

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL

MAY 23, 1960

FOIAb3b

11-213

(COMMITTEE)

REP. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO (D-CONN.) TODAY SUGGESTED A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO WATCH OVER INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

DADDARIO SAID THE SUPERVISION COULD BE ORGANIZED ALONG THE LINES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY.

DADDARIO SAID THE U-2 INCIDENT "COUPLED WITH INCIDENTS THAT HAVE OCCURRED OVER THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS, INDICATE A NEED FOR A CONTINUING REVIEW AND SUPERVISION OF INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE MACHINERY."

CPYRIGHT

percent better attendance record than younger workers. In Chicago, when a leading department store checked its files, it discovered that absenteeism was 35 percent higher among its younger saleswomen than among those over 50.

"We need young trainees who will stay with us for many years," one crewcut personnel man, himself just recently out of the trainee class, told me. "If we hired people over 40, half of them wouldn't stay on the payroll long enough to justify their training costs."

But who are really the job jumpers? To find the truth the Labor Department analyzed nearly 2 million job-separation records. The quit rate of men in their twenties and thirties turned out to be nearly three times higher than that of workers over 45.

What about the charge that older workers have more accidents? Bunk again. It's the inexperienced youngsters who leap before they look who end up in the hospital. Workers over 45, a Federal survey of 18,700 employees recently revealed, actually have 2.5 percent fewer disabling injuries and 25 percent fewer non-disabling injuries than those in the younger age brackets.

As for sickness, mature workers have a far better record than their juniors. Visits to plant clinics for headaches, colds, and similar ailments are most common in the 20-34 age group, least frequent among those over 50. In a study of more than 9,000 steelworkers, men with 20 or more years of service were sick enough to be hospitalized only half as often as were the younger men.

No matter what other reasons they recite for denying jobs to mature workers, almost all who practice age discrimination eventually fall back upon the argument that higher insurance and pension costs make it too expensive to hire anyone on the wrong side of 40. But this alibi has been thoroughly exploded by an extensive study conducted for the Department of Labor by a committee of 19 pension and insurance experts.

To provide \$3,500 group life insurance for a worker hired at 55, the committee noted, would cost an employer only 2 cents more per hour than for a man of 30. "Tax deductions and dividend credits," the report added, "would reduce this cost to 1 cent an hour or less."

Workmen's compensation rates the committee reminded industry are based upon each employer's accident record, not upon the age of his workers. Health and accident insurance policies likewise are not generally affected by the age of the employee. "Sickness and accident insurance costs," the report declares, "may actually be lower for employees in the older age groups, since their dependents are fewer and maternity is no longer a significant hazard."

When he hires an older worker, the employer is seldom expected to pile up as large a pension for him in 5 or 10 years as would be accumulated for a younger man over a period of 25 to 35 years. The employer makes the same contributions for both—so many cents per hour or per dollar earned. The older man, of course, gets a smaller supplementary pension when he retires. But that is far better than being barred from employment and getting no income at all.

The experts' report was published more than 2 years ago. Yet many an employment manager still uses the old pension cost argument.

What is the price we all are paying for this callous squandering of precious skills and trained minds?

For the victims of the process, age barriers spell shattered lives. For millions more of us the threat of finding ourselves all washed up in the prime of life poses a haunting fear for the future.

But for all of us, whether we be employees, the self-employed or employers, the insidious growth of age discrimination involves an even greater threat to our futures. Already

we are all paying higher taxes to provide unemployment benefits and relief payments to the competent workers that industry is needlessly discarding.

Yet these vast expenses are but the beginning of the toll. For as long as we permit men and women of 45, and even 35, to be barred from employment solely because of their age, we are leaving the way wide open for the rise of an explosive political movement that will make the "ham and eggs," the "\$30 every Thursday," and the Townsend plan of the 1930's seem like Sunday School picnics.

"The older worker," New York State Senator Thomas C. Diamond has warned us, "is tired of hearing about the problem of age discrimination. He wants something done about it. There are millions of people between 40 and 65 whose livelihood is jeopardized by the discriminatory use of the crude, unreliable index of age as a measure of capacity. The frustrations of the older worker can find release in a wild handout movement that will engulf the stability of our entire economic order."

"If economic life becomes too hard for the over-40's," says Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, "they will form the most potent pressure group this Nation has ever known and force some kind of public program for their survival. This is a problem industry must face immediately. Will it find places for them—and make profits from their production—or will it wait to be taxed much more heavily than now in order to sustain them as nonworkers?"

Where We Stand in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective and hard-working Members of the House is my good friend and distinguished colleague from the First Congressional District of Connecticut, the Honorable EMILIO Q. DADDARIO.

"MIM" DADDARIO long ago acquired a habit of attaining distinction in anything he attempts. From his college days at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Conn., where he became one of Wesleyan's alltime star athletes, he proceeded to compile an enviable military record in World War II with the Office of Strategic Services. In the postwar period, he became mayor of Middletown and later judge of the Middletown municipal court. With the outbreak of the Korean conflict, he returned to military service, this time in the Far East, again compiling a distinguished record.

As a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, "MIM" DADDARIO has made significant contributions to the pioneering work of this group. His grasp of the difficult and complex problems of the exploration and development of outer space are clearly shown in an article he has written for the May 1960 issue of the Wesleyan University Alumnus, entitled "Where We Stand in Space." Under leave to extend my remarks, I call the article to the earnest attention of my colleagues. The text follows:

WHERE WE STAND IN SPACE (By Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO)

The exploration of space and the development of its use for service to man is a major responsibility of Congress and its Committee on Science and Astronautics. Because we are not the only nation so interested, a race for space has been created with every success or failure tallied on the chart of world public opinion. We cannot ignore so great a challenge. Involving as it does both the military survival of the Nation and its economic well-being, it demands an ultimate effort. This is a capsule report on the outlook as it appears to me after studying reports and listening to statements by our scientists, military leaders, and industrialists as presented to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am a member.

MAN IN SPACE

There is great public interest in the project to put man himself into space. This represents a new frontier, one without limit, unlike the vanished frontiers of the earth's surface. It is too early to say whether putting man into space in this manner will have immediate economic or military significance, but no one can doubt the psychological impact in the world power struggle, or the ultimate consequences both for military development and for scientific and economic endeavor.

Putting man into space successfully for any length of time is the culmination and synthesis of a great amount of our modern scientific knowledge and technical achievement. It involves reliable propulsion, materials of remarkable qualities, intricate guidance and communications, and a collection of environment controls to overcome the absence of air, the presence of radiation, weightlessness, and the fierce heat of reentry. It also requires a vast system of ground support including tracking and computing facilities and effective recovery means. To have all this combined and made to work reliably is a major undertaking resting on the base of billions of dollars of research, development, and testing.

As of this date it is difficult to predict with certainty whether it will be the United States or the Soviet Union which first achieves the successful orbiting and recovery of a man in a ballistic capsule. It would not be surprising if the Russians do it first. This is because they have had larger rocket powerplants for a longer period of time, and because they early pursued a vigorous and highly successful program of biological experiments in space which have included the successful recovery of living animals from some very ambitious vertical probes into space.

The U.S. effort is centered in Project Mercury. Although it has its limitations, it represents our first important hope for success. It is well thought out and is proceeding in an orderly way at a very high level of priority.

Particular public interest has centered on the seven chosen astronauts. Having met these young men, I can assure you that they are skilled and dedicated, and that they will bring this country success if it is within the capabilities of man.

No positive timetable can be given on such an experimental program. However, our tentative goal is to make the first ballistic-type attempt with a modified Redstone carrying the capsule and astronaut some time this year. If all goes well, it may be possible to orbit a man in 1961. It is most likely that he will orbit the earth three times in a period of 4 hours and then skip down from outer space into the upper atmosphere, beginning over the Pacific, crossing the continental limits of the United States, and landing in the Atlantic Ocean.

Follow-on projects at various stages of development or study include Dyna-Soar,

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, persuasive reasons why workers over 40 should not be discriminated against were set out by Albert Q. Maisel in the American Weekly several years ago. These reasons still are valid and the Maisel article deserves not to be forgotten. The following is a condensation which appeared in the Catholic Digest:

THROUGH AT DJ—INDUSTRY IS SAWING OFF THE BRANCH ON WHICH IT IS SITTING
(By Albert Q. Maisel)

He was a well-dressed, dignified man who had never before found it hard to put his ideas over convincingly. But as he sat uncomfortably before an interviewer's desk in an office of the New York State Employment Service, his words came hesitantly. He had been hunting a job for nearly 6 months, and had found nothing.

John Jones (that's not his real name, of course) had lost his position when a merger swallowed up the drug manufacturing firm for which he had worked for 14 years. He described his record: As an honor student at college, as chief pharmacist at a hospital, as a "detail man" introducing new drugs to physicians, and as supervisor of a dozen other pharmaceutical detailers.

There was more than a hint of desperation in his voice as he named the salary he would accept, a third less than he had earned before. But when he finished, the interviewer smiled encouragingly, and lifted a card from her file. "You've got exactly the experience these people are looking for," she told him as she reached for her telephone.

Seconds later she was describing him to a personnel director. "Yes, he has his own car," Jones heard her say. "Yes, he lives out on Long Island and knows every physician and druggist in the territory. His age? Let's see. Oh, yes—he was 41 last December."

For a fleeting moment Jones' eyes had been aglow with hope and anticipation. Then he heard the interviewer saying, "But won't you even see him?" And his shoulders drooped as he realized that once again he had been denied the chance to be considered for a job that he knew he could have filled to perfection.

"I'm terribly sorry," the interviewer explained. "I should have remembered that they have an ironclad rule against hiring any new employee who is over 40."

Fantastic? Irrational? Disgraceful? Of course. But shockingly true. What happened to John Jones is happening every day to scores of thousands of men and women. At 45, 40, 35, sometimes at 30, they are discovering that they have become too old to meet the arbitrary hiring age barriers erected by more than half of all employers.

Mind you, I am not talking about incompetence, not pleading for neurotics who can't get along with supervisors or fellow employees. I am not defending job jumpers who quit whenever a whim strikes them. My concern (and, I hope, yours) is with the innumerable talented, experienced men and women who, in the face of a desperate shortage of skilled personnel, are being routinely refused even an interview, solely because of the accident of their dates of birth.

The age bias could hit you just as disastrously as it hits them, through no fault

of your own, if a merger, business failure, or introduction of automatic machinery suddenly wiped out the job you've held for years.

In New York City, for example, changes in shopping habits have compelled three large department stores to close within the last two years. Each time, almost 1,000 employees were thrown out of work. Each time, the younger workers, with but a few years of experience, were quickly offered jobs by other big stores. But almost all the others, men, and women with 15- and 20-year records as star salespeople, found themselves on the scrap heap.

"When the Namm-Loeser Brooklyn store closed, nearly 600 of its older workers registered with us," Janet O. Wolfe, manager of the commercial and sales office of the New York State Employment Service, told me. "In nearly a year we've managed to place only a handful of these skilled people. The rest? Most are still haunting the personnel offices and getting nothing but an occasional part-time job. But a number of them, rebuffed over and over, have completely cracked up."

In Michigan, in 1956, automation enabled one of the big auto makers to boost production in its stamping shops by fully 300 percent. As a result, an independent stamping plant lost its contract and was forced to close down, throwing 5,000 men out of work.

For most of the younger men it meant only a short layoff; other manufacturers did not fight one another in a wild scramble to hire them. But the unemployment benefits of most workers between 35 and 50 were exhausted before they could find new positions.

Even when the luckiest of these victims of age discrimination had to accept wage cuts of from 25 to 50 percent to get any work at all. And a full year after the disaster had struck them, 1,000 of the older workers were still without employment.

In 1951 an analysis of 4,374 "Help wanted, male" ads in a New York City daily revealed that 38.2 percent carried age restrictions. Last year U.S. Labor Department officials found that the proportion of want ads limiting job opportunities to workers under 45 had skyrocketed to nearly 60 percent.

Often the iron curtain against age descends faster than that. A typical Los Angeles advertiser, for example, demands "Researchers on defense project; B.S. degree plus 5 years' minimum experience; age 27-35."

A large manufacturing plant near Chicago seeks "Machinists, experience all phases of setup on planers, millers, shapers; must be under 30."

Thousands of similar ads, casually barring mature workers as if they were doddering has-beens, appear every day. But such open admissions of age bias tell only a part of the whole ugly story. Confidential hiring orders to employment agencies are even more often discriminatory. Last spring, for instance, the U.S. Department of Labor sponsored a study of more than 21,000 such job orders received during a single month by the State employment services in 7 cities. In Detroit, more than two-thirds of all jobs were tagged "older workers needn't apply." In Miami, 73 percent of job orders set rigid age limitations. In Minneapolis and St. Paul, age restrictions accompanied more than three-quarters of all requests for new employees.

In Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, fully 79 percent of all employers were barring men and women in their middle 40's from all hope of employment. In all seven metropolitan districts, one hiring order out of every five set the maximum age for new employees at 35 or lower.

Is there any real excuse for this cruel discrimination? Why does industry, so effi-

cient in everything else, so flagrantly waste skill, talent, and experience?

For more than 4 months I have hunted for a logical answer to these questions. I have interviewed scores of personnel directors, sales managers, production executives, and company presidents. Like everyone else who has studied the problem, I've listened to a host of reasons. But every last one has turned out to be not a reason at all, but merely an excuse based upon myths, old wives' tales, half-truths, and raw, ugly prejudice.

