much more expensive and inconvenient for the Soviet Union to make Castro succeed.

In January of this year the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I were the two delegates from the Senate to the Punta del Este Conference. We listened to the diatribes and the Communist propaganda of the President of Cuba in a series of speeches at Punta del Este.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to continue for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. He put on a repeat performance yesterday at the United Nations, about which we read in the newspapers today. He was answered, in a prepared statement that was circulated throughout the United Nations, by our brilliant and great statesman, the American Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stevenson's statement of yesterday be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

OCTOBER 8, 1962.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN PLENARY SESSION

Mr. President, I have asked to speak to a point of order. For 17 years we have come to expect that when a chief of state asks for the privilege of this podium, he has an obligation not to abuse it, and not to demean the United Nations and the dialog of diplomacy, but to speak here in a constructive and a statesmanlike manner.

But the President of Cuba, Mr. President, speaking as chief of state on a ceremonial occasion, has seen fit to use this rostrum to attack my country with unparalleled calumnies, slanders, and misrepresentations for 1 hour and 45 minutes.

Yet, Mr. President, I will not claim a right of reply from this platform this morning. Instead, I shall respond to his intemperate and false charges outside of this hall and at once. And, with your permission, Mr. President, I will have my response placed before the members of the General Assembly in printed form during the day.

Mr. President, the traditions of etiquette and of good taste which have been established here have built respect for this organization and, for my part, I do not want to descend even by reply to the levels of the chief of state we have just heard on this ceremonial occasion.

He is right, however, on one point. The last word will be written by history.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN REPLY TO PRESIDENT DORTICOES

Slander and invective are no substitute for facts and the weaker a case is the longer it takes to present. I think I can be very brief, indeed.

The charges just rehearsed by President Dorticoes of Cuba against my government are neither original nor true. Four times within the last 8 months, once in the Special Political Committee of the Assembly, once in the Plenary, and twice in the Security Council, the United Nations has decisively rejected accusations similar to those we have heard today.

I repeat the policy of the United States:

The Government of the United States, like the governments of the other independent American Republics, will honor its commitments to the United Nations Charter and to the Inter-American system. As we have stated so often, the United States will not commit aggression against Cuba. But let it be equally clear that the United States will not tolerate aggression against any part of this hemisphere. The United States will exercise the right of individual and collective self-defense—a right expressly recognized in the charter—against aggression in this hemisphere.

The charges made by Cuba against the United States are dictated by two factors. One is that the Castro regime has associated itself with the Communist bloc in its pursuit of world domination. A tactic always used in seeking this objective is to ridicule, malign and vilify anyone with the courage to oppose them.

The second factor is Cuba's self-inflicted exclusion from the American family of nations. The Castro regime has turned its back on its history, tradition, religion and culture. Cuba has turned away from its neighbors, and it is at the mercy of the political riptides that sweep through the Communist world with such frequency.

Thus the other nations of the Americas are understandably anxious and alert. But vigilance cannot and should not be equated with intervention, nor alarm with aggression.

The hemisphere—and the world—were prepared to accept the original promises of the Castro government that economic and social justice would be brought to the Cuban people. But its original pledges have now been discarded by the Cuban regime, and we condemn with all the force at our command the violations of civil justice, the drumhead executions and the suppression of political, intellectual, and religious freedom which have been inflicted on the Cuban people.

But even these excesses would not constitute a direct threat to the peace and independence of other states. However, Cuba has been opened to a flood of Soviet weapons and "technicians," and to the Soviet Union's so-called fishing fleet which is a long way from the fishing grounds off the north shore of Cuba.

The cod and the herring, gentlemen, are a long way from the new fishing fleet's headquarters. Cuba has not only armed itself to a degree never before seen in any Latin American country, but it has also welcomed penetration by the foremost exponent of a doctrine condemned in this hemisphere as "alien" and "incompatible." What we cannot accept—and will never accept—is that Cuba has become the springboard for aggressive and subversive efforts to destroy the Inter-American system, to overthrow the governments of the Americas and to obstruct the peaceful, democratic evolution of this hemisphere toward social justice and economic development.

The statements of the President of the United States on this subject, and the recent joint resolution of the Congress of the United States amply attest to this concern.

Nor can these developments be ignored by the American Republics as a whole. Let there be no doubt as to the solidarity of the nations of this hemisphere on the problem of Cuba.

The foreign ministers and special representatives of the American Republics have just concluded 2 days of informal discussion on Communist intervention in Cuba. Speaking unanimously, they declared that the most urgent problem facing the hemisphere is this foreign intervention in Cuba and its threat to convert the island into an armed base for penetration and subversion of the democratic institutions of the hemisphere.

