

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18643

H.R. 8074. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, and the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, as amended, with respect to certain foreign corporations (Rept. No. 2106).

PERMANENCY OF EXISTING SUSPENSIONS OF TAX ON FIRST DOMESTIC PROCESSING OF CERTAIN OILS, ACIDS, SALTS, AND COMBINATIONS OF MIXTURES THEREOF—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2102)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 5260) to make permanent the existing suspensions of the tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, and combinations or mixtures thereof, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with my supplemental views and the supplemental views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR CERTAIN BANKS TO INVEST IN BANK SERVICE CORPORATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2105)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, the bill (H.R. 8874) to authorize certain banks to invest in corporations whose purpose is to provide clerical services for them, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with supplemental views of members of the committee with respect to the bill may be filed as late as midnight tonight.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that these supplemental views may be printed along with the committee report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and the report, together with the supplemental views, will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated September 10,

1962, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, The following favorable report was submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive B, 87th Congress, 2d session, Treaty of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation between the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, together with a related protocol (Ex. Rept. No. 7).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 3726. A bill for the relief of Charles F. McKellar, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 3627. A bill for the relief of Barry T. Thornycroft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3728. A bill for the relief of Evanthia Haji-Christou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

CREATION OF A WESTERN HEMISPHERE MILITARY ALLIANCE

Mr. SMATHERS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 393) favoring the creation of a Western Hemisphere Military Alliance, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SMATHERS, which appears under a separate heading.)

RECOGNITION OF A FREE CUBAN GOVERNMENT IN EXILE

Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. BEALL) also submitted a resolution (S. Res. 394) concerning the recognition of a free Cuban Government-in-exile, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SMATHERS, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A STUDY ENTITLED "UNITED STATES PRIVATE FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS"

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 395); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a Senate Republican Policy Committee staff study entitled "United States Private Foreign Aid Programs"; and that one hundred and three thousand addi-

tional copies be printed for the use of the Senate.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11970) to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROUTY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 1970, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that yesterday the Senate received the nomination of W. Walton Butterworth, of Louisiana, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador to Canada.

In accordance with the committee rule this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 319) to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide that the provisions of section 4(1) thereof, relating to long- and short-haul charges, shall not apply to express companies.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 455) to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2511. An act to provide for the production and distribution of educational and training films for use by deaf persons, and for other purposes; and

S. 3408. An act to establish in the Library of Congress a library of musical scores and other instructional materials to further educational, vocational, and cultural opportunities in the field of music for blind persons.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

18644

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 18

were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by W. P. Shofstall, dean of men, Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz., before Young Americans for Freedom, Phoenix, Ariz., September 15, 1962.

Article entitled "The Relationship Between Profits and Jobs," published in the August 10, 1962, issue of NAM News, being an economic analysis by the National Association of Manufacturers, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. HARTKE:

Address entitled "Knowledge: The Key to a Century of Agricultural Progress," delivered by Claude R. Wickard at the Purdue Centennial Celebration, Purdue University, on July 27, 1962.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Article entitled "Cuba: Watchful Waiting," written by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington (D.C.) Post of today, September 18, 1962.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorial entitled "America's Power System," published in the Greenville (Wis.) Press-Gazette of September 12, 1962.

RUSSIAN UNITED NATIONS EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN SPYING

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I feel certain that many, if not all, in this Chamber felt as I did on learning that certain Russian United Nations employees were leaving the country—scot free—after "engaging in illegitimate intelligence" activities, following a 3-year effort on their part to bribe a student assistant in the office of the U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York. These spies offered \$3,000 in exchange for "information regarding internal operations of U.S. Government agencies."

To put it mildly, I was surprised, indignant, and apprehensive. Then, on learning that, even without diplomatic immunity, these men were able to leave the country virtually unchallenged, my apprehensions grew even stronger. There is some basis for granting immunity to those with diplomatic status, because we, in turn, are granted the same immunity for our own diplomats. But there is no reason whatsoever to give relatively minor United Nations employees diplomatic status. Certainly, it cannot be justified on the basis of reciprocity for our employees, since the United Nations is in New York.