Typical was the answer of the personnel director of a metalworking firm with more than 5,000 employees. "I hate to turn down an older man," he told me. "But you can't get over the fact that, after 40 they slow down. If we didn't set a hiring age limit, our production costs would climb sky high."

This same reason was cited by more than 4 out of every 10 employers interviewed by the Department of Labor in its recent seven-city survey. But is it really a fact?

The National Association of Manufacturers tried to find out, 6 years ago, through a study of more than 3,000 companies employing more than 3 million people. And 93 percent of the firms reported that workers 40 and older were equal or superior to younger workers.

More recently, when the Bureau of National Affairs asked the personnel and industrial relations executives of 196 large companies, "Are your older workers less efficient?" three out of every four of these men responded with a loud "No!"

Researchers from Temple University recently queried 97 Pennsylvania companies employing 1,000 or more workers each. On quantity of production, more than 60 percent of the firms rated their older employees as "average or above average." More than 90 percent of the companies said that older men turned out finer work, had far lower spoilage rates, and far fewer rejects.

Another favorite excuse centers about the charge that older workers are inflexible and unimaginative, and have trouble getting along with younger men. But when the Bureau of National Affairs asked executives whether they had any great difficulty supervising the work of older men in their own plants, 81 percent of the officials from large companies replied, "Not at all," and 90 percent of the executives from companies with fewer than 1,000 employees gave the same emphatic answer.

The University of Illinois survey dealt with workers over 60, presumably the crankiest and most inflexible. Yet 69 percent of their supervisors reported that the older men got along just as well with their foremen and their fellow employees as did the majority of younger men.

In fact, study after study has shown that the work attitudes of people over 40 are measurably better than those of youngsters. Prentice-Hall, Inc., a book-publishing concern, surveyed a cross section of companies ranging in size from 100 to 50,000 employees. Seventy-six percent of the firms reported that general dependability was greater among the older men. Not a single company claimed that younger men deserved a better rating.

One excuse for hiring only youngsters is that absenteeism is far more common among older workers. But what are the facts?

Among women it is predominantly the young, unmarried ones who phone in to plead a "headache" after a too-late date with the boy friend. Among men it is again predominantly the youngsters who turn up on Tuesday or Wednesday after a weekend bender.

In fact, when the Bureau of Labor Statistics studied the timecards of more than 16,000 male employees in 109 manufacturing plants, it found that men over 40 had a 20

which in advanced versions will orbit a man, and allow some choice as to point of landing through use of a winged glider reentry instead of the straight ballistic fall with blunt nosecone and parachute as intended with Mercury. Farther away but under study are manned space stations and ultimate expeditions to the Moon, Venus, and Mars.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES

One of the earliest and surest payoffs from our space research is in the area of space communications. The most compelling urgency is to have a sure system of worldwide communications. The volume of military messages being far in excess of our commercial traffic illustrates the importance of communications to our national security. We know how vulnerable most of our communication channels are from solar disturbances and how terrible the consequences would be in this missile age if immediate commands could not be passed between headquarters and our strategic forces both on airfields and in the air the world over, and how our defensive tracking and command systems also can falter when communications become difficult. Ordinary communication channels are not only overcrowded, but can blank out for days, and yet military requirements call for instantaneous linkage.

These are the compelling arguments advanced for putting the first generations of communications satellites called Project Notus under the control of the Defense Department. Project Notus includes several parts: Project Courier will be an improvement of the Project Score Atlas which carried the President's voice and teletypewriter messages around the world in December 1958. It is called a delayed repeater active satellite because its taperecorders pick up messages for delivery on command from the ground at a later time. Project Steer will be somewhat similar, but will relay messages instantaneously by rebroadcast. It offers the opportunity for developing virtually jamproof, sun-storm-proof line of sight narrow beam signal transmission. Project Decree will come about when we have more powerful launching vehicles to place the real time repeater satellite 22,300 miles over the Equator so that its speed in orbit matches the rotation of the earth exactly enough to hold it with minor corrections in fixed position relative to the surface of the Earth. Three properly spaced equatorial orbit satellites will allow line of sight communication to all except the extreme polar regions. All these devices are practical, but will call for careful design to create reliability of circuits and a durable power supply from either solar cells or a nuclear source of energy whether isotopic battery or a miniature reactor with heat exchanges, turbine, and generator.

While we are waiting for these military projects to reach perfection, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will be pursuing the passive relay of signals by placing large reflecting objects in orbit against which anyone may bounce signals just as the Navy is bouncing signals off the surface of the Moon. This passive satellite relay is called Project Echo and will include the placing and inflating of exceedingly thin 100-foot-diameter metal-coated plastic balloons into orbit. It is planned that these balloons will stay in orbit for a time before they gradually slow and are destroyed on reentry to the upper atmosphere.

Once urgent military needs have been cared for, and perhaps partly in parallel, we are going to see a commercial use of communications satellites. The research for this is already underway among the big telephone, cable, and radio companies. The reasons are fairly simple. Not only can such links be free from the delays of solar activity, but they offer many more channels through which information can be

poured. Satellites will prove cheaper than laying more ocean cables, will provide many additional channels, and will make intercontinental television a practical thing. As of today pictures sent live across the Atlantic take hours of broadcasting and taping to produce a few minutes of pictures and the results are hardly satisfactory for regular or instantaneous use.

In contrast, the satellite planned for Project Decree will be able to carry 300 voice channels or two television channels through the 8,000 pounds of weight in orbit. This project should be a going thing, in less than 5 years, and will be just the beginning, for one industrial company has plans for an advanced satellite capable of relaying 50,000 voice messages simultaneously. Once the big 1.5 million pound thrust Saturn booster is perfected, stations of this type can be placed in orbit.

The needs for high capacity are very great. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has shown that there were 1.5 million overseas telephone messages in 1950, that 3 million are expected this year, and that the saturation capacity of slightly over 4 million messages will be reached by 1962. By 1970 the number of messages could rise to 21 million if facilities were provided. Since no cables are planned to keep up with this project demand, communication satellites will be a virtual necessity during the present decade. The present two Atlantic cables carry only 36 voice channels each. Compared with the estimate above as to what satellites will do, one can envision the kind of "quantum jump" which is coming in our contacts with the rest of the world. Indeed, it was Arthur Clarke, author of "The Exploration of Space," who suggested to my committee that the first nation to achieve a practical television satellite might set the universal language for all the world. This will exert a force on the course of history far greater than ever previously experienced.

WEATHER SATELLITES

Although not a commercial project in itself, the weather satellite is likely to exercise a profound influence on the world economy within a decade. Leading weather experts have said that the United States alone may realize benefits from this one type of satellite in excess of \$4 billion a year. Such a saving would be more than enough to pay for the entire space program.

The weather satellite is still an experimental device and is under development by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under the code Project Tiros. This will be followed by the more sophisticated Project Nimbus. Success here will give continuous reports on cloud cover, heat balance, solar activity, and many other related matters. Weathermen on the ground can then feed the worldwide information into computers and complete studies now based greatly on theory. Only then will we begin to have reliable weather reports useful to agriculture and industry in a definitive way.

The weather satellite will have military uses as well. For example, when reconnaissance military satellites are able to broadcast the immediate position of ships at sea to missile launching pads, these ships will lose some of their present invulnerability. Information from weather satellites relayed to ships will give them cloud cover reports allowing them to keep out of sight much of the time, and thus reduce their vulnerability.

NAVIGATION SATELLITES

The Navy in particular has a very keen interest in a navigation satellite called Project Transit. In effect it will become a manmade radio star which regardless of weather can be sighted through instruments and very exact readings on location can be made through the Doppler shift of signals as it passes. It is expected that these devices will be available within 2 years to guide ships

and Polaris submarines at a cost well below the presently maintained long-distance range stations. Their signals will also have practical commercial value and will be available to other countries as well.

VEHICLE FAMILIES

My discussion above is largely in terms of the important end uses which are coming most immediately. Equally significant is the development of the launching vehicles themselves.

Ballistic missile experience is the foundation of by far the largest part of our space effort. Powered with the H-1 rocket engine, the Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter have put up all but the nominal payloads of the Vanguard and the early Explorer satellites. However, the relatively limited Vanguard and Explorers of the 1958 period have provided components for the upper stages of the more versatile vehicles of the present. Still better is the new Agena second stage for use on either Thor or Atlas. It has been placing 1,700-pound Discoverer engineering test satellites into polar orbit.

The Agena B version which will be ready presently will have a restart capability in space. This development will be essential to attaining the controlled and circular orbits in space needed for the communications and other advanced satellite applications. An additional improvement because of the greater efficiency of hydrogen as a fuel will be the Centaur upper stage. This will have important military assignments and also will provide the first significant capability for lunar soft landings of instruments and interplanetary probes.

However ingenious we are with improved upper stages, our present total lifting capacity will be limited to that possible with our largest launching booster, the Atlas. Atlas has a thrust of 360,000 pounds, only about half that used for the first three sputniks and first three Lunik Soviet rockets. This gives a clue to the importance of Saturn, a clustered arrangement of eight H-1 engines of the type used by our present boosters, and expected to give a first stage thrust of close to 1.5 million pounds.

Along with the big booster are to come super upper stages fueled with hydrogen, and delivering in final version 800,000 pounds of thrust for the second stage, tapering to a fifth Centaur stage. This ultimate arrangement is the kind which will carry men around the moon and perhaps support a landing there. Such landings are feasible with our present technology within a decade.

Saturn is not the end of the line in booster development. Some funding has been given the F-1 engine, to deliver from a single chamber 1.5 million pounds of thrust. With clustering in the Nova concept, we may see as many as 12 million pounds of thrust made available, the basis for a manned round trip to Mars.

Many people close to the work also wish we were pushing with more speed on Project Rover. This is a nuclear heat exchanger rocket already ground-tested which will ultimately increase tenfold the payload that can be sent on interplanetary missions. Here is an opportunity for a significant surge ahead in space for the United States.

Another possibility in the nuclear field is Project Orion, a nuclear bomb propulsion system which would propel a spaceship by firing a sequence of modest-sized nuclear weapons. Enthusiasts see the opportunity for lifting literally thousands of tons of payload by this means.

Electrical propulsion development is showing another important gain for interplanetary work. These may include electrostatically accelerated ions or electromagnetically accelerated plasmas.

All of these plans will see much further development and some applications within the next decade or two, the speed being

largely a matter of how much support we give to the work.

IMPLICATIONS OF SPACE DEVELOPMENT

There is not room here to develop the full implications of our entry into the space age. I have reviewed in general terms some of the applications which will come in our spacework and the vehicles which will carry out these tasks. We must realize that our needs for scientific discovery are linked with space research and that our success in meeting these challenges affects our status as a world leader in the eyes of people all over the globe. There is no doubt that we have at this moment the technical ability and the industrial skill to accomplish leaps ahead in space. We also have the inherent abilities and skills in government and in the universities. It will all take a combination of time, money, and good management. In the background there must be attention to scientific education and training, and an understanding of the importance of this program extending far beyond the current funding of the particular projects being developed.

My review would not be complete without a clear recognition that however we may wish to dedicate space to peaceful uses and to practical applications which are financially self-supporting, there are some very urgent military aspects as well. Quite aside from the ballistic weapons which are becoming for the immediate future the mainstay of the nuclear deterrent of both the United States and the Soviet Union, space has an immediate and urgent significance of military concern. The Midas infrared detector for satellite observation of any missile launchings, and the Samos photographic, television, and electronic ferret satellite for advance warning of military activity represent key projects which involve our very survival. They represent a means to have sufficient warning of any sneak attack on this country which may in fact rule out such sneak attack as being a practical strategy to use against us. Civil defense and retaliatory strikes are back in the picture to a worthwhile degree if we could have even a full half hour of warning from Midas. The present hoped for 10 to 15 minutes of warning is almost meaningless. Modern defense involves many complex issues and forces, and space development is inseparable from consideration of our defense.

There remains the very real hope that space activity in some form will eventually rule out the waste of military preparations, and may serve as a unifying force in human endeavors. This is something for which we should all fervently hope. Meanwhile we have no real choice but to do our best to increase our understanding of the space environment and to increase the skill to use this environment. These are goals worthy of man's best efforts and high faculties.

Veterans Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a number of letters from my district regarding the right of the World War II and Korean veterans to reapply for national service life insurance which was terminated on April 25, 1951. I feel these veterans have a just

cause and hope that favorable action can be secured on pending legislation by the House Veterans Committee and the Congress before adjournment.

The following is a resolution passed by the Hessville Community Service Post 232, the American Legion, Hammond, Ind.:

RESOLUTION—HESSVILLE COMMUNITY SERVICE POST 232, THE AMERICAN LEGION, HAMMOND, IND.

Whereas the right of World War II veterans to reapply for national service life insurance ended on April 25, 1951, and Korean veterans had only 120 days after separation from the Armed Forces in which to apply for said insurance; and

Whereas readjustment and economic problems made it extremely difficult for many worthy veterans to maintain their national service life insurance or to take advantage of early opportunities to secure the insurance, and because now, with advancing age and growing family responsibilities, they desperately need the insurance protection; and

Whereas three bills are now before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee which would accomplish the purpose of providing a limited opportunity for one year for veterans to secure national service life insurance; and

Whereas the three pending bills are described and enumerated as H.R. 4305, H.R. 5437 and H.R. 10407, and said bills should be reported out favorably by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a resolution be passed requesting Congressman RAY J. MADDEN and Congressman E. ROSS ADAIR, both from the State of Indiana, to do all they can to have the aforementioned House bills reported out favorably from committee, and to support said bills on through final passage; it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman RAY J. MADDEN and Congressman E. ROSS ADAIR, with a letter requesting their cooperation in the passage of this veterans' legislation.