The hemisphere representatives unanimously affirmed their will to strengthen our common security against all aggression and all situations threatening peace and security in this hemisphere. Noting the special characteristics of the Inter-American regional system, they stated that a military intervention by Communist powers in Cuba cannot be justified as a situation analogous to the defensive measures adopted in other parts of the free world in order to resist Soviet imperialism.

The communique issued by the foreign ministers in Washington last week reflected the sense of increased gravity with which the American States have witnessed a succession of developments in Cuba since the Punta del Este meeting, where the Communist government of Cuba was found to be incompatible with the American system.

In the face of this threat, the foreign ministers have again unanimously reaffirmed their will to strengthen the security of the hemisphere against all aggression, from inside and outside the hemisphere, and against all developments and situations capable of threatening its peace and security.

The historic support of the members of the Organization of American States for the principles of self-determination and non-intervention are well known. These principles have been enshrined in acts of inter-American conferences, antedating by decades even the conception of the United Nations.

The United States has already begun to take effective measures concerning shipping and trade with Cuba, and the surveillance of traffic in arms and other strategic items in accordance with the discussions of the ministers of foreign affairs, the resolutions of the eighth meeting of consultation and other inter-American instruments.

The purpose of these measures is the collective defense of the hemisphere. As I have said, these measures have no offensive purpose.

There was incessant talk this morning about economic strangulation and economic blockade. Neither of these terms has any application to this case.

The current regime in Cuba has pronounced its intention to overthrow other governments in this hemisphere. Could anyone, therefore, take part in any trade, or aid trade designed to boost the Cuban economy, and to arm its military services?

To say that our self-protective actions are aggressive or a warlike gesture is absurd. It is the most normal, and indeed the least violent way, in which we can express our strong disapproval of the threats and sword rattling emanating from Cuba.

No threat to peace in this hemisphere arises out of the unanimous determination of American Republics in this regard.

The President of Cuba professes that Cuba has always been willing to hold discussions with the United States to improve relations and to reduce tensions. But what he really wishes us to do is to place the seal of approval on the existence of a Communist regime in the Western Hemisphere. The maintenance of communism in the Americas is not negotiable. Furthermore the problem of Cuba is not a simple problem of United States-Cuban relations. It is a collective

United States. In absolute terms, however, the gap between the two nations has widened. U.S. GNP, at the year's start, was \$491.4 billion greater than that of Japan. Eight years ago, the U.S. lead was only \$342.6 billion. At last count U.S. GNP was more than 10 times Japan's.

"It's impossible to say for certain how fast we should expand—there's a tendency to pick a figure out of the air," asserts F. L. Simmons, vice president and economist of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York. "The statements made, moreover, often reflect the political underpinnings of the speakers."

CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most scholarly and penetrating analyses of the Cuban issue is contained in an article by Walter Lippmann which was published this morning in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

ON WAR OVER CUBA

(By Walter Lippmann)

On the question of going to war over Cuba (by blockade or invasion) we now have available a summary of the intelligence findings on which the administration is acting. These facts explain the President's decision to confine himself at this time to measures which are short of war. The facts were put on the record last Wednesday, October 3, before the House Select Committee on Export Control by Mr. George Ball, the Under Secretary of State.

This intelligence estimate is based on an elaborate system of surveillance by sea, by air and by land, and there is every reason to think that its accuracy is very high. For Cuba is an island easily within reach of the Navy and the Air Force, and with the modern apparatus of electronic and photographic intelligence, little of military interest can happen without our knowing it. We do not have to guess about what is being landed at the Cuban ports or about what is being constructed on Cuban territory. We know. And anyone who chooses to question the basis of our present policy must begin by proving that the intelligence estimates are wrong.

So I shall quote in full Mr. Ball's testimony on the crucial question of the Cuban military buildup. "Since July, when the volume of Soviet military shipments to Cuba suddenly vaulted upward, 85 shiploads arrived in Cuban ports. Many of them carried military items, supplies and personnel. These shipments have consisted, in part, of types of weapons previously delivered to the Cuban armed forces, including more tanks, self-propelled guns, and other ground force equipment. The major tonnage in recent shipments, however, has been devoted to SA-2, surface-to-air missiles (SAMS)—together with all the related gear and equipment necessary for their installation and operation. To date, 15 SAM sites have been established in the island. We estimate the total may eventually reach 25. These are antiaircraft missiles having a slant range of 20 to 25 miles.

