

America in Congress assembled, That, in order to improve the meteorological services of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce may enter into contracts with private or governmental facilities to conduct research in meteorology, including agricultural meteorology, hydrology, climatology, and closely related geophysical fields, and provide for the publication of results of such research contracts unless such publication would be contrary to the public interest.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 7 of the Act of August 23, 1912 (ch. 350, 37 Stat. 414), as amended, appropriations for the Weather Bureau shall be available to pay for telephone service installed in private residences when such installation is determined by the Secretary of Commerce to be needed in carrying out the provisions of law authorizing the collection and distribution of data relating to information on weather conditions in the United States, its territories and possessions: *Provided*, That, in addition to the monthly local service charge, the Government may pay only such tolls or other charges as are required strictly for the public business.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 45, Senate bill 683.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 683) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a similar bill passed the Senate last year, but was not taken up in the House.

The purpose of S. 683 is to amend sections 219, 308, and 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to eliminate the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain reports and application forms submitted to the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to said sections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a general statement relating to the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce at the request of the Federal Communications Commission. Full and complete hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Communications on an identical bill (S. 1736) in the 86th Congress at which all interested parties were afforded an opportunity to present their views. S. 1736 was favorably reported and passed the Senate but died in the House.

The requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain reports and application forms submitted to the Commission imposes a burden on the public and also on the Commission in those instances where the applicant omits the required oath or affirmation. In such cases the workload of the Commission

is increased to the extent necessary to re-turn reports or application forms for the required verification. This slows up the consideration by the Commission of the matters involved and the processing of applications. Inconvenience and delay to the public result.

As a substitute for the oath or affirmation on Commission forms, where presently required, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to provide on the forms a warning similar to the following:

Willful false statements on this form can be punished by fine or imprisonment (18 U.S.C. 1001).

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By way of comment on the bill, the existing law requires that the Commission may require annual reports from all carriers, under oath or affirmation. It appears that that is an undue burden and is not necessary. I think the Senate saw the wisdom last year of amending the existing law, so the bill is not controversial at all, and should be approved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In order to amplify what the distinguished minority leader has said, I point out that the general statement in the report reads, in part:

As a substitute for the oath or affirmation on Commission forms, where presently required, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to provide on the forms a warning similar to the following:

"Willful false statements on this form can be punished by fine or imprisonment (18 U.S.C. 1001)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 683) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 219 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 219(a)), is amended by striking out from the first sentence thereof the words "under oath".

SEC. 2. That subsection (b) of section 219 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 219(b)), is amended by striking out from the penultimate sentence thereof after the word "Act" the semicolon, adding a period thereafter and striking out the following: "and such periodical or special reports shall be under oath whenever the Commission so requires".

SEC. 3. That subsection (b) of section 308 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 308(a)), is amended by striking out from the last sentence thereof the words "under oath or affirmation".

SEC. 4. That subsection (a) of section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 319(a)), is amended by striking out from the last sentence thereof the words "under oath or affirmation".

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR MONDAY NEXT—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Monday the Senate will take up S. 610, a bill to provide for an Office of Inter-

national Travel within the Department of Commerce. The bill was reported today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill to be called up on Monday is the one to create a new Office of International Travel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I presume there will be much discussion of the bill. There were a good many cosponsors of the measure. I hope they will take notice of the fact that the bill will be taken up for consideration on Monday next.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S STATEMENT ON THE CONGO AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, President Kennedy's statement regarding the Congo has, I am sure, the full support of Congress and the people of our country. While it deals directly with the Congo, it has much wider implications. It is a declaration of firm support for the United Nations. For if the United Nations is not supported in the Congo, and if its organization should be broken up by the threats of the Soviet Union, by the removal of Mr. Hammarskjöld and a change in the status of the Secretary General, its effectiveness to prevent war in the Congo, and in other situations that may arise, would be nullified.

This is undoubtedly one of the purposes of the Soviet Union. The President was correct in pointing out that members of the United Nations—those who are not military powers, who are neutralist, and particularly those who are now emerging into independence—have the greatest stake in the maintenance of the United Nations in the Congo, and in its integrity as a world body for peace.

I note with great interest the statement of Prime Minister Nehru of India supporting the continued functioning of the United Nations in the Congo, and his offer to send some combat troops to the Congo in its support. We hope that the position of India will be followed by like action on the part of many nations in Asia and particularly of nations in Africa.

The President was correct also in making clear to the Soviet Union that the United States will support the United Nations against the unilateral intervention of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of the Republic of the Congo. The declaration of the Communist Party meeting in Moscow in December, and the speech of Mr. Khrushchev at a later date elaborating the meaning of the Communist Party declaration in the context of its policy of "coexistence," clearly

committed the Soviet Union and other countries controlled by the Communist Party to intervention in every situation in Africa, Asia, and even Latin America when it would be to their advantage to impose the rule of communism.

President Kennedy, in his statements, has made it clear that the United States is prepared to negotiate seriously with Russia the issues which divide the world, and particularly, disarmament. Mr. Khrushchev has said that Soviet Russia would like to see a solution of disarmament and other issues which, unresolved, continue the danger of war. The action of the Soviet Union and other Communist countries regarding the Congo and the maintenance of the United Nations will provide for our country and the world a test of the good faith of the Soviet Union toward negotiation.