It is well known that official representatives of foreign governments in the diplomatic service enjoy full diplomatic immunity. I have checked today with the State Department, however, and am advised that employees of the United Nations are not included in the category of diplomats, but under the United Nations Headquarters Agreement are granted the privilege of residence in New York City while employees of the United Nations.

These employees are not given diplomatic immunity, and their privilege of residence can be withdrawn at any time. While residing in New York City, they are able to assemble and gather information to be used by the Soviets or others against us. New York City is a fertile ground for such activity by United Nations staff members attached to the Soviet Union or to any of the Communist

member nations. These staff members total in the hundreds. The question arises: Is this freedom from prosecution and trial likewise to be applied to each of them?

We are thankful that these two enemy agents were detected. But how many others have gone undetected? The history of the betrayal of atomic bomb secrets by our country's enemies carries continual warning of the dangers to our security through espionage. Yet, in this instance, two enemy agents and spies are ordered to leave the country, without trial or punishment.

This incident brings into focus the possibility of continuing, vigilant, insidious activities of Soviet spies in our midst, with complete immunity to prosecution and punishment, so long as they are members of the Soviet United Nations staff. It is time to be upset and alarmed. This is an intolerable state of affairs. It must be remedied.

Are we to sit idly by, giving haven to spies and enemy agents, and even encouraging them, to plot, plan, and bring about our own destruction? Any treacherous act must be punished.

These two agents should be prosecuted and punished. This is the only method of dealing with them and any others guilty of espionage activity.

I demand that the Nation be advised of the full facts in this case. We must know where we stand. We must have an effective plan to protect the security of our Nation.

There must be a full explanation as to just what happened, and the reason for the end result of no prosecution. To this end, I am calling on the United Nations Ambassador, the State Department, and the Justice Department for a full explanation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Cuba file WESTERN HEMISPHERE MILITARY ALLIANCE AND CUBAN GOVERNMENT IN EXILE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I submit, and send to the desk, two resolutions which have to do with the problem of Cuba. I ask that the resolutions be printed and be appropriately referred, and also that they be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolutions will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions submitted by Mr. SMATHERS were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. RES. 393

Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared to the Congress that we should consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this Hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety"; and

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties thereto agreed that "an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States, and consequently, each one of the said Contracting Parties under-

takes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations"; and

Whereas the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January, 1962, unanimously declared, "The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extra-continental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union"; and

Whereas the United States has joined with certain other nations of Europe in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in order to offer mutual protection against Communist attack or threat of attack and thereby has successfully halted Communist encroachments in that area of the world; and

Whereas the United States has joined with other countries of the Western Hemisphere in an effort to prevent Communist penetration of this hemisphere, as evidenced by provisions set forth in such inter-American agreements as the Rio Treaty (1947), the Charter of the Organization of American States (1948) the Caracas Agreement (1954), and the Declaration of Punta Del Este (1962); and

Whereas international communism now controls Cuba and has created a massive arms build-up there and threatens to extend its political, economic, and military sphere of influence to other nations of the hemisphere; and

Whereas, in order to protect and preserve the security of this hemisphere against the threat of international communism, the agreements referred to above, including Articles 6 and 8 of the Rio Treaty, must be fulfilled by all of those nations that are willing to act; Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Senate that the United States Government should support the formation of an Inter-American Military Alliance, joined by all nations in the Western Hemisphere who voluntarily wish to do so, for the purpose of carrying out the principles previously enunciated.

S. Res. 394

Whereas historically Cuba has been a member of the Inter-American family of free and democratic nations; and

Whereas the present Cuban dictatorship is now under the domination of an alien Sino-Soviet Communist power and was publicly denounced and expelled from the Inter-American System at the Eighth Meeting of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este in January of 1962; and

Whereas that dictatorship has destroyed the personal and political freedoms of the people of Cuba; and

Whereas the existence of that dictatorship is a continuing threat to the peace and security of the other Western Hemisphere nations, and violates the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 as well as the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (1947), the Charter of the Organization of American States (1948), the Declaration of Caracas (1954), the Declaration of Santiago de Chile (1959), and the Declaration of San Jose (1960), which the nations of the Inter-American System have pledged to support and uphold; and