"In addition, three and possibly four missile sites of a different type have been identified. These sites are similar to known Soviet coastal defense missile sites that are believed to accommodate antishipping missiles with a range of 20 to 35 miles. Quite likely several more such sites will be installed.

"Cuba is now estimated to have 60 older type Mig jet aircraft. In addition, at least

one advanced jet-interceptor has recently been received, and probably several more are in the process of assembly. This type of advanced jet-interceptor is usually equipped with infrared air-to-air missiles. We estimate that the total of these advanced interceptors in Cuba may eventually reach 25 to 30.

"In addition, 16 'Komar' class guided missile patrol boats, which carry 2 short-range missiles (11 to 17 miles) were included in recent shipments.

"About 4,500 Soviet military specialists have arrived, including construction men and technicians."

The military buildup, in short, consists of weapons for the army, antiaircraft missiles, coastal defense weapons, some short-range patrol boats, a few fighter interceptors and some 4,500 Soviet specialists, technicians, and construction men. What is it all for? To attack the United States? Obviously not. The United States, using only conventional weapons, could dispose of Cuba in a few hours. Is the buildup to invade a Latin American neighbor? Conceivably, but only if Castro was prepared for the enormous punishment that would follow. It is obvious, I submit, that Castro is being armed against a rerun of the raid on the Bay of Pigs in April 1961. Tanks, coastal defenses, patrol boats, and antiaircraft equipment would be just exactly what he would need to repel another landing by Cuban exiles.

The present Cuban military buildup is not only not capable of offensive action, but also it is not capable of defensive action against the United States.

What then is Mr. Khrushchev up to in Cuba? Secondly, perhaps he is baiting a trap for us which, if we fall into it, would throw the whole Western Alliance into confusion and disorder just at the time when a Berlin crisis is developing.

But primarily Mr. Khrushchev is in Cuba because he has talked so loudly about helping revolutions. Castro has thrown himself into Khrushchev's arms, and is blackmailing him. The Castro regime has made itself the prime and public test of whether international communism is a real force or a lot of words. Unless Castro can be made to succeed in Cuba, the revolutionary propaganda among the backward countries in the rest of the world will be greatly weakened.

So Mr. Khrushchev, despite what was undoubtedly much reluctance, is entangled in the fortunes of Fidel Castro. He must pour into Cuba oil and machinery, raw materials and food, and technicians and know-how, and money in order to demonstrate that communism can do better and faster in Cuba what the United States and the Alliance for Progress are trying slowly, but by peaceable means, to do elsewhere in Latin America.

This is the core of the Soviet-Cuban alliance. Mr. Ball described the Soviet intervention in Cuba as an effort "to establish a beachhead for subversion in this hemisphere." This would mean that Cuban facilities and Cuban connections with other countries in Latin America would be used to infiltrate agents and propaganda and small arms and money. All of this will work only if in Cuba there is a showpiece of successful communism. It will not work if the agents come from a land that is in misery and disorder.

It follows that as long as there is no direct military aggression by Cuba, as long as we are limiting ourselves to measures short of war, one of the best responses is to force the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc to carry the whole burden of Cuban reconstruction. That is the intent of the shipping measures now being formulated. They will not destroy the Castro regime now. But they will make it much more expensive and inconvenient for the Soviet Union to make Castro succeed.

Following the increasing agitation of the war party in this country, I have turned once more to a famous passage in Winston Churchill's writings in which he discusses the rights and wrongs of going to war.

"The safety of the State, the lives and freedom of their own fellow countrymen, to whom they owe their (the statesmen) position, make it right and imperative in the last resort, or when a final and definite conviction has been reached, that the use of force should not be excluded. If the circumstances are such as to warrant it, force may be used. And if this be so, it should be used under the conditions which are most favorable. There is no merit in putting off a war for a year if, when it comes, it is a far worse war or one much harder to win. These are the tormenting dilemmas upon which mankind has throughout its history been so frequently impaled. Final judgment upon them can only be recorded by history in relation to the facts of the case as known to the parties at the time, and also as subsequently proved." In the Cuban question the facts do not now compel a decision to go to war and there is no evidence whatsoever that war is inevitable and that it should therefore, be engaged in at once.

"Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp and clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclination is to bow their heads, to seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in the majority of instances they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will. \* \* \* How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to read two paragraphs from the article, because in my judgment it is a very clear and, I believe, unanswerable defense of the brilliant policy which President Kennedy is following in connection with the Cuban crisis. There are those who want our country to go to war over Cuba; but they overlook the fact that if we do, we shall stand almost alone, because I think that, at the present time, world opinion is overwhelmingly against any such course of action—and rightly so.