Proposals for the resolution of the difficult questions of the Congo, are for the President and State Department to consider, in their careful negotiations within the United Nations and with other countries. We should keep in mind that it is doubtful that the United States can secure or maintain the support of countries of Asia and, particularly, Africa unless the plans we submit point to the reconvening of the Parliament which was elected by the people of the Congo, or to a new Parliament to be elected by the people.

This carries with it the proposition that forces in the Congo must be there only under the auspices of the United Nations. This means that Belgium should agree to the early removal of its military advisers or forces under such an agreement.

For at last the decision for the government of the Congo must be made by the people of the Congo and not by outsiders. As a practical matter it would be difficult for any newly independent country, in Africa or elsewhere, to accept the decisions of outsiders as to the ultimate character of its government. For if they accept such a proposal for the Congo, they could consider that some day they might be required to accept it for themselves.

And it is by our willingness to stand by the decisions of the people of these new States that we can support our own principle of self-government and secure the confidence of the people of these newly independent countries.

Mr. President, I say this is a time in which our country and the members of both parties should give without question the fullest support to President Kennedy in his very clear statement regarding U.S. policy.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his very wise contributions in regard to one of the most troublesome questions facing us today. His long experience, his great prestige in the areas to which he refers, and, notably, his service as U.S. Ambassador to India entitle him to speak with very great authority, on the basis of his wise judgment.

I hasten to add that I am eager to identify myself with the burden of his statements, as they relate to the crisis in the Congo. In fact, I shall address

myself to those points, and my views in regard to them are very closely parallel to his.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I know that only recently he visited Africa, particularly the Congo, and that his advice and judgment will be valuable to both the Senate and the country.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

THE SITUATION IN THE CONGO

Mr. President, I rise today to speak for a few minutes about the Congo. One does this with considerable hesitation. It has been necessary to read the cables very closely and to read the ticker tapes constantly in order to try to keep abreast of the changing events in that area.

Many have spoken. In the last few days, both wise words and hot words have been uttered. Most of the latter have been triggered by the unfortunate and regrettable circumstances surrounding the death of Patrice Lumumba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks today an editorial entitled "The Lumumba Aftermath," published in the Washington Post of yesterday; an article entitled "Crisis in the Congo," written by Walter Lippmann, and published today in the Washington Post; and the latest item from the ticker tape in regard to a proposal, expected today by certain countries of Africa and Asia, that aims at a solution of the Congolese crisis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, from a quick glance at the news ticker item on the solution proposed by these Asian and African nations, I note that it closely parallels some recommendations I have prepared.

The fact that the emotions of the world have been stirred by the unfortunate death of Lumumba is to be regretted by peace-loving people everywhere. When we were in the Congo a little over a month ago, it was my impression that Lumumba, a very exciting personality, was much more important outside the Congo than he was inside it. I suspect that as events unfold before us, right now, considerably more will be made of his death in other capitals of the world than in his own land. Whatever the case there, however, his passing demands that the United States, in particular, and the United Nations, in general, take a fresh look at the Congo.

The U.S. policy in regard to the Congo has seemed, in recent months, to be altogether too much warped by the personality of Lumumba; and altogether too much of what we have done in central Africa—or, at least, too much of what we have said we intended to do there—has been triggered by fear of this one man. As a consequence, his presence there and this fear have tended to straitjacket both our thinking and our freedom of action.

Mr. President, this is not an unusual circumstance in history. In fact, an

American historian, Earl Johnson, has developed what he calls the "devil" thesis of history: that, often, peoples—including ourselves—are tempted to try to simplify the complications of the world by focusing their attention on a "devil."

Thus, at the time of our troubles with Nazi Germany, we tended to focus our attention on Hitler. During the post-war period we tended to focus our attention on Stalin. So it is that more recently we have tried to apply the same formula to the problems which have developed in central Africa. In that connection, we have tended to focus our attention on Lumumba.

Although no one would ever suggest that a member of the human race be destroyed, I can see one beneficial consequence to be derived from freeing the public mind from fear of this one man. This opportunity to take a fresh look is what prompted me to speak rather informally today about what might be done in the Congo.

What I shall have to say will be little more than personal opinion—a reflection of the views of only one man—but some of what I shall say has been derived from many, many conversations, in the Congo, with members of the Kasavubu government, with members of the opposition groups there, and with both groups of Belgians on the scene. The Belgians there refer to the "good Belgians" and the "bad Belgians." We talked with all those groups, and also to members of other embassies, to private citizens of the surrounding countries in Africa, and to the international press from Asia, from Africa, from Europe, and from our own country. Some of the very finest minds and most gifted pens of the fourth estate in the United States have long been in the Congo, and we have benefited from the articles they have been sending home.

So my remarks will constitute somewhat of a distillation—a substantive attempt to judge, on balance, what the Congo crisis comes down to—as a result of all the cross currents and the differing ideas at work at the moment on this particular issue.

Let me suggest that the problem of the Congo is complicated by the heritage of the past. It would be convenient if we could avoid that harsh fact, but it remains with us. The factors of the past that still influence the present of the Congo are of both African origin and colonial Belgian origin.

Sheer size, physical isolation, vastness, and yet emptiness are words that come to mind when one attempts to describe this great land, the Congo. It is one of the largest countries in the world, and potentially it is one of the richest. If the map of Congo were superimposed on a map of the United States, for example, it would stretch from the eastern borders of Kansas, northward into Canada, eastward into the Atlantic, and southward into Florida. The Congo is a tremendously large country. Yet, distributed throughout that vast area are but 14 million people. I cannot help but think—as others have—of the contrast with parts of Asia. The Belgian Congo is not smaller