Whereas the United States has historically given aid and comfort to oppressed peoples through the recognition of governments in exile, when free nations were overrun and occupied by totalitarian powers, as was the case in World War I with the recognition by the United States of the Czechoslovak Na-

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18645

tional Council in 1918 (at a time when this territory was still part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire) and in World War II when the United States recognized seven European governments in exile whose homelands were occupied by the Nazi armies; and

Whereas, a Cuban government in exile would (1) provide a rallying point for two hundred thousand Cuban refugees who have demonstrated their desire to liberate their homeland and return to a free Cuba, (2) provide a legal and effective means whereby the Government of the United States and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere could help freedom-loving Cubans to regain their homeland, (3) provide an instrument whereby freedom-loving Cubans could ask for and receive the assistance that is necessary if they are to throw off the yoke of communism, (4) provide an effective contact with those brave people inside Cuba who are already opposing the Communist dictatorship in whatever way they can, and (5) assure the people of the world that the fight against a Communist Cuba is not ended and will not end until Cuba is free: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Senate that the United States should recognize as the true government of Cuba a Cuban Revolutionary Government in Exile whose avowed purpose is to lead the Cuban people in the liberation and recovery of their homeland;

Resolved further, That the United States should recognize only a Cuban Revolutionary Government in Exile which agrees, prior to recognition by the United States, that it will, upon the liberation of Cuba, transfer its power and authority to the Cuban people by the holding of free elections.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, one of the resolutions calls for the creation of a Western Hemisphere military alliance. Personally, I cannot help but believe that before we get rid of communism in Cuba and before we get rid of Castro, some action, and possibly some military action, will be required. It seems to me it is not the wisest course for the United States to let this situation continue to develop, and then finally have to make this move and act unilaterally. It seems to me quite important that steps be undertaken now to get the countries of Latin America who feel about communism and Castro very much the same way that we do, and who are willing to enter into a type of alliance similar to that which we have with NATO, to act. I understand that NATO is an organization formed wholly to use military force to stop Communists wherever and however it is deemed important to use that force to stop them; and the same thing is true of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

There are in Central America and in South America a number of countries which I believe would be willing to join in an alliance of this type; and I believe the time has come for the United States to take the lead in organizing such an alliance, so that if the day comes when troops are finally put into Cuba, they will go there under the direction of an organization in which many countries are represented, and in which at least a large number of them will be Latin American countries. In that event, if the substance of my other resolution is adopted, when that day comes, many of the Cubans themselves will be leading the invasion. That is what the Cuban

refugees would like to do, and that is what should be done.

So, Mr. President, one resolution calls for the creation of a Western Hemisphere military alliance. I shall not read the resolution for it appears in the Record along with these remarks.

The other resolution calls for recognition of a free Cuban government in exile. There is a great deal of precedent for such action. In World War I, we recognized the exile government of Czechoslovakia. In World War II, we recognized many exile governments. For all practical purposes, there is today an exile government of Chiang Kai-shek, which operates from the Island of Taiwan. We have refused to recognize the Communist government of China; but we recognize the government of Chiang Kai-shek, and we give to that government a great deal of funds and much material.

So it seems to me that we should recognize a free Cuban government in exile, which could enter into treaties and agreements with the United States and the other countries of Central America and South America. These governments could then openly and legally send materials, equipment and money to the Cuban revolutionary government. In that way the Cuban exiles can receive the materials and funds they need in order to begin to do the job they wish to do, which is to free Cuba from Castro.

I am told that many of the Cuban refugees are in touch with the Cuban freedom fighters who remain in the Escambray Mountains of Cuba. One of the reasons why the freedom fighters there are not more active is that they do not have sufficient equipment with which to fight, and they have no means of obtaining funds with which to purchase such equipment. They can obtain it only from friendly governments, but they do not have funds with which to pay for it. But under the treaties and diplomatic arrangements we have made with all the countries in the Western Hemisphere, if we recognize a Cuban government in exile, we can then turn over to it the equipment and material it needs, and they can be put into the hands of the freedom fighters who are still in Cuba, so that they can oppose Castro more effectively.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I wish to join the Senator from Florida in sponsoring the two resolutions, and I congratulate him for submitting them.