This resolution passed unanimously by the membership of the aforesaid American Legion Post 232, May 10, 1960.

A. L. BRADBURN,
Judge Advocate, Hessville Community
Service Post 232, the American Legion,
Department of Indiana.

Letter From Constituent on Post Office Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a letter recently received from a constituent of my congressional district:

In reading newspaper items I notice that Postmaster General Summerfield is screaming to high heaven about the niggardly attitude of Congress toward his appropriations and asking for various and sundry increases.

I ride the bus downtown each day going to work. Having nothing better to do, I look over the advertising signs that are placed in these buses. I am just wondering what these various types of advertising cost if

the same ratio prevails over the entire United States. The buses I ride have for the Post Office alone four different types of advertising: (1) "Certified Mail"; (2) "Stamp Containers"; (3) "Wrap Right"; (4) "Air Mail Service." How much does this cost over the United States and what good does it do? The Post Office is not the only one. The Navy, for example, has three different types of ads in these buses. Another one is "Launch Hope"; another is "U.S. Savings Bonds"; another, "World Refugee"; another, "Radio Free Europe." This is just a few of them that appear in the buses alone. I am just wondering who pays for all of these things.

Personally, I think if we cut out all of the public relations departments in these various Government agencies and not let these "squirrel heads" run loose that we could save a lot of money for the taxpayers of the country. I can't understand why these various departments have to have a lot of high-priced public relations departments to carry on an activity at the taxpayers' expense to promote their ideas which may or may not be good. If the Government has a good program on any subject, I am sure it does not take the public long to be apprised of it without the high-priced, long-haired public relations people to try to sell the idea at taxpayers' expense.

Newspapermen Must Warm Themselves by Their Own Fires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, all of us in public life are naturally concerned with the responsibility of our Nation's press. A view of this problem, from the community service aspect is this article, titled "Community Leadership," which was written by Fred W. Stein, editor and general manager of the Binghamton Press and the Sunday Press, at the request of Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalistic fraternity. The article, herewith condensed, was published in the April issue of "The Quill," the fraternity's publication, and was the fifth in a series on journalistic ethics compiled by the SDX Committee on Ethics.

(By Fred W. Stein)

Every city has its own personality. Every city is a complex, sometimes confusing, blend of virtues and evils, success and failure, hope and despair. The task of portraying this municipal personality is the almost insurmountable job of the newspaper.

Most editors would agree that the only hope of accomplishing this lies in telling the readers the whole story, in illuminating fairly and accurately every situation, every incident that concerns the city. The difficulties and differences arise, however, in the application of this concept.

Where does coverage begin? How deep should the newspaper probe? Are there occasions on which the newspaper performs a greater public service by withholding information than publishing it?

For years newspapers generally have pointed at real and imagined corruption in their cities. Sometimes their motives have been pure. Sometimes not.

Why, then, have the Arab countries not devoted themselves to turning arid land into opulent farmland? Mr. Johnston replies to the question: "The answer, I think, lies in three factors: The basic instability of the region; the intensity of inter-Arab mistrust and rivalries; the Arabs' emotional rejection of Israel, and the whole pattern of political insecurity and social ferment that has made the region a hotbed of trouble."

And who has done most to make the Arab world a hotbed of trouble? The answer can only be Gamal Abdel Nasser. Who continues to tell the Arabs that they must reject Israel, even destroy her? The answer is still Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Of course, the Arabs were to analyze Nasser's fulminations, they would laugh in his face at his ridiculous charges that Israel is intent on gobbling up the Arab countries. To speak of tiny little Israel, which is such a little speck on maps of Eurasia that there is not enough room for printing its name entirely within the space allotted for its geographical borders—to speak of this lamb devouring the elephantine land mass of the Arab nations is nothing short of sheer nonsense.

Of course, while Israel is a lamb in size, it has a lion's heart, and it will not allow itself to be attacked and not fight back. This lamb will not allow itself to be taken to the sacrificial block to satisfy Nasser's ambitions. And therein lies the danger that the United Nations must confront. Nasser is amassing, along the Israel frontiers, troops with tanks, cannon, bombers, machineguns and all other impedimenta of war. And while he is doing this, he is seeking to whip up war hysteria through the Arab League by crying that he is set to begin the sacred march, he is ready to fight the holy war, he is prepared to shed blood, and he yearns to realize his dream of many years to drive the Israelis into the sea.

He taunts the premier of Iraq for not being equally as sanguinary. He calls upon Iraq to "fight with us against Israel on the battle-front lines."

These fiery exhortations are intended incite the Arabs into attacking along Israel's frontiers. And if they attack, what will happen? The attack will surely be repelled to under the law of self defense, reserved in the United Nations charter. But that will not end the matter. The self-defense will bring on reprisal, and the barbarous spectacle of bloody combat will be upon us once again. And as the blood flows and homes fall, and the ground scorches, the world will hold its breath to see what Russia will do. Unfortunately, Russia's performances in the past can give us no assurance that she would do other than seek to use the conflict to her advantage in fulfillment of her long pre-determined plan to achieve world conquest. Russia's action in such a case could be such as might bring remonstrances from the Western World, with the taking of necessary security measures. And then, what?

Aside from realistic attack and defense, there is always the possibility of a misunderstanding of some kind, and the first inter-continental missile would be on its way. It is because of such dire possibilities that the Philadelphia Inquirer said only last Sunday: "The increased massing of the United Arab Republic troops at Israel's borders, plus other military demonstrations pushed by President Nasser, confront the world with a new explosive Middle East."

"Serious tension there could at any time spark off an Arab-Israeli armed clash, with dangerous and widespread consequences."

The editorial carries the heading "Dynamite Keg in Middle East."

The New York Times said recently that border clashes constitute a "warning that a

hair-trigger situation continues to exist in Palestine—a situation that could blow up the peace of the Middle East."

Only 2 weeks ago the able and highly respected General Secretary of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold, said that the situation in the Middle East was "deteriorating." He declared that the only way to break the "chain reaction of reprisal and counterreprisal was to strengthen the hand of the United Nations and for the United Nations to stick to its guns."

I agree with that recommendation absolutely. I believe that the Security Council should step in at once—step in before it is too late. I believe that Nasser at this very moment is no less dangerous to world peace than was Hitler, 22 years ago. Nasser does not have the diabolical ability that Hitler possessed, nor does he have anything like the military machine which Hitler commanded. But he has given evidence of being just as unreasonable and as unwilling to listen to reason, and, with the powder keg admittedly existing in the Middle East he could, through unbridled egotism or dictatorial inebriation, strike the match which could accomplish the holocaust the United Nations was formed to prevent.

The United Nations came into being while the flames of World War II were still licking at the ruins of the abode of civilization in which 22 million human beings had been reduced to ashes. Fully aware that another such war would finish off the human race completely, the peoples of the world authorized their representatives to build an ark of covenant for world peace. They spoke through the Charter of the United Nations. Article I of the charter enumerates as the first purpose of the United Nations:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

Who can doubt that Nasser's actions threaten the peace of the world?

Article II, sections 3 and 4, provide:

"3. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

"4. All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Who can doubt that Nasser and the Arab nations with which he is conspiring have violated and continue to violate these provisions of the Charter of the United Nations?

Under all these circumstances, I believe that the Security Council should convene and order Nasser at once to do the following:

1. Lift his illegal blockade of the Suez Canal, and allow ships the free navigation which international law authorizes and guarantees;

2. Cease his agitations for war and the shedding of blood;

3. Enter into immediate negotiations for a treaty of peace with Israel under the auspices of the United Nations.

If Nasser fails immediately to obey these mandates, the United Nations should expel the United Arab Republic from the United Nations, as provided for in article 6, as follows:

"A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Progress in Space Promotes Peace and Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Thursday night to attend the reception and banquet given by the Baltimore Association of Commerce commemorating the second anniversary of the Vanguard I earth satellite, and to hear my distinguished colleague on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Honorable EMILIO Q. DADDARIO. As the principal speaker on this historic occasion, Mr. DADDARIO made an excellent analysis of the great challenge and the equally great opportunity which lie before us in space. He clearly pointed out why this Nation must recapture the leadership in space technology to maintain the security of the free world. I urge my colleagues to give careful study to his speech which follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN EMILIO Q. DADDARIO DELIVERED AT SECOND ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF VANGUARD I, AT BALTIMORE, MD., MARCH 17, 1960

From Portland, Maine, to Norfolk, Va., crowding against the eastern Atlantic seaboard, live approximately 40 million Americans. This is the greatest concentration of population in the United States. Within this area is a great amount of our national talent and ability.

This one gigantic community is alert to the future, and it has shown its awareness by meeting the problems of growth that have confronted the Nation. A tremendous road network, interwoven with bridges and tunnels, binds it together. Schools by the thousands, from the lowest to the highest levels of education, have been provided. In our midst are located some of the outstanding intellectual communities of the world.

I live and work in this community as many of you do, and know the great concern that exists about the state of our national effort in space. Our people respect achievement. They were proud when Vanguard I was fired into orbit 2 years ago today. They were proud of the technical accomplishments, in which the Martin Co. played such a large part. They had a natural expectation that the United States would be first in space. They saw the Vanguard accomplishment as a great step forward in the reestablishment of our world position. They expect that more will be done and demand that it shall.

Within the week, we have seen a 94.8-pound sphere hurled millions of miles into space. Pioneer V is on its way to a 527-million-mile trip around the sun. It carries five principal scientific experiments to teach us more about the universe. This, too, is a heartening accomplishment and deserves to be applauded.

To some, the exploration and uses of space are an illusion. It is not unusual to hit pockets of doubt in the course of our progress. You hear expressions of scorn about visionaries, and severe concern about the pocketbook. I am reminded of the words Columbus wrote in a letter after his first voyage:

pledge given by a member nation at the table of the Security Council."

When the case of the *Bat Galim* was discussed in the Security Council, the Representatives of the United States declared:

"We cannot fail to state our view that Egyptian restrictions on ships passing through the Suez Canal, whether bound to or from Israel, or whether flying the Israeli or some other flag, are inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement, contrary to the Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951 (S. 2324), and a retrogression from the stated objectives to which both sides committed themselves in signing the armistice agreement. We cannot fail to state, therefore, that we look to Egypt to give effect to these decisions and agreements."

On October 12, 1956, Egypt was reminded again of her international obligations. The Secretary General of the United Nations read to the Security Council the list of principles to which Egypt was bound. Nos. 1 and 3 read:

"There shall be free and open transit through the canal without discrimination, overt or covert.

"The operation of the canal shall be insulated from the politics of any country."

In February 1957 President Eisenhower said to the American people and to the world that if Egypt tried to block Israel shipping in the Suez Canal "this should be dealt firmly by the society of nations." And what has happened since then? Egypt has not only tried to block Israel shipping. She has blocked it. She has more than blocked it, she has usurped it—all in flagrant defiance of international law, in opposition to United Nations edicts, and in disregard of maritime principles and elementary rules of justice.

And what has the society of nations done about these unspeakable usurpations? There have been remonstrances, protests, and mild criticisms, but no action. The United Nations sent its Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjold, whom I greatly admire, to plead with Nasser, but since when, has law had to plead with outlaw, since when has honor had to plead with infamy, since when has authority had to plead with mutiny, and loyalty with perfidy?

Nasser, of course, resisted every appeal. He was deaf to reason, impervious to logic, scornful of legal obligation, insensate to demands of fundamental humanity.

There is utterly no excuse for Nasser's bellicosity. No nation has any design on his territory. On the contrary, many nations are assisting Egypt with heavy financial loans and private investment will tremendously help her economy. But those who are giving assistance to Nasser in this manner, and the United Nations which has been extremely lenient in its treatment of Nasser, should ask themselves if in view of Nasser's attitude toward international law, they are not building for themselves a Frankenstein on the Nile?

I believe in the United Nations with every atom of sincerity; it is the one bastion of hope for salvation of the world, but I feel that its failure to deal firmly with Nasser may lead to holocaust.

Of course, it is futile to compare Nasser with Hitler because the evil of Hitler, as the world now counts time, occurred so long ago that only the victims of his fiendishness can sense the horror which his name immediately conjures. But it is not inappropriate to say that the Western World is appeasing Nasser with the same lack of foresight manifested when the later-to-be allies were attempting to soothe the ferocity of the Nazi monster.

Nasser's despotism over the Suez Canal cannot possibly be defended. It has been condemned by the society of nations gen-

erally and by the United Nations officially, but no pragmatic force has been exerted toward making him obey the law. The situation is worse than that. He has been led to believe that he may continue his usurpations without hindrance. He applied to the World Bank for a loan of \$56½ million with which to widen the canal. This would have been the time to demand guarantees that he respect international law and no longer interfere with Israel shipping. But no such guarantee was asked of him and of course he offered none. The loan was approved and Nasser may now widen the canal to allow for a greater scope to the stream of his fierce hatreds.

He has already given ample evidence of the expansion of his anti-Semitic malevolence. He has called upon all the Arab nations to devise plans and ideas on how to destroy Israel. One of his mad plans is to divert the waters of the Hasbani River in Lebanon, which lies north of Israel, so as to reduce Israel's water supply. In order to accomplish this piece of satanic sabotage, the Lebanese would have to tunnel through mountains at a cost of from \$10 to \$15 million. Another plan is to reverse the course of the Banias which now flows down from Mount Hermon, and divert it through mountainous country to the Yarmuk.