Lippmann points it out with his keen mind in a very convincing manner. As I said before, and repeat today, the American people have every right to have confidence in President Kennedy's position in the Cuban crisis. He has no intention of allowing Cuba to take an aggressive course of action, but he has stated, in a way that is unanswerable, that even a Communist country has the sovereign right to build up its defenses.

Lippmann states:

The military buildup, in short, consists of weapons for the army, anti-aircraft missiles, coastal defense weapons, some short-range patrol boats, a few fighter interceptors and some 4,500 Soviet specialists, technicians, and construction men. What is it all for? To attack the United States? Obviously not. The United States, using only conventional weapons, could dispose of Cuba in a few hours. Is the buildup to invade a Latin American neighbor? Conceivably, but only if Castro was prepared for the enormous punishment that would follow. It is obvious, I submit, that Castro is being armed against a rerun of the raid on the Bay of Pigs in April 1961. Tanks, coastal defenses,

Morse

number of television sets has very greatly increased, and that the number of washing machines, air conditioners, and so forth, has also greatly increased.

The article also states:

The great burst of consumer goods production in recent years far outpaces the population rise. Since 1955, the U.S. population has increased 12 percent. But the number of motor vehicles in use, for example, has climbed 24 percent. Some 8 million families own more than one auto now, nearly double the 1955 total.

Witness the rise of television in recent years: 10 homes have sets today, up from 7 in 1955.

Washing machines: Nearly a quarter of U.S. homes are now equipped with them, up from 15 percent in 1955.

The article also points out:

Rapidly rising research and development spending in recent years has laid the ground-work for further betterment in living standards. The \$50 billion so spent in the U.S. in the past 4 years is nearly double the sum spent in the previous 4 years. This spending has increased yearly, through recovery and recession, since totals first were compiled in 1954.

Mr. President, the argument for increasing spending and reducing taxes has been based on the notion that our economy has grown far more slowly than have the economies overseas. But this is partly a statistical mirage. As the article points out:

But such comparisons can be misleading. Many foreign economies were smashed by World War II. All are expanding from levels far below the U.S. postwar base.

Japan's GNP, for instance, has soared over 120 percent since the mid-1950's, far steeper than the comparable rise of GNP in the United States. In absolute terms, however, the gap between the two nations has widened. U.S. GNP, at the year's start, was \$491.4 billion greater than that of Japan. Eight years ago, the United States lead was only \$342.6 billion. At last count U.S. GNP was more than 10 times Japan's.

So I believe we should look at the real facts, and should examine them very carefully, before we embark on policies of deficit spending and of deliberately unbalancing the budget in times of relative prosperity, since the economy has done extremely well in the last 8 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

**ECONOMIC GROWTH—U.S. LIVING STANDARD RISES TWICE AS FAST AS IN EARLY POSTWAR ERA—PERSONAL INCOME AFTER TAXES GAINS 18 PERCENT IN PAST 8 YEARS; 9 OF 10 HOMES HAVE TV—FLAW IN GROWTH COMPARISON**  
(By Alfred D. Malabre, Jr.)

The American standard of living has grown twice as fast in the last 8 years as in the first 8 after World War II.

This fundamental fact shines through the fog of Federal statistics in an era of much fretting over slow growth in the Nation's economy.

There is no index of the standard of living. Measuring it precisely is impossible. But one figure comes close to the mark. This is per capita disposable income adjusted for changes in the level of prices. The disposable means it's after all personal taxes.

Since late last year this figure has held above \$2,000 for the first time. Latest tally

puts it at \$2,030 in terms of 1961 prices. That's an upward bounce of 16 percent in less than 8 years. In the 8 years ended with 1954 it rose less than 7 percent.

The 2,000-plus figure on the statistically average American's ultimate ability to buy the goods and services of life is now nearly double the \$1,212 of prewar 1939. (The 1939 total, to make it comparable despite price changes, is in terms of 1961 dollars. In 1939 dollars it was only \$537.)

#### EVIDENCE IN HOMES, GOLF COURSES

Evidence of how this great growth in real buying power has bettered the lot of the citizen is abundant. It's found in homes and on highways, in bowling alleys and on golf courses. It shows in book stores and concert halls. And—for the sick—in hospitals.

The 48 million new United States autos made in the last 8 years alone add up to twice as many cars as there are today on all the roads of Europe (including Russia). Once-a-week bowlers in the United States now at 36 million, double the total of 1955. The golfing army has grown 25 percent.

The leap of living standards goes beyond the enjoyment of material things. Columbia Records reports the recording of classical music is the fastest growing part of its business—up 80 percent from the year earlier period in the first half of 1962. Book sales, over \$1.2 billion yearly, are twice the 1955 total. The number of persons now entering hospitals is nearly half again as large as in the mid-1950's.