I am glad to hear him state that there is ample precedent for them, particularly our recognition of the government of Chiang Kai-shek.

Does the Senator from Florida believe that if we were to recognize a Cuban government in exile, it would be able to form its own organization perhaps to take over and recapture Cuba?

Mr. SMATHERS. There is no question about it. Today, there are roughly 200,000 Cubans in Florida. Let us say 75,000 of them are in a position to do some fighting and, if necessary, to go

to war. When the day comes when troops are finally put into Cuba, I can think of nothing better for all concerned than to have Cubans lead the fight. They want to do it, and they should do it; and, at the same time, that will negate the Communist propaganda—which otherwise would be made against us—that that was "U.S. imperialism" and all that sort of thing. Certainly the Cubans must have some financial means and assistance, in order to take that lead.

Mr. President, I have submitted the resolutions. I cannot help but believe that ultimately we shall have to come to this idea, and I believe we should do so.

DR. JAMES R. SHAW

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, Dr. James R. Shaw has been rendering service in matters of health among American Indians for many years. He has recently retired from the program of that service to 400,000 American Indians. The Gallup Independent of Gallup, N. Mex., has published several articles on Dr. Shaw's service. I ask unanimous consent that the said articles be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Gallup Daily Independent, Gallup, N. Mex., Aug. 3, 1962]

INDIAN HEALTH IMPROVING

When the overall health of a racial or ethnic group within a progressive society is considerably below that of the rest of the population, it is an indictment of that society. Using this criteria, the United States has been open to indictment in the matter of health standards among American Indians.

Twenty years ago, a newborn Indian baby could expect to live no longer than a half century. In less advanced societies in the world, the average life span is even below that, but it is a sad commentary that it was true in the United States even 20 years ago. Indians were particularly susceptible to such diseases as tuberculosis, infant diarrhea, respiratory illnesses, and deformity.

Half of all Indians hospitalized in 1956 had tuberculosis, but the mortality rate has been reduced considerably. In the past 6 or 7 years, infant mortality among Indians has declined 30 percent. Tuberculosis has declined 44 percent in the past few years.

The problem of improving the health of Indians is one of education and improved facilities, and one man who has contributed a great deal in both respects is Dr. James R. Shaw.

Dr. Shaw, 54, stepped down Wednesday as head of the Division of Indian Health within the U.S. Public Health Service, a post he had held for 9 years.

There were vast changes made in Indian health care during his tenure. From an organizational standpoint, the biggest step was transfer of Indian health care from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Public Health Service. This was accomplished in 1955 and Dr. Shaw was one of the prime movers.

He has seen appropriations increased from \$20 million in 1955 to \$61 million in 1962, an increase in personnel and new Indian hospitals built around the country, one in Gallup.

As Dr. Shaw retires to a more placid life in Arizona, it is his hope that the trail he has blazed will be pursued until Indian

18646

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 18

health reaches the same level as that of other people in this country. It is axiomatic that with improved health and a longer life there will follow other improvements in the Indians' standard of living.

[From the Gallup (N. Mex.) Daily Independent, August 1, 1962]

DR. JAMES SHAW RETIRES AS HEALTH ADMINISTRATOR

WASHINGTON.—Dr. James R. Shaw today turned over to Dr. Carruth J. Wagner the Federal program providing health services to about 400,000 American Indians.

Dramatic changes took place in the 9 years that Shaw was in charge of Indian health, and he anticipates that equally dramatic changes will take place during the next decade with Wagner at the helm.

A major milestone occurred in 1955, when, on July 1 of that year, it was transferred from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the U.S. Public Health Service. Shaw was instrumental in the transition. He had been detailed by the U.S. Public Health Service to take over the BIA Indian health program in July 1953. Two years later Shaw and the 3,400 employees in the Indian health service were transferred to U.S. Public Health Service within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the interim the Indian health program has made more progress than any other Indian program. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall on July 25 hailed the Indian health program as one of the major accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration—quite a compliment coming from a highly partisan Democrat for a Republican administration.