Anyone who has traveled through the Arab regions can see the great need for water for the prime requisites of life: the satisfying of thirst, the preparation of food, the answering to the demands of sanitation and agriculture. Nasser is building a dam on the Nile to supply water to his own Egypt, but to the north he would build a reservoir of hatred so as to channel the poison of hateful spite into all the Arab countries. Instead of helping the Arabs to get more water, he would endanger the sources which they do have. Instead of helping them to get more bread, he feeds them with the cry that Israel must be destroyed.

But must Israel be destroyed? What has Israel done which calls for her extinction? Never was a country brought into existence under more lawful auspices than Israel. The United Nations, in General Assembly convened, after long deliberation and study, decreed the autonomous formation of this state, this little state which in size is not as large as our State of Vermont. The land space of the nations in the Arab League, on the other hand, would cover an area equal to one-third of the whole United States.

On March 14, 1948, this tiny piece of the earth's surface, the state of Israel, with a population of only 650,000, became an independent country. On March 15, 1948, the very next day, the armies of six Arab nations thundered across their respective borders with guns, bayonets, scimitars, and knives to kill off the 650,000. Why?

Were the Arab invaders seeking to take up where the Nazis had left off? The Nazis had already persecuted, tortured, butchered and slain 6 million human beings, the mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, and other kindred of the 650,000 in Israel. Were the Arabs hoping to finish off the race entirely? And, if so, why?

What amazes me more than anything else in the history of the last quarter of a century is the fact that the United Nations did not come to the assistance of its own creature. Why didn't the countries which had fought for the freedom of the world extend a helping hand to the Israelis who also needed freedom, needed it as much as any other people in the world? It may be that the world was tired of fighting, tired of helping, so it decided to let Israel fend for itself. But the Israelis had been fighting not only during World War II, but through the centuries for the right not only to be free but to survive. And so, although there were only 650,000 of them banded together in this

little defile of destiny, they opposed the invaders. They fought with the pluck and the heroism of the Spartans at Thermopylae, the Finns at the Mannerheim Line, the minutemen at Lexington, the Texans at the Alamo, and the Marines at Soissons—and they threw back the invaders.

The leaders of the Arab nations should hang their heads in shame for this unprovoked assault on a little sister in the family of nations, and the world should take off its hat to the courage, daring, resourcefulness, and willingness to sacrifice on the part of the defenders of Israel—for the sacred cause of liberty and independence.

Since the end of the war Israel has worked and continues to work. She wants peace. As her citizens plow the fields, operate machines, build roads, erect homes, churches, and schools, she stands ready at any moment to pick up the fountain pen at her side with which to sign a treaty of amity and concord with all her Arab neighbors. But Nasser gives evidence of not wanting peace.

So long as he can keep the Arabs in a fever of agitation over a country other than the one in which they live, he hopes to keep them from thinking about his dictatorship. The only way a dictator can retain absolute power is to direct the attention of his subjects from their own miseries by telling them they must fight against a threatening country. And so, in Hitlerian fashion, Nasser exhorts the Arabs to destroy the Jews who are their mortal enemies. But the Jews are not enemies and they entertain no ill feelings toward the Arabs. I personally witnessed in Israel the freedom which the Arabs enjoy in that country. They have all the rights and privileges of the Jews. They hold property, they vote, they speak without hindrance. They elect representatives to the Israel parliament. The Arab children go to Arab schools. They may worship as they wish and no one attempts to proselyte them.

Nasser blindfolds the people in his country and the other Arab countries to these facts and calls for war against Israel. Using Hitlerian methods of propaganda and employing unashamedly the most primitive hate-rousing methods, he screams that Israel is determined to conquer the Arabs and that it wants to reign from the Nile to the Euphrates. If his philippics were not capable of stirring up tragic results, they could be regarded as ludicrous. Israel has a land area of 8,050 square miles. The land area of the countries in the Arab League, whose leaders have all proclaimed hatred for and hostility to Israel, covers 1,444,000 square miles. The population of Israel is 2 million, that of the Arab countries 51 million. Israel's land is basically sterile, stony and one-half of it is desert. Much of the Arab lands are rich with oil deposits and contain vast potential fertile domains. If Nasser would release the Arabs from the physical and emotional burdens of war preparation and if he would lift from them the racial prejudices with which he has yoked them, these domains could be cultivated and eventually developed until they would smile a good living for all the inhabitants.

Eric Johnston, chairman of the Committee for International Economic Outgrowth, who has made an intensive study of the Mideast problems, declared in a special article in the New York Times, that with the harnessing of the five main rivers in the Arab countries, the Tigris, Euphrates, Litani, Jordan, and the Nile, there would be reclaimed for agriculture 8 million acres of land. And why has this not been done? It is not because of lack of offer of financial help. The West has offered many times to finance river development programs in the Arab world. The United States offered to finance a \$200 million project in the Jordan Valley; it has made funds available to Jordan for a project on the Yarmuk.

"For although men have talked or written of these lands, all was conjecture without getting a look at it, but amounted only to this, that those who heard, for the most part listened and judged it more a fable than that there was anything in it, however small."

Consider that Columbus was beset by some of the same difficulties that our scientists and engineers face today. He was required to submit his proposal to the so-called Talavera commission of learned men for review and to justify his requirements. They held hearings in the year 1486, and issued their report in the year 1490, 4½ years later. They judged that the promises of Columbus "were impossible and vain and worthy of rejection." They reported to their royal majesties that it was "not a proper object for their royal authority to favor an affair that rests on such weak foundations and which appeared uncertain and impossible to any educated person, however little learning he might have."

Yet, curiously enough, it was the educated, then as now, who knew how well the foundations had been laid for such a trip. For centuries, men had been making discoveries that pieced together the maps from which Columbus's great design sprang.

The Renaissance was a great age of exploration, not unlike today. We have broken the bounds of many scientific fields, and we have discovered others that our scientists long to invade. Historians think that the welfare of a country and its will to explore may be closely related. The energy, the inquiring mind, the courage for endurance that find expression in exploration may well turn out in themselves to be the most important measures of a country's greatness. I hope the zeal and courage that have brought us in this half century to the top of Everest, to the North and South Poles, to the greatest depths of the oceans, and even into the heart of the atom, will not lessen.

Why do men seek these things? It is sometimes difficult to explain why it was necessary to get to Timbuktu or Lhasa, or even Everest or the Matterhorn. The common motives for exploration are given as conquest, military advantage, plunder or trade advantage, commercial gain or scientific advantage. Yet, I rather like a somewhat more irreverent analysis by the sage of Baltimore, the late H. L. Mencken. He said:

"The value the world sets upon motives is often unjust and inaccurate. Consider, for example, two of them: mere insatiable curiosity and the desire to do good. The latter is put high above the former, and yet it is the former that moves one of the most useful men the human race has yet produced—the scientific investigator. What actually urges him on is not some brummagem idea of service, but a boundless, almost pathological thirst to penetrate the unknown, to uncover the secret, to find out what has not been found out before. His prototype is not the liberator releasing slaves, the good Samaritan lifting up the fallen, but a dog sniffing tremendously at an infinite series of rat-holes."

And today, of course, on the heels of the scientific investigator comes the congressional investigator.

Why should Congress, or the Government, display so much interest in scientific advance, the quest for knowledge? Why should men of industry or the university, or the laboratory spend so much time coming to tell of their plans to people on Capitol Hill?

I am privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives, assigned to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, chaired by the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana. A parallel space committee exists in the Senate. When these committees were established at the beginning of this 86th Congress, they were the first new

parallel standing committees created in half a century.

These committees were created because Washington has recognized that science and innovation is the greatest single factor affecting our future economic growth and national security. Radical technological change has forced repeated attempts to adjust our policymaking processes so we can best use, or come to grips with, the challenge of research and development. An analysis of the 1961 budget shows that some \$8,391 million is identified as Federal support of research and development. How we spend that money is very important to the American taxpayer. In a sense, we are diverting money from his pocket to what we believe is necessary for the common good and the national security. He expects that this money will not be spent lightly, and he is entitled to a close review of these efforts.

While we are reviewing these programs, it is also the responsibility of Congress to establish governmental policies in science and astronautics. We are confronted with issues of a highly technical nature in an era of exploding technology. The world is in the grip of a scientific revolution, which offers both promise and danger. It is of vital importance that we, the lawmakers, make every effort to understand the implications of the language the scientists speak, so that we may incorporate this knowledge into planning for national security and industrial well-being.

We must make every effort to know what is happening in scientific areas. We must analyze these issues and the needs they pose. We must bring together men from government and industry—in short—the best brains we can summon to our assistance in this task, listen to proposals for solution, investigate conditions, seek to choose wisely among courses of action set before us and act to propose laws that can help secure a more orderly progress.

Congress has set the policy that U.S. activities in outer space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind. Project Vanguard satellites were launched on such peaceful missions, to gather data for analysis by scientists throughout the world. One small package of instruments in Vanguard I has provided a tremendous amount of information.

Since that launching, there have been a number of others, up to and including the successful Pioneer V. There have been other attempts which have failed. There have been efforts canceled because no back-ups were available, the funds not having been provided. And criticisms have continued of low priorities, piecemeal funding, and too many administrative channels—faults which plagued the first Vanguard, as well as its successors.

These continued criticisms caused disquiet across the country last fall and led to many reappraisals. When Congress reconvened in January, our committee undertook a broad look at the posture of our space effort, the nature of the so-called space gap, and the details of the criticisms.

We have heard considerable testimony from many witnesses—diplomats, defense experts, space experts, scientists, administrators, and businessmen. Some disputed others. Many acknowledged past errors in the space program. Others tied our space effort to national policy and the defense of the Nation, while still others cried out that defense has no part to play in space.

From these posture hearings, still to be concluded, I have personally drawn some tentative conclusions:

First, space exploration is one of the major keys to our survival. This has far-reaching significance in the cold war today and the possibility of global conflict in the future. Rightly or wrongly, world opinion has asso-

ciated Russian achievement in space with general Communist technological superiority. This fact was substantiated by Under Secretary of State Livingston Merchant, when he acknowledged that the spectacular nature of the space effort in Russia has made the job of the State Department a tougher one. The following day, the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, George V. Allen, said bluntly that space achievements go far beyond their intrinsic importance when they are examined by the peoples of other countries.

The second conclusion I have drawn is that space holds advantages for both civilian and military users, and it can be dangerously unrealistic to hold to artificial compartments for civil and military research.

Going back to the posture hearings again, the committee has heard testimony from numerous civilian and military leaders in the Department of Defense. Each recognized the need for the military in the space race; some stated the case more strongly than others. General Trudeau, Admiral Hayward, and General Schriever did an excellent job of enlightening the public to the potential threat from space. The committee also heard the NASA 10-year program, calling for ever-increasing performance in space throughout the next decade.

My third conclusion is that there is a critical urgency associated with the space program. For years, members of the Department of Defense—then the only organization with a capability for space flight—could not even refer to satellites or space exploration. Our attitudes changed when the first sputnik temporarily shattered our national smugness and complacency. That Russian vehicle and subsequent Russian space accomplishments gave us the shot in the arm to press forward in search of a way for survival in the space age. As a result, we expanded our missile and space base. The foremost space question before the public today is: When will we catch up with the U.S.S.R.?

Our Nation has excelled over all other nations in this industrial age because we have been able, through our vast industrial energies and resources, to produce results faster and better than any other people. And I propose to you that the concentrated, vigorous application of our national talents and abilities cannot only overcome the Russian space lead, but can also surpass it. The full utilization of our resources would leave no doubt in the mind of the world regarding the effectiveness of the democratic system to meet any challenge and overcome any obstacle.

There are several other conclusions that I have reached during these past 2 months of hearings. But I believe the three just mentioned are the most important. To recapitulate: (1) Space exploration is one of the keys to survival. (2) There is a need for both the military and civilian approach to space. (3) There is urgency associated with the program.

Let us again refer to the NASA's 10-year program for space. To many, the program is realistic and acceptable. To me, the program lacks foresight and urgency. I would take exception to the timing of many projects, but will limit my remarks to only three major areas: The F-1 engine; Project Rover, the nuclear-powered rocket; and NASA's lack of a plan for manned lunar landing during this 10-year period.

The F-1 engine, being developed by North American's Rocketdyne Division for NASA, will produce 1½ million pounds of thrust. Four of these engines will be clustered to make the Nova launch vehicle of 6 million pounds of thrust, enough thrust to launch a manned interplanetary mission.

The NASA claims that this engine has been delayed 12 to 18 months, due to lack of funds in the 1960 budget. As a result, the first flight test is not scheduled until 1968,

and no date has been set for the completion of the Nova space vehicle. It will be 8 years before we are ready to flight-test this vehicle. Is that urgency? Is it typical of the urgency associated with the space program? I assure you that I am vitally concerned, and I suspect you are, too.

When the Atomic Energy Commission witnesses appeared to discuss the nuclear propulsion powerplant, their testimony conflicted, in my opinion, with that of the NASA witnesses. Project Rover, the nuclear-powered rocket, is being developed jointly by AEC and NASA. The AEC is responsible for designing and operating an engine. NASA takes it from there, assembles it, flies it and fits it into the space program. The AEC witnesses stated that they can develop the Rover device and demonstrate its actual use, probably in a shorter time than set forth in the requirement.