Growth of consumer products has accelerated sharply in recent years.

The table below shows U.S. production of some familiar goods. The postwar years, starting with 1947, have been divided into two 8-year periods to match recent output against that in the supposedly fast growing early years. Totals for 1955-62 include full-year estimates for this year. Figures are in millions of units.

	Output	1955-62	1947-54
Autos.....	48.4	40.6	
TV sets.....	51.9	37.7	
Washing machines.....	30.8	29.0	
Air conditioners.....	12.6	3.2	
Clothes dryers.....	10.6	3.3	
Dishwashers.....	3.9	1.6	

The quantity of goods produced in the more recent 8-year span, in every case, exceeds the earlier output. In two instances—air conditioners and clothes dryers—1955-62 production is more than three times the 1947-54 total.

And the list doesn't include many items not even produced in the early years. Examples: Washer-dryer combination appliances (100,000 units sold by manufacturers last year), electric can openers (1.7 million), electric knife sharpeners (500,000) and tape recorders (500,000).

#### OUTSTEPS POPULATION RISE

The great burst of consumer goods production in recent years far outpaces the population rise. Since 1955, the U.S. population has increased 12 percent. But the number of motor vehicles in use, for example, has climbed 24 percent. Some 8 million families own more than one auto now, nearly double the 1955 total.

Witness the rise of television in recent years: Nine of 10 homes have sets today, up from 7 in 10 in 1955.

Or clothes dryers: Nearly a quarter of U.S. households are now equipped with them, up from 6 percent in 1955.

Or beef consumption: Per capita, Americans ate 67 pounds of it last year, a 12-pound jump from the 1955 average.

The homebuilding surge—over 10 million new homes in less than 8 years—has reduced "doubling up" among families. In

1955, about 1.5 million married couples were without homes of their own and had to live with relatives or others. The total now is close to 900,000.

And homes are getting bigger. Floor space in a new single-family house averages about 1,500 square feet, a third more space than the average new home contained in 1955.

#### DEPRESSING DEMAND?

Paradoxically, the great boom in things for consumers has caused some fears that consumers now possess so many items there is little room for continuing strong demand.

Many economists, however, believe such concern is unwarranted. Norris O. Johnson, vice president and economist of First National City Bank, New York, puts it this way:

"Human wants are insatiable. If the old worries about people having everything were valid, our economy would still be in the horse-and-buggy stages."

Living-standard growth through access to more so-called services has been sweeping.

A dramatic example: U.S. hospitals last year handled a record 25.5 million admissions. That's about 40 percent above the mid-1950's level.

To supply the growing wants of Americans, U.S. industry has carried out a vast expansion in recent years. Industry's massive ability to produce has prompted some concern about "excessive" capacity. But it also has paved the way for fast growth in the years just ahead, many experts contend.

#### ELECTRICITY TO SPARE

Note the gigantic growth in facilities to generate labor-saving electricity. The country's generating capacity now exceeds 180 million kilowatts; that's nearly 70 million above the 1955 level.

"We have the capacity now to handle a 25-percent jump in demand," says an official of Edison Electric Institute, a trade group representing electric utility companies. In the mid-1950's, he estimates, generating capacity was only 15 to 20 percent higher than demand.

To increase and otherwise improve production, the Nation's manufacturers have pumped \$101.3 billion into new plant and equipment projects since 1955. That's some \$17 billion more than they spent for plant and equipment in the entire previous postwar era.

One result of such spending has been a 30-percent leap in production capacity in basic industries (metals, chemicals, petroleum, textiles, lumber, and cement) in the past 8 years. These industries as a whole are now using some 80 percent of their capacity, according to Government estimates, down from about 85 percent in 1955.

Rapidly rising research and development spending in recent years has laid the groundwork for further betterment in living standards. The \$50 billion so spent in the United States in the past 4 years is nearly double the sum spent in the previous 4 years. This spending has increased yearly, through recovery and recession, since totals first were compiled in 1954.

Much of the concern over "slow growth" in the United States centers in comparisons between the increase of gross national product (the market value of all goods produced and services performed) in the United States and in other lands.

GNP in the United States has risen only 2.7 percent annually since the middle of the last decade (after allowing for price increases), far below the comparable rise in some other lands.

But such comparisons can be misleading. Many foreign economies were smashed by World War II. All are expanding from levels far below the U.S. postwar base.

Japan's GNP, for instance, has soared over 130 percent since the mid-1950's, far steeper than the comparable rise of GNP in the