The NASA witnesses, however, were much more conservative. They assured the committee that the program is being expedited to the fullest extent. So the debate is on—it will continue for years to come. How will it be resolved? Hopefully, there is a sense of urgency in the AEC, as indicated by the fact that on March 8, the AEC itself transferred funds within its budget to add \$11 million to the Project Rover experiments. I see no comparable sense of urgency in the NASA program. And yet, knowing the importance of this project, I long to sympathize with the AEC witness who commented: "I would like to see this one have the stars and stripes on it, for a change."

The last point I wish to make regards NASA's lack of a plan for a manned lunar landing during the next 10 years. There are rumors already flying that the U.S.S.R. will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution on the moon. Will we be there to greet them? Or is that the day we shall promise to accelerate our program for a manned lunar landing?

Mr. Khrushchev has already boasted that the mark of the Soviet Union has been stamped on the moon. It is well within the technical and industrial capacity of the Russians to land a man on the moon one day in the near future.

The future of the free world may well depend on whether or not a U.S. mission is already on the moon when that event occurs.

Consider the possibility of a Russian lunar base and the threat that could literally be hung over the heads of the free world. Gen. Homer Boushey, of the USAF, was the first to speak out in favor of a lunar base, its capabilities and potential. His remarks were scoffed at in some circles. I, for one, fear the results of being second on the moon. A manned lunar landing and return, in the 1970's, as NASA outlines its schedule, is much to late.

The first need, then, is the recognition that we must be first. I believe that we cannot fail, if we resolutely determine that we will not. Once that is accepted, some other lines of approach fall into place.

We must, for instance, make better use of the resources of industry and management available to us in this country. We know that the full scale of the skills and talents here have scarcely been tapped. Even in production, we are not making the defense effort today in terms of proportion of gross national product that we were in 1953—and we are making only one-fifth the effort we made in World War II, when we knew it had to be done.

We must do everything we can to streamline, and to make more effective the organization and management of our national programs. Few believe that we are squeezing every last ounce of effort out of our Defense Establishment. I can tell you candidly that I do not think we have enlisted all our managerial talent in this space field. We certainly do not see the

single-mindedness of a Manhattan district in this space effort.

Even in such a field as communication of information regarding the state of the art, more must be done. Researchers are complaining about the proliferation of scientific papers and meetings. Industry is said to be committing some \$21 million a year to these exchanges, which consume 258,000 man-days of technical time, and it has been difficult to weed out overlapping and duplication.

Is the way we disseminate technical information good enough to meet the challenge of modern technology? A recent Guggenheim Foundation study urged we go beyond our traditional ways to seek better methods that could produce important results.

We have made real gains in awakening to scientific research and findings elsewhere in the world. Government has intensified the translation of scientific documents. We are translating more papers on scientific work than ever before. The material is made available to industry through the Office of Technical Services of the Department of Commerce, and there has been a growing interest. I am told that OTS is selling more monographs every month, and that more libraries, industrial and public, have started following the material. The twice-monthly publication, Technical Translations, which started a year ago with 150 to 175 listings of new translations, now lists about 600 an issue. Government is thus pointing out some 12,000 to 13,000 translations a year which may be of use. Industry is also showing interest in a projected publication that would digest news releases and articles in Russian journals, so that a quicker break is possible in learning what the Russians are doing.

Today, the problems of space research, development, exploration and exploitation are still in their infancy. Vanguard I was a stepping-stone to a great future. What is still needed is a firm and clear decision by the United States and the free world to press ahead. The Communists are making capital of space exploration and the propaganda that goes with it. They found in their space achievements a chance to prove to themselves and to the world what they could do in a highly advanced technology. The United States must counter this propaganda by unleashing its technological know-how and industrial power to regain world leadership in the space race. Then our deeds will speak for themselves.

**Statement of Robert T. Stevens, President
of J. P. Stevens & Co. Before U.S.
Tariff Commission**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of Robert T. Stevens, president of the J. P. Stevens & Co. before the U.S. Tariff Commission relative to its investigation of cotton imports:

STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERT T. STEVENS,
PRESIDENT OF J. P. STEVENS & CO., INC., NEW
YORK, N.Y., MARCH 4, 1960

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Robert

T. Stevens. I am president of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., a publicly owned company manufacturing a wide variety of textile fabrics. We have been in business since 1813—a very long time in American industrial history. I come before you as an individual American citizen engaged in the textile business. I do not represent any group or organization. I do, however, speak in behalf of the 34,000 workers in our company and for the company itself. We are very vitally concerned with these deliberations.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this Commission at this hearing which is called for the purpose of determining whether articles containing cotton are being, or are practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to interfere materially with the Department of Agriculture's export program for cotton and cotton products.

I also wish to express my appreciation of the wide knowledge of and interest in the problems of the cotton textile industry on the part of the U.S. Tariff Commission, as evidenced on many occasions over a long period of years.

My testimony will be in full support of the petition filed by the National Cotton Council under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. It is most constructive that the enlightened leadership of the National Cotton Council has seen fit to attack the very ominous situation with which the American cottongrowers' best customer, the American spinner, is now faced. The growers' interest and ours are the same.

Already sorely pressed by the dramatic increase in imports of manufactured cotton products, as set forth by previous witnesses, the full adverse effects are yet to come. The extent to which the American cotton textile industry will be permitted to survive, is clearly in the minds of the executive and/or the legislative branches of our Government. The importance of this hearing, therefore, before this duly constituted independent agency cannot possibly be overstated. It is essential that all the pertinent facts be set forth.

Let me, at the outset, make one point unmistakably clear. I do not seek to keep foreign manufactured products out of the United States. Having served our Government under both Democratic and Republican administrations, from time to time over the past 25 years, I have some real understanding of the problems the country faces, including its foreign trade policy. I recognize the extent to which foreign trade policy becomes an integral part of overall foreign policy. Textiles have, however, been called upon to carry far too much of the load of our foreign policy and the time has come for drastic action, unless our Government desires to consider the textile industry as expendable.

J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., has a close connection with the cotton growing industry of America. Of our 52 manufacturing plants, spread from Maine to Georgia, south, and west to Tennessee, 23 are devoted to the manufacture and finishing of cotton textiles. Most of these plants are located in close proximity to the traditional cotton growing areas of our Nation. We purchase large quantities of American cotton. American textile mill raw cotton consumption is about 9 million bales per year and J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., consumes about 4 percent of this total. I believe, without an expanding cotton textile manufacturing industry, that American cotton growing will eventually be drastically curtailed. Likewise, without American cotton, produced in abundance on American farms, the domestic textile industry of the United States would no longer be able to play its appropriate part in the American economy.

JSE

March 21

and basic human rights to the people of the captive nations of eastern and central Europe should be one of the first subjects taken up at the summit meeting.

There are at least three separate reasons for my convictions on this subject, embodied in the concurrent resolution.

First, justice demands that these rights be restored to the people of captive nations;

Second, progress on the issue of disarmament—which is uppermost in the minds of many people throughout the world—cannot be achieved in a vacuum. It must be related at all times to the reality of the political situation in the world; and

Third, any agreement on disarmament which may come out of the summit meeting will not be worth the paper on which it will be written until we have some concrete evidence that the Soviets will abide by such an agreement.

The first two considerations do not require much elaboration. I am certain all of us will agree that justice demands the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights to the people of the captive nations. There ought not be, anywhere within the free world, any disagreement on this point.

Further, I am certain we all realize that disarmament cannot be achieved in a vacuum. Effective disarmament can only be attained within the framework of a broader agreement providing for the solution of unresolved political issues. These issues are in evidence in all of the explosive situations existing along the entire circumference of the Communist empire: from Korea and the Formosa Strait in the Far East through southeast Asia and the Middle East to eastern and central Europe in the West.

It is unrealistic to expect to reach an agreement on disarmament—to see the world disarm—before those issues are settled. I believe, therefore, that the United States must be prepared to discuss at the summit each of the explosive situations I have mentioned.

This brings me to my third point, which has special bearing on the concurrent resolution I introduced: the point dealing with evidence of good faith on the part of the Soviets.

I firmly believe that, before we place our faith in any disarmament agreement, we must first insist that the Soviets live up to their past agreements—especially those which dealt with the fundamental freedoms and basic rights of the people of the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to cite some of those earlier Soviet pledges—with particular reference to the ones embodied in the agreements reached at the Yalta Conference.

The Soviets solemnly promised to assist the liberated nations of eastern and central Europe—and I quote—"to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems and to create democratic institutions of their own choice."

The Soviets affirmed—and I again quote—"the right of all peoples to choose

The reasons for introducing the above resolution may be summarized very briefly.

As we all know, less than 2 months from today—on May 16 to be exact—the heads of state of the great powers will hold a summit meeting in Paris.

There is every indication that the issue of disarmament, and the question of Berlin and West Germany, will probably dominate the discussions at the summit. Nevertheless, the agenda for the meeting is open, and has not been restricted to any specific item or items. I firmly believe, therefore, that the restoration of the fundamental freedoms

1960

the form of government under which they will live."

The Soviets pledged to facilitate—and I am still quoting—"the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people."

With respect to Poland, the Soviets were even more specific. They pledged themselves—and I quote—to "the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections," the agreement continued, "all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates."

As we all know, none of these pledges have been fulfilled. The captive nations of eastern and central Europe were forcibly deprived of their sovereign rights, of their fundamental freedoms, and of their basic human rights by the Soviets. Soviet domination over the lives and affairs of the people of the captive nations continues to this very day.

Mr. Speaker, as sensible and realistic people, we cannot in good conscience put any faith in new Soviet pledges until they show some semblance of good faith by living up to the old ones.

This is precisely what the concurrent resolution which I introduced is intended to achieve. It reaffirms the right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own free choice, and to enjoy basic human rights; and it urges the President of the United States to pursue energetically the attainment of those goals at the forthcoming summit meeting in Paris.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this resolution will be overwhelmingly approved by this House at the earliest possible time.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the gentleman in naming the Members who have introduced similar resolutions today inadvertently omitted my name. I am sure that was an unintentional omission on his part, because he and I have discussed this matter at some length.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It certainly was inadvertent, and at this time I want to say that the gentleman from Michigan has been most helpful in preparing the resolution. I welcome the gentleman's contribution and I am very happy that he has joined in the cosponsorship.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to him for his diligent and untiring work in preparing and putting forth this very important concurrent resolution which I hope and trust will be passed by the Congress prior to the forthcoming summit conference. Since I share the gentleman's viewpoint, the question of the freedom of the people of the captive nations, their right to live under their own chosen governments, and the restoration of their fundamental freedoms and basic human rights is of such importance that it should, under any circumstance, be a

subject for discussion at the summit conference.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a resolution which I introduced on August 5, 1959, House Resolution 337.

The purpose of my resolution which is now pending before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and on which hearings have been held would have been, if adopted, the expression of the sense of the House that no summit conference be held until the Soviet Union and the leaders of the Communist governments of Central and Eastern Europe had taken some visible steps toward the holding of free elections.

I felt it very necessary, Mr. Speaker, in view of a great many documentary sources of the past regarding the expression of free elections in this part of Europe to endeavor to hold the Soviet Union and the Communist leaders to their promises in this connection.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we first of all must go back to August 14, 1941, the date of the Atlantic Charter, under which both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill signed an agreement which was endorsed 6 months later by Premier Stalin of the Soviet Union that those peoples and their countries—that is, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Next, Mr. Speaker, I think we should refer to the declaration of these three heads of state when they signed a declaration at Teheran on December 1, 1943, saying:

We look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives, untouched by tyranny, and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

Next, of course—and the gentleman from Wisconsin has already referred to this—there was the declaration by the same three heads of state at the Yalta Conference, February 11, 1945, when they pledged themselves that their "three governments will jointly assist the people in any European liberated state or former Axis satellite state in Europe (c) to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people; and (d) to facilitate where necessary the holding of such election.

Then on December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the following universal declaration of human rights which included the statement:

The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government. This will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held in secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

I also think, Mr. Speaker, reference should be made to the declaration forth-

coming from the Yalta Conference with respect to free and unfettered elections on the part of the Polish provisional government.

Mr. Speaker, I think reference should be made to the three treaties of peace, signed on February 10, 1947, between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union on the one hand, and, respectively, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania on the other hand, with reference to freedom and the implementing of human rights and fundamental freedoms on the part of the peoples of those three countries.

But I think it evident, Mr. Speaker, that the leaders of the Soviet Union and their Communist satellites in Central and Eastern Europe have cynically betrayed these and other wartime and postwar pledges by brutally restricting the natural, unalienable rights of these people.

Mr. Speaker, I think reference should be made at this time to the fact that both the Republican and the Democratic Parties in their prior political platforms have made clear their own belief that the independence and the liberty of the captive nations forms a nonpartisan, or a bipartisan pledge on the part of both of our leading political parties.

For these and many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I felt it incumbent to introduce House Resolution 337 last August, which has been pending, as I say, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Of course, since the summit meeting has already been agreed to, with no promise on the part of the Soviet Union regarding the question of free elections, possibly the passage of House Resolution 337 at this time would be somewhat academic. But in view of its importance, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include its entire text in the RECORD at this particular point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

[86th Cong., 1st sess.]

HOUSE RESOLUTION 337

Whereas it was the declared principle of the Atlantic Charter, signed by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain on August 14, 1941, and publicly agreed to six months later by the Premier of the Soviet Union, that these persons and their countries do "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them"; and

Whereas it was the declaration of these three heads of state, Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, signed at the Teheran Conference of December 1, 1943, that "we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives, untouched by tyranny, and according to their varying desires and their own consciences."; and

Whereas it was the conclusion of Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, reached at the Yalta Conference on February 11, 1945, that their "three governments will jointly assist the people in any European liberated state or former Axis satellite state in Europe * * *

(c) to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic

elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people; and (d) to facilitate where necessary the holding of such elections."; and

Whereas it was the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the universal declaration of human rights, adopted December 10, 1948, that "The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government. This will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held in secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures."; and

Whereas it was also declared at the Yalta Conference that "The Polish provisional government of national unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible, on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot."; and

Whereas it was the declaration of the three treaties of peace, signed on February 10, 1947, between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union on the one hand, and respectively, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania on the other hand, the "Hungary (Bulgaria and Rumania) shall take all measures necessary to secure to all persons under Hungarian (Bulgarian and Rumanian) jurisdiction, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion, and of public meeting."; and

Whereas the leaders of the Soviet Union, together with their subordinates in the satellite areas of Central and Eastern Europe, have cynically betrayed these and other wartime and post-wartime pledges by brutally restricting the natural, unalienable rights of these people; and

Whereas it was the declaration of the platform of the Republican Party in 1952 that, "It will be made clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples."; and

Whereas in 1953 President Eisenhower stated that "It seems clear that the safety and future of the people of Eastern Germany can only be assured when that region is unified with Western Germany on the basis of free elections * * * it is still our conviction that this represents the only realistic road to German unity, and I assure you that my Government will continue to strive for this goal."; and

Whereas it was the declaration of the platform of the Democratic Party in 1956 that, "We look forward to the day when the liberties of all captive nations will be restored to them and they can again take their rightful place in the community of free nations. We shall press before the United Nations the principle that Soviet Russia withdraw its troops from the captive nations, so as to permit free, fair, and unfettered elections in the subjugated areas, in compliance with the Atlantic Charter and other binding commitments."; and

Whereas in 1958 President Eisenhower, in replying to Premier Bulgenin's request for a summit conference, wrote, "You then (at Geneva in 1955) took the position that there were no grounds for discussing this question (of captive nations) and that it would involve interference in the internal affairs of the eastern European states. But have not subsequent developments shown that I was justified in my appeal to you for consideration of these matters? Surely the Hungarian developments and the virtually unanimous action of the United Nations General Assembly in relation thereto show that conditions in Eastern Europe are re-

garded throughout the world as much more than a matter purely of domestic scope. I propose that we should now discuss this matter. There is an intrinsic need of this, in the interest of peace and justice, which seems to me compelling."; and

Whereas the unanimous passage of the resolution concerning Captive Nations Week, July 17 through July 24, and the subsequent angry reaction of Premier Khrushchev, point up both the continued high level of unrest on the part of the people of the United States in the fate of the captive nations and the feelings of guilt and the vulnerability of Premier Khrushchev on this account; and

Whereas the American people feel, with their governmental leaders, that the desire for freedom among the captive people of central and eastern Europe, from whom much of the American culture has been derived, has been and should continue to be kept sharply alive for reasons both of our own and their security; and

Whereas the American people, like many others, hold to the belief which our Founders expressed in the Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; and

Whereas the American people also believe, as Abraham Lincoln put it, that there is "something in that Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time."; and

Whereas the American people, never acquiescent in the enslavement of any peoples, believe, with their governmental leaders, that the pledges of the Soviet Union concerning the captive European countries must be honored if the world is to begin to find a true and lasting peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that, before the President of the United States agrees to any future summit meeting with the head of government of the Soviet Union, the leaders of the Soviet Union should promise to hold free elections in the Communist-controlled countries of Central and Eastern Europe; furthermore, that before a summit conference takes place, some concrete and visible steps must be taken toward the holding of such elections.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to include a letter from the Department of State dated August 27, 1959, the text of this letter being a report from the Department on House Resolution 337, at this point.

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

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, August 27, 1959.

The Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of State appreciates the opportunity afforded by your letter of August 11, 1959, to comment on House Resolution 337, a resolution providing for the holding, before any future summit conference, of free elections in the Communist-controlled countries of central and eastern Europe, which has been introduced and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The Department of State does not favor the adoption of House Resolution 337 because it believes that the principal effect of this resolution would be to circumscribe unduly the freedom of action of the President and the executive branch of the U.S. Government in those matters of foreign policy planning and diplomatic negotiation that are directed not only toward the improvement of the present situation in Soviet-dominated central and

eastern Europe but also toward the settlement of other complex issues in United States-Soviet relations.

In the Department's view, there is no evidence that Soviet leaders would promise to hold free elections in the Soviet-dominated countries of central and eastern Europe as a precondition for a summit meeting. In existing circumstances, therefore, the putting forward of such a condition could only tend to perpetuate the stalemate of interests which has prevailed for many years and to handicap this Government and its allies in working out gradually and progressively, as such matters will inevitably require, the conditions and foundations of a just and stable peace.

Finally, the Department believes that it is clear that the formula of free elections for the Soviet-dominated countries of central and eastern Europe, while desirable in proper perspective as an appropriately timed step in the process of the restoration of freedom and national independence to the captive peoples, can only reflect, as applied in House Resolution 337, an unrealistic and oversimplified conception of the highly complicated and interrelated problems which now confront the world. Such a narrow and restrictive approach to these problems cannot contribute effectively to their solution and can only seriously encumber the executive authorities of the U.S. Government in their efforts to achieve the fundamental objections of U.S. policy in central and eastern Europe as well as in other areas of the world that are threatened by Soviet Communist imperialism.

In the light of the foregoing considerations, the Department of State must conclude and respectfully submits that the adoption of House Resolution 337 would not serve the foreign policy interests of the United States.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,

Assistant Secretary

(For the Acting Secretary of State).

Mr. BENTLEY. I regret to say that for various reasons the Department did not support the resolution and is in opposition to the adoption of House Resolution 337, but I feel to keep the record straight that the Department's reasons for opposing it should be set forth, although, of course, I cannot agree with them.

I think this matter is of overwhelming and cosummate importance, to judge from the support it has received. I may say that the folders in front of me represent only a small part of the correspondence I have received in support of House Resolution 337 from many organizations, of which I have a list here, from many American patriotic organizations, from many organizations who are vitally interested in extending freedom and self-determination to the peoples of central and eastern Europe who have been deprived ever since the end of World War II through the Communist enslavement. I believe the question of the freedom of the captive peoples in the nations of central Europe should under any and all circumstances be a part of the agenda in the forthcoming conference. I trust my friend from Wisconsin and all of the cosponsors who support him in this resolution of his, and I commend them, will get this resolution passed by the Congress, that we will once again put the Congress on strong record as believ-

ing in the independence of the captive peoples and believing that it is a question that should be taken up and continually discussed with the Soviet Union at any and every opportunity, including the forthcoming summit conference.

Once again I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I certainly extend to him my heartiest congratulations and the promise of my full support in the passage of this resolution, which I assume will go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which both he and I are members.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman. I congratulate him on his fight for the basic freedom and human rights of the people of the captive nations.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wish to join in commending the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for initiating this discussion today. I am very proud to introduce a companion resolution which urges President Eisenhower to demand free elections for the captive nations when he meets with Soviet leaders at the summit conference in May. In view of the fact that the gentleman, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, has played such an important part in the introduction of this resolution, we have high hopes of getting formal action on it before the President leaves for the conference. Fears have been expressed that the forthcoming summit conference will not produce any results. Already it appears that the stage is being set to somewhat deflate the conference.

I believe if the President will adopt the spirit of the resolution we are today introducing and carry this mandate from the American people with him when he sits down at the summit conference table, he can make a demand, a forthright, decisive demand, that before we can look to lasting peace in this world, before we can look to genuine disarmament, these people who are now being held captive by the Soviet Union must have a right to free elections, a right to select their own forms of government. The President can give real meaning to this conference by making such a demand on the Soviet rulers.

I have always believed there is a great deal more vigor in defending a right than opposing a wrong. We can certainly defend here with a clear conscience the right of these people to choose their own form of government. There is no question but that the people in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, East Germany, the Ukraine, and all the others being held captive by the Soviet Union today may very well constitute the balance of power between a lasting peace and ultimate war.

We must keep alive the hope of ultimate freedom for these people. The Soviet Union is most concerned because the Soviet Union knows it cannot rely on these people in the event that it touches off a third world war. I have said re-

peatedly that the gallant people in these captive nations, who traditionally have maintained their ties with the democratic West, want to restore their traditional relations with us as free people. If the Soviet Union ever succeeds in crushing the spirit of these captive nations through brute force and extended brainwashing, she will then not hesitate to attack us. The spirit of these captive people is today the greatest deterrent to war and the best guarantee for peace. We must keep this spirit alive.

I think this resolution is important for another reason. This great trend of cultural exchanges and economic exchanges, while I am very happy about it and endorse the purpose of it, could very well create the impression that the United States has accepted as the status quo the position of these captive nations under their Communist rulers. Should this feeling really take hold behind the Iron Curtain, it would demoralize whatever spirit still remains among these people and whatever hope still remains that some day they are going to see the spark of freedom in their own country as we, in America, enjoy it today. I believe by adopting this resolution and by the President taking a positive and forthright position at the summit, he would, indeed, be documenting the fact that this Nation has not given up its traditional belief that all people in the world should be free because that is what we are fighting for now and that is what we fought the last war for.

Finally, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, it is important that this resolution be adopted because nothing ruffled the Soviet Union as thoroughly as the captive nations resolution last year when we observed Captive Nations Week in this country. This is an indicator that the Soviet Union is very, very mindful of the fact that the people behind the Iron Curtain in the captive nations are yearning for a tie with the West. I believe, therefore, that it is very important that this resolution be adopted. I join in commending the gentleman who obtained this time today under special order of the House, and urge that we all work very hard to get this resolution passed. I also strongly recommend that the gentleman who obtained this special order for today write to President Eisenhower and advise the President of the action that we are taking here today and advise him of the proposal that has been submitted on a bipartisan basis. I hope we are able to get the support of the President on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in the last session of this Congress, I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 491, calling for the placing of the subject of the captive nations on the summit agenda. The report from the Department of State was a negative one. Again, I introduced the resolution, House Resolution 520, urging that the President discuss liberation of the captive nations at his Camp David meeting with Premier Khrushchev. We did not get any answer from the Department of State on my second proposal until Congress adjourned 2 days before Khrushchev's ar-

rival in Washington. I sincerely hope that the Department of State is not going to use this same type of delaying technique in giving us a reply on the resolution we are introducing today until after the summit meeting. I hope the Department of State will move forthrightly because if it does not, if it opposes this resolution, then we will move to conclude that the State Department and the President have in fact accepted the "status quo" of the captive nations. The Communists keep referring to the "Spirit of Camp David." This is an excellent opportunity for us Americans to show that the spirit of Camp David means freedom for all people. I think if the President were apprised personally of what we are doing here today, perhaps, the President will lend his own weight to this resolution to help create the spirit that we are trying to generate. Certainly, there is no question but what we can put the United States and the entire free West in the forefront, if we would today demand the liberation of these captive nations. We have been on the defensive too long. We should make it crystal clear to Khrushchev that the free world will not pull its forces out of Berlin until the Soviet Union withdraws its forces from the captive nations and permits all of these great people to choose their own forms of government.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for the fine statement he has made, and I commend him for the work he has done in his activity in introducing the resolutions in the first session. I hope the gentleman will include that in his remarks in the body of the Record at this point.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 491

Joint resolution relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations

Whereas the unprecedented reception given the Vice President of the United States by the people of Poland on his recent trip to that country has demonstrated the strong bonds of friendship between these people and the United States; and

Whereas by this spontaneous greeting for an American official the people of Poland have spoken loud and clear their sincere desire for the same freedom enjoyed by western democracies; and

Whereas this demonstration was in fact the first real opportunity for the free world to see the sincere regard which the people behind the Iron Curtain have for the free world; and

Whereas the same feeling would be expressed by the peoples of all other captive nations if they had a similar opportunity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That—

(1) It is the intent of Congress that the formulators of American foreign policy should hereafter insist that all future summit conferences include on the agenda a discussion of restoration of full freedom to the captive nations now being held in the Soviet bloc;

(2) The Congress of the United States urges the President that he press for such peaceful restoration of full freedom for the people of the captive nations when he meets here in the United States with Russian Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev; and

(8) The Congress of the United States is resolute in its belief that the people of the captive nations should have an opportunity to freely express their will in choosing their own philosophy of government and they should also have the freedom to elect those who will govern their respective countries.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 520

Joint resolution relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations

Whereas the unprecedented reception given the Vice President of the United States by the people of Poland on his recent trip to that country has demonstrated the strong bonds of friendship between these people and the United States; and

Whereas by this spontaneous greeting for an American official the people of Poland have spoken loud and clear their sincere desire for the same freedom enjoyed by western democracies; and

Whereas this demonstration was in fact the first real opportunity for the free world to see the sincere regard which the people behind the Iron Curtain have for the free world; and

Whereas the same feeling would be expressed by the peoples of all other captive nations if they had a similar opportunity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) The Congress of the United States urges the President that he press for such peaceful restoration of full freedom for the people of the captive nations when he meets here in the United States with Russian Premier Nikita S. Khrushchey; and

(2) The Congress of the United States is resolute in its belief that the people of the captive nations should have an opportunity to freely express their will in choosing their own philosophy of government and they should also have the freedom to elect those who will govern their respective countries.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman that the Soviet Union is very sensitive—very, very sensitive when it comes to its indefensible position as to the status of the dominated nations—the nations that are captive nations. I want to assure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] that the gentleman from Wisconsin who is now addressing the House will certainly advise and directly advise the President of the proceedings this afternoon.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman been referring to the resolution that was on the Consent Calendar today or is this another resolution?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. This is not the resolution that was on the Consent Calendar today. This is another resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, if the gentleman will yield further, my only opposition to that resolution was, as I believe the gentleman knows, the fact that it provides any funds that are saved to the taxpayers of this country would be spent for additional technical assistance in foreign countries. That was my objection and my only objection to that resolution.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I fully understand the gentleman's objection, and I hope the gentleman from Iowa will have an opportunity to vote in the very near future on the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. But, without that language in it, if I may ask the gentleman?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is not my intention to amend the resolution stricken from the Consent Calendar today.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress inspired the common man the world over, brought new hope to the millions of captive people behind the Iron Curtain, and struck genuine fear into the minds of the leaders of the international Communist conspiracy during the last session by enactment of the Captive Nations Week resolution, which has now become Public Law 86-90. I know of no single action by our Government during all the years I have been privileged to serve the people of the 20th District of Ohio, which has done more to advance the cause of peace with justice, or to make our Nation more respected and admired by men in all walks of life the world over. Many who had lost hope that we would come to understand the true nature of the Communist conspiracy in time to take effective action against it have been renewed in their faith that freedom's cause is the wave of the future. Others who have spent many years of devoted service to their country have brought new strength and courage to their official tasks in the knowledge that at long last we had returned to the battlefield of moral and political ideals.

The Captive Nations Week resolution not only serves notice on the leaders of Russian communism that the United States intended to lead the crusade for peace with justice, by standing firmly by those great ideals which have made us the hope of the world, but it provided evidence we had no intention of limiting the application of those inspiring ideals. Committees of the Congress have worked long and diligently to uncover the truth about the methods and scope of Communist aggression, to identify all the nations of the world which have fallen victim to this new imperialism, and to uncover the truth about the hidden nature of imperial communism. From these studies we have learned much. In my judgment these basic lessons stand out:

First. The U.S.S.R. is nothing more than a prison of nations, that is, non-Russian nations all of whom have won and held their national independence at some time during the past 40 years. These once free and independent nations were the first to fall victims to the new imperialism of the Russian Communists.

Second. The Russian nation alone, among all the nations of the U.S.S.R., is the only one which has failed to produce a national independence movement at a time in history when this powerful human appeal is reshaping the order of the world. The evidence is clear that the Russians prefer the concept of a Soviet state and to this view they have every right because we believe in the right of all nations to freely choose their form of government. But we do not agree the Russians have the right to impose their peculiar concepts of government upon other nations.

Third. During the past 40 odd years the Russians have imposed by force their peculiar concepts of government upon a score of nations, thus establishing an empire which far exceeds the dreams of Tzar Peter who was the first Russian to propose a world empire as the goal of the Muscovites. It is the existence of this empire of captive nations which has caused the dangerous tensions which grip the world and threaten the outbreak of another war. We must accept the fact that these dangerous tensions will continue to exist as long as this empire of captive, non-Russian nations exists.

Fourth. All the captive nations suffer a common plight, that is, they are all subjected to the same tyranny, terror and police state control. In this common plight there is common cause. And this common cause is strengthened because the vast majority of the people of the captive non-Russian nations are struggling for their liberties, their freedoms and for their national independence. It is essential, therefore, that the government of the United States continue to view this problem in its broadest aspects, to regard the independence of each captive nation as important as the independence of any other nation.

Fifth. It is in the nature of things that we should join the common cause of all the captive nations because the political goals they seek are the key to a just and lasting peace.

I have studied the resolution introduced by my good friend, the Congressman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and congratulate him for the initiative he has taken to strengthen the hand of President Eisenhower for the forthcoming summit conference. I call to the attention of my friend the need to broaden his proposal to include all the captive nations. As I read his resolution I sense that its intent is limited to the captive nations of Central and East Europe. I am certain that he did not intend to do so as he was one of the leaders in causing the enactment of the Public Law 86-90, which carries no geographical limitations. I am equally certain that he regards the captivity of the Baltic Nations, the nations of the Caucasus and the Far East to be equally worthy of our support and recognition.

I ask, therefore, that the wording of the resolution introduced by Mr. ZABLOCKI be changed so that it conforms to the existing law with respect to the captive nations. I am suggesting that we spell out all the captive nations listed in Public Law 86-90 so that no one will misunderstand the seriousness of our purposes in enacting that law. There are those who, liking the old order of things, would like to degrade and belittle the Captive Nations Week resolution. Not the least among these is the Russian leader Khrushchey, who has been busy attacking the good faith of Congress in enacting the law which has officially established the third week of July as Captive Nations Week.

In the spirit of helpfulness, I am proposing some additions to the resolution introduced by Mr. ZABLOCKI which I feel are in keeping with prior action by the Congress.

1960

The urgent need exists for Congress to provide unstinting support for President Eisenhower in his role as leader of the free world nations at the summit conference this May. Extensive plans are now being made for that meeting. Everyone recognizes that the basic issue at the summit conference is human rights, the rights of nations and people, and no other consideration can take priority over that fact. Recently President Eisenhower gave voice to his determination to support the principle of self-determination for the people of free Berlin. This conforms with our role as defender of human rights and President Eisenhower knows that he has the complete support of the American people in standing firm on this issue. But the future of free Berlin is only one of the issues, important though it may be, which will come up at the Paris meeting.

There now remains little doubt that the main objective the Russian Communists will seek at the Paris meeting is an acceptance by the leaders of the free world of a status quo with respect to their empire. They seek and desperately need what they call recognition for the permanency of their empire of captive nations. There are signs that they will be willing to pay a price for such recognition; that is, a price involving nonessentials. At no point, however, can we expect them to make concessions which conform to the requirements of a just and lasting peace. Their concepts of justice are completely alien to those of freemen and the only peace they will recognize is the imposed peace of communism which now rests heavy upon almost one-third of the human family. That is why the underlying issue, the priority issue and the only issue of substance to be taken up at the Paris summit meeting, is peace with justice for all nations and all people.

This setting provides an unusual opportunity for President Eisenhower to climax his two terms as President by emerging from the Paris summit meeting as undisputed champion and leader of the cause of peace and justice. He can do this by casting aside the straight-jacket of nonessentials which the Russians have imposed upon the agenda for the meeting, by refusing to get bogged down with secondary issues and by insisting that since the purpose of the meeting is to remove the causes which have created dangerous tensions between nations, the first item to be taken up and to be resolved is the question of the future status of the captive nations. Such a position is completely consistent with the policy statements made by the President during his recent good-will tours of Europe and Latin America. The common man in those areas of the world will be looking for the President to undertake such action, to follow through at the summit where the real test of our serious intentions will take place. Hundreds of millions of people behind the Russian iron curtain are anxiously awaiting the Paris summit meeting, awaiting clear and unequivocal actions which will assure them that our Government thinks no less of them and their aspirations for human freedom.

President Eisenhower and President Eisenhower alone carries this heavy responsibility to the Paris summit meeting. Congress can and should take every means to assure the President of its complete support for his expected followthrough on the high promises made during his free world tour, but it remains for the President to emerge from the Paris summit meeting as the undisputed champion and leader of the cause of peace with justice for all nations.

In order to meet any doubts that may exist, particularly in the minds of the Russian leaders, that a Democratic majority in the Congress may create a difference of opinion with the President on the question of peace with justice, I urge that the resolution offered by my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] carry a direct appeal on this score from the Congress to all nations and peoples of the world. Such an appeal would be in strict conformity with what the President has been urging upon all the nations and peoples of the world and its acceptance would remove any doubts that may exist as to the unbreakable unity all Americans have on this all-important issue.

I have, therefore, introduced a concurrent resolution which seeks the same purposes as that proposed by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and which conforms to the language and intent of the captive nations resolution passed during the first session of Congress.

My resolution reads as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATING TO RESTORATION OF FREEDOM TO CAPTIVE NATIONS

Whereas the rulers of the Soviet Union have repeatedly declared their determination to pursue relentlessly their political, economic, and ideological drive for a worldwide victory for communism; and

Whereas, in their efforts to attain that objective, the leaders of Russian communism, through force of arms, subversion, infiltration, and other unlawful means, have imposed puppet Communist regimes upon the people of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas the leaders of Russian communism have employed organized tyranny, terror, mass killings and deportation, and other inhuman means to crush the spirit of the people of these captive nations and to transform their countries into political, social, economic, and cultural replicas of the Russian Soviet State; and

Whereas, in direct violation of the commitments set forth in the Atlantic Charter and the provisions of the Yalta Agreement, the people of the captive nations are still being denied the right of self-government by democratic means and the opportunity to choose, through free and unfettered elections, national governments of their own free choice; and

Whereas in contravention of duly ratified treaties of peace, of the Charter of the United Nations, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and of expressions of the United Nations General Assembly, the people of the captive nations are being systematically deprived of the exercise of fundamental freedoms and basic human rights; and

Whereas the 86th Congress did unanimously enact the Captive Nations Week resolution as a testament of support for the legitimate aspirations of the people of all the captive nations, thus recognizing the common plight of all the submerged nations forcibly incorporated into the Russian Communist Empire during the past 42 years; and

Whereas, the President of the United States has concurred in this action by Congress by signing the resolution into law and declaring by public proclamation that the third week of July shall henceforth be observed officially as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas the United States of America has stood firmly on the principle of self-determination, welcoming the enlargement of the area of freedom and self-government and insisting on the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice; and

Whereas the United States of America has consistently refused to sanction, either directly or by implication, the political status quo of the captive nations, which the leaders of Russian communism have persistently attempted to impose upon the countries of the free world, particularly the United States;

Whereas the attainment of a just and lasting peace is inconceivable without the restoration of freedom, independence, and national sovereignty to the captive nations forcibly incorporated into the Russian Communist Empire, the United States of America is determined to pursue by all peaceful means, the emancipation of these nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) The Congress of the United States reaffirms its intention to stand firmly by the people of the captive nations in their aspirations for freedom, liberty, and national independence;

(2) The Congress of the United States invites the active cooperation of all nations and men of good will in a crusade for peace with justice and freedom for all mankind; and

(3) The Congress of the United States urges the President to pursue energetically and as a matter of first priority at the forthcoming Summit Conference the inalienable right of all people to self-government, individual liberty, and the basic human freedoms, and, in particular, the restoration of these God-given rights to the people of the captive nations.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement. His recommendations will receive my utmost considerations when this matter will be acted upon by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio that this legislation is a logical followup to the resolution adopted by the Congress and signed by the President last year proclaiming Captive Nations Week?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Absolutely; with complete certainty. The resolution that has been introduced by our distinguished and able Member from Wisconsin should be broadened to include all nations. His resolution embodies only central and eastern Europe. I feel that it should embody all nations of the world, including Asia, all of Europe, and any other nation that is not free. Any nation that is not free is captive. I am in thorough accord with the objective of my col-

league's resolution. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's undertaking and feel that he is deserving of the highest praise.

The Zablocki resolution includes only Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. That is what I think eastern and central Europe means. Some may say it means more than that, but the fact it is open to dispute plays right into the hands of the Russians and their efforts to discredit Public Law 86-90, which reads as follows:

S. J. RES. 111

Joint resolution providing for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet-Nam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with

appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

Approved July 17, 1959.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is my feeling that the gentleman from Ohio has made a very significant contribution in suggesting expanding and defining the term "captive nation" and to take in all of the captive peoples of the world. May I ask one more question? Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio or the gentleman from Wisconsin would like to comment on this frequent argument that we hear from Communist rulers. Whenever the suggestion is made that the question of freedom of these captive people be discussed at the summit conference, the Soviet Union always holds out the argument that these are internal matters of the respective captive nations and therefore do not belong on the agenda of the summit conference. I wonder if either the gentleman from Ohio or the gentleman from Wisconsin would like to comment on this totally fallacious argument that is always presented by the Soviet Union?

Mr. FEIGHAN. It is a specious argument. Every agreement among the belligerent victorious nations during and subsequent to World War II, such as the Atlantic Charter, the Yalta Agreement, every peace treaty entered into by the victorious powers after the war, and all other agreements, emphasized and agreed that every nation should have the opportunity to determine its own destiny by free and unfettered elections, unharassed by alien occupation forces. Only after a free and unfettered election has taken place in any nation, can the United States and other nations who were parties to agreements insisting upon the right of self-determination of any nation, agree that any subsequent elections are internal matters.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that certainly if the Communist forces were not in Hungary, we could then say that any difference of opinion in that country would be an internal matter. However, when by sheer force a power dominates the policies in a country it is not an internal matter. In my opinion it is not only within the scope of discussion of the summit meeting, but we have an obligation to the free world to demand that atrocities and Communist violations be placed on the agenda of the conference. The argument of the Soviets is absolutely erroneous; it is very specious. Of course, they will try to sweep under the rug the conditions that exist today in captive nations.

In answer to the gentleman from Ohio I wish to reiterate that we cannot possibly hope to have disarmament unless and until the explosive situations and problems are resolved. It is very necessary that the political problems throughout the world, from the Communist-dominated Chinese mainland, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet, Central and Eastern Europe must be solved before we can ever hope to move

toward disarmament. I believe that the United States must insist on the inclusion of the restoration of freedom to all captive nations at the summit conference.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. With respect to the argument on the part of the Soviet Union that the question of free elections is an internal matter and not subject for discussion at the summit conference, I refer again, as I did in my own remarks, to the fact that the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States signed a treaty of peace with Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria which guaranteed the responsibilities of the three signatory powers to the holding of free and unfettered election in the three countries which, of course, were the wartime allies of the Axis.

To the extent that the treaties of peace have been violated in these particular provisions it does directly become a subject for consultation and cooperation, if possible, between the three powers—ourselves, the British, and the Russians, and under no circumstances can be termed merely a question of internal politics with respect to those three countries, because it directly refers to the terms of the peace treaties arising out of World War II under which we and the British and the Russians adopted certain mutual guarantees with respect to the question of free elections. If free elections have not been held, according to the terms of the treaties themselves, we have the right to take those matters up with our wartime partners.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it the position of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] that since these people in the captive nations are forced to accept governments that they did not elect freely, that it is now as much our responsibility as anyone else's to make sure that the wartime agreements are carried out, that the provisions of the agreements are carried out which would, in fact, guarantee them free elections?

Mr. BENTLEY. If the gentleman will yield to me for the purpose of permitting me to answer the gentleman from Illinois, I will say that it is our responsibility more than anyone else's.

I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in Hungary, one of the three powers with whom we have a peace treaty, there were free elections in November of 1945 at which the Communist Party got approximately 25 percent of the total votes. There were semifree elections in August of 1947 at which time the Communist vote shrunk to 20 percent. That was the last free election, so far as I know, anywhere in Eastern or Central Europe. But I think it is a very good criterion of what would happen, if there were free elections, to the Communist Parties in those countries. I venture to say that their vote would be less than half of what they got even in those elections.

I say that it is our responsibility according to the terms of the treaty of peace, and on that basis, if no other, we would be perfectly entitled to take this matter up with the British and the Soviets at the summit conference.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his forthright answer.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentlelady from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly thank the gentleman for his courage, resolution, and good judgment in introducing this resolution today. I was very proud to tell the gentleman that I wished to be listed as a cosponsor, and I hope to forward this great movement with him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman that it has been my pleasure and greatly to my benefit to serve on his subcommittee during the last 8 years in the Congress. I know of no one who has given more conscientious effort or closer dedication to the cause of freedom than the gentleman from Wisconsin. I think I have been fortunate to be under his leadership for so long, and I can assure him that in this and other matters where he leads so soundly I shall always follow.

I hope the gentleman has listed me as a cosponsor, because I so indicated to his office.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I have so listed the gentlelady as a cosponsor. I am deeply grateful for the very kind words she has spoken about me. I want to commend the gentlelady for her efforts in the past and the cooperation that I have received from her in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that where freedom is denied our own freedom is threatened.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I do agree.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a final question?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin have any indication that he is at liberty to discuss as to what is the position of the State Department regarding this effort to strengthen the President's hand at the summit meeting?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. May I advise the gentleman that last week at an executive session of the Foreign Affairs Committee—I shall, therefore, not identify the representative of the State Department—I inquired of the representative whether such a resolution as was today introduced would be helpful in the summit conference discussion and whether such a resolution would reiterate the strength and posture of our will. I am pleased to advise the gentleman from Illinois that this high-ranking State Department official stated, and I quote: "As an offhand reaction, I would be inclined to think it would be useful." Naturally I advised him that I hoped the executive branch would promptly send a favorable report on the concurrent resolution.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with Congressman ZABLOCKI today in introducing a resolution which deals with the restoration of freedom to the captive nations of Europe.

This resolution reaffirms what has been basic to American policy from the beginning: that these peoples have an inalienable right to choose the government under which they shall live. The United States has never recognized the legality of the puppet regimes imposed upon them by a foreign aggressor against their will and without their consent.

The peoples of the captive nations, have continually resisted their oppressors, always in the secrecy of their hearts and sometimes in bloody martyrdom. Despite years of police-state tyranny, they continue to hope for the liberty and freedom which is rightfully theirs.

In addition to reaffirming their right to self-determination, this resolution urges the President to press for a restoration of freedom at the forthcoming summit conference. I urge every Member of the House to keep faith with the captive nations by supporting this resolution.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN: THE GREAT COMMONER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1860—a century ago last Saturday—occurred the birthday of a great American and a great Democrat, William Jennings Bryan.

Elected to the House of Representatives at the age of 30, he served two terms in this body and went on to become the youngest man ever to run for the Presidency after he swept the convention with his Cross of Gold speech in 1896.

William Jennings Bryan gave a text to the country when he proclaimed:

I fear the plutocracy of wealth, I respect the aristocracy of learning, but thank God for the democracy of the heart.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. It is a great honor to yield to my good friend and colleague from South Carolina, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I thank my colleague from West Virginia.

May I say that it is fitting and proper that this House pause during its great deliberations here to pay tribute and homage to William Jennings Bryan, who was born 100 years ago last Saturday, March 19.

William Jennings Bryan came along at a time when the Democratic Party's fortunes were at a very low ebb, and by his principles and ideals, his dynamic personality and his oratorical ability, he rejuvenated the Democratic Party.

Many of the great measures he advocated have since become the law of the land during subsequent Democratic administrations.

When William Jennings Bryan made his famous campaign in 1896 he was only 36 years old. During this great election year when we are considering various candidates in both political parties it might be well to remember that some of the greatest leaders in all the history of the world have been young men. William Jennings Bryan was one of them. William Pitt of England was 24 when he was Prime Minister, and the greatest Prime Minister England ever had. I do not think how old or how young a candidate for President should enter the question, but rather his character and ability to lead this country.

I want to thank my great friend from West Virginia for yielding. Since my distinguished friend from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] has been a Member of this body he has impressed those of us on both sides of the aisle. It is an indication of the continuing interest of the people of America in our political welfare when they send men to this Congress like my friend from West Virginia. I commend the gentleman from West Virginia for the great record he has made here in so short a time.

I commend the gentleman again for bringing to the attention of this House a great American birthday; a man who was not a conformist but who believed in standing up for those principles and ideals in which he believed.

I was named WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN because my father disagreed with our great President Woodrow Wilson on the question of our entrance into World War I. He sided with William Jennings Bryan. Of course, Mr. Speaker, once we were forced into that war, Bryan, like all Americans, backed our gallant soldiers in their unsurpassed achievements on the battlefields of Europe.

Mr. HECHLER. I think my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, for his generous personal remarks about me and for his illuminating comments on the man for whom he was named, William Jennings Bryan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At the time that William Jennings Bryan was giving us the benefit of his services, it was my privilege to be attending Northwestern University Law School at the Masonic Temple on the northeast intersection of State and Randolph Streets. We admired William Jennings Bryan very, very much. He was all that my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina said—an orator, a statesman—we can't—at least some of us are—certainly, I cannot go along with his political philosophy, but one thing I do want to say for the record is that his namesake is possessed of all the ability as an orator—and is there such a word as "convincer"?—and only last week our colleague from South Carolina gave us

an example of how he could work his charm, to charm the birds off the perch or off the limb. But of his ability, and one thing that I would say to him that I regret is that always when he speaks the office force that I am privileged to have in my office, when they know of it, insist upon coming over and listening to him. I cannot go along with the political views of my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, but I certainly can be persuaded by what he has to say on the floor of the House.

Mr. HECHLER. I appreciate the contribution of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan.

William Jennings Bryan served 2 terms in this body. He was elected in 1890 from the State of Nebraska and served from 1890 to 1894. He was the youngest man ever to run for the Presidency when he ran in 1896.

I believe that the Republican Party produced two great Presidents—Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt. Theodore Roosevelt inherited and took many of his ideas from those first pro-pounded by William Jennings Bryan.

The poet Vachel Lindsay immortalized Bryan's great election battle in 1896 when he wrote:

There were truths eternal in the gab and
 tittle-tattle,
 There were real heads broken in the fustian
 and the rattle.
 There were real lines drawn:
 Not the silver and the gold,
 But Nebraska's cry went eastward against
 the dour and the old
 The mean and the cold.

In a coat like a deacon, in a black Stetson
 hat
 He scourged the elephant plutocrats
 With barbed wire from the Platte
 Gigantic troubadour, speaking like a siege-
 gun
 Smashing Plymouth Rock with his boulders
 from the West—

July, August, suspense
 Wall Street lost to sense
 August, September, October,
 More suspense
 And the whole East down like a wind-
 smashed fence.

Then Hanna to the rescue
 Hanna of Ohio
 Rallying the rollertops
 The bucketshops
 Threatening drouth and death
 Promising manna.

Rallying the trusts against the bawling flannel-
 mouth
 Invading misers' cellars
 Tin cans, socks
 Melting down the rocks
 Pouring out the long grain to a million
 workers
 Spondulix by the mountainload, to stop
 each tornado
 And beat the cheapstate, blatherskite,
 Populistic, anarchistic,
 Deacon-desperado.

Election night at midnight
 Boy Bryan's defeat
 Defeat of western silver
 Defeat of the wheat
 Victory of letter files
 And plutocrats in miles
 With dollar signs upon their coats
 Diamond watch chains on their vests
 And spats on their feet.

Victory of custodians
 Plymouth Rock.
 And all that inbred landlord stock
 Victory of the neat.

Defeat of the aspen groves of Colorado's
 valleys
 The blue bells of the Rockies
 The blue bonnets of old Texas
 By the Pittsburgh alleys.

Defeat of alfalfa
 And the mariposa lilly
 Defeat of the young
 By the old and silly.

Prairie avenger,
 Mountain Lion,
 Bryan, Bryan, Bryan, Bryan.

(Mr. HECHLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

IMPRISONMENT OF BISHOP JAMES EDWARD WALSH IN RED CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed this weekend to learn of the steps taken by Red China to sentence Bishop James Edward Walsh to prison for 20 years on charges of espionage.

Earlier this year I commented on the action taken against United Press International Reporter Bill Yim, who had been permitted to enter Red China with the full understanding that he would be allowed to cover a story. Once inside, he was arrested.

Bishop Walsh was in China as a missionary, concerned with the well-being of humans, not with politics. He had been under surveillance since the Red takeover in 1949, and under arrest since the fall of 1959.

Throughout the years, efforts have been made by our Government to persuade the Communist Chinese to liberate Americans held in Red prisons. These include an outstanding young American from my district, John T. Downey, of New Britain. Continuing talks have not resulted in any concession by the Chinese. Despite word given by Chinese negotiators long ago that prisoners of the Korean conflict would be released, these men have been held in jails.

It has been obvious for some time that this contributed nothing to the solution of world tensions. So long as Red China claims its right to hold these men whom it imprisoned after unconvincing trials; there is full reason to hold the Communist regime beyond the pale of civilized nations.

Now Red China has compounded her sins by the action taken against Bishop Walsh. The bishop was a man of religion. He had declined, despite permission offered by his superiors, to leave his post. In 1956 he wrote:

Here in Shanghai I share the lot of Chinese clergy who cannot leave, who must share all the pressure and annoyance. They are the key factor in the church situation in China these days. There is some good, I think, giving them a little help or encouragement, if only as a moral gesture. I don't wish to do anything to separate myself from them of my own volition.

He also expressed his feelings in these words:

I don't feel inclined to get off the earth just because some people dislike my religion. Internment and death are simply the normal risks that are inherent in our state of life, a small price to pay for carrying out our duty, in our particular case a privilege because it would associate us a little more intimately in the cross of Christ.

Those of us who have watched the pattern of behavior established by the Chinese Communists since the Civil War that brought them to power over the mainland have known for many years of the cruel indifference to human feeling that it represents. A handful of men who can watch millions die as they seek to consolidate their power, who can tear apart families by the thousands to increase their labor supply, who retreat only for tactical advantage and press forward in areas heedless of the world conflagration they might touch off, are not likely to be moved by the spirit of compassion and humanity that motivates Bishop Walsh.

This latest action of the Chinese Reds has caused new revulsion on the part of the American people. It may well be argued that nothing better could be expected from a Godless regime which feels itself threatened by any appeal to the soul of mankind. The moral should be clear. We cannot lessen our attention to a regime which is so inimical to the hope of peace. Nor can we reduce our efforts to seek the freedom of those held in Chinese jails despite the nature of the tyranny that sends them there.

I think it well, too, that all members of the House meditate on the feelings expressed in this editorial from the New York Times which comments on the fate of Bishop Walsh:

BISHOP WALSH'S CRIME

Bishop James Edward Walsh, of Cumberland, Md., may spend the rest of his life in a Chinese prison for offending the Red China government. At 69, he has been a servant of the Chinese people and of his church for almost half a century. All of us, of whatever religion, can share in an admiration for Bishop Walsh and indignation for the cruel 20-year sentence inflicted upon him.

An associate, the Very Rev. John F. Donovan, vicar-general of the Maryknoll Fathers, said of him: "If love is a crime, then he is guilty; if opposition to a brutal and tyrannical regime is a crime, he is guilty; if allegiance to his church is a crime, then he is guilty." In the raw, bitter communism of mainland China most of the civilized virtues are crimes and the Sermon on the Mount is full of reason.

Secretary Herter's protest will carry little weight with a government which charges our own Government with an "imperialistic scheme to subvert the Chinese people's democratic regime." But outrages such as this may well be remembered when somebody inquires why we do not want Red China in the United Nations or a Red Chinese Ambassador in Washington.

INFLATION IN ITS WORST AND LEAST UNDERSTOOD FORM—STRANGLING INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.