Dr. Luther L. Terry, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, said on July 12, that Shaw had been a prime mover in transferring the Indian health service to U.S. Public Health Service, the Federal agency which specializes in health: that he had spearheaded the initiation of the highly successful Indian sanitation program in 1959; and that he had spearheaded legislation passed in 1958 providing Federal funds for the construction of hospital beds for Indians within community hospitals.

So outstanding has Shaw's work been in the field of Indian health that on November 7, 1961, he received the Gorgas Medal for his work in conquering diseases among American Indians at the 68th annual meeting of the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States. This is the top award of the association and is made to those who have made outstanding contributions to the field of preventive medicine.

[From the Gallup (N. Mex.) Daily Independent, Aug. 1, 1962]

SANITATION PROGRAM WOULD CUT DISEASE

WASHINGTON.—The Indian sanitation program undertaken by the U.S. Public Health Service in 1959 could wipe out 30 to 40 percent of all diseases among Indians, if the Indians do their part in carrying out the program.

That is the view of Dr. James R. Shaw, retiring Chief of the Division of Indian Health of U.S. Public Health Service. He believes the Indian sanitation facilities bill enacted by Congress in 1959 was a landmark in preventive medicine.

"As I looked at the whole Indian health program, I became convinced that we had to attack the cause of disease among Indians at the source. From 30 to 40 percent of diseases we were treating Indians for were due to environmental conditions. They were due to lack of sanitation, lack of information and lack of ability by individual Indians to provide proper sanitation facilities," Shaw stated last week in an interview.

An Indian sanitation program at Elko, Nev., proved to be the forerunner of the pro-

gram initiated by Congress in 1959. In 1958 the Elko Indian Colony, the city of Elko and the U.S. Public Health Service shared the cost of building water and sewer lines after employes of the Division of Indian Health showed the Indians how to improve sanitary facilities in their homes, dispose of garbage and refuse. Under special legislation passed in 1957, the U.S. Public Health Service received \$34,000 from Congress to build 4,000 feet of sewer main and 2,000 feet of water main and the necessary service lines for 28 Indian homes. These were connected with the sewer and water mains of the city. U.S. Public Health Service entered into agreements with the Indians and the city of Elko to operate and maintain the facilities. Many benefits flowed from this initial construction, Shaw said. The Indians began improving and broadening their streets. They electrified their houses and bought refrigerators.

"The initial sanitation training program for Indians proved to be the mechanism that brought the whole community together in meeting the health problems of the whole population, Indian and white alike," Shaw said.

The Elko experiment was so successful that other programs have been patterned after it in the Indian sanitation program begun in 1959, Shaw said. It proved that "there must be participation by Indians in the program, from the very beginning. If they have no responsibility for it, they may reject the whole thing," Shaw said.

Under the 1959 program, the U.S. Public Health Service was given authority to make agreements with Indians and communities in Indian-border areas to build sanitation facilities for Indians. They include domestic and community water supplies and facilities, drainage, sewage and waste-disposal facilities. The facilities are transferred to the Indians or communities to operate and maintain.

Shaw has been absolutely insistent that it be a self-help program. For every dollar spent by U.S. Public Health Service under the program, the Indians must put up 40 cents either in cash or in work toward construction of the facilities. "No money is obligated until and unless we have agreements with the Indians on each project, including the role of participation of the Indians in it," he said.

[From the Gallup (N. Mex.) Daily Independent, Aug. 2, 1962]

SHAW PREDICTS CHANGES IN INDIAN HEALTH PLAN

WASHINGTON.—Dr. James R. Shaw, retiring chief of the Division of Indian Health of the U.S. Public Health Service, foresees major changes in the Indian health program over the next decade.

"The Public Health Service will be treating more vertical cases, fewer horizontal patients," Shaw told the Independent in an interview. "More patients will walk in and be treated by doctors, and there will be fewer cases of patients being hospitalized for long periods of time," he said.

Indians will no longer be so plagued by the diseases to which they have been particularly susceptible in the past, notably tuberculosis, infant diarrhea, and respiratory illnesses. There already has been a marked decrease in these diseases, and as the health of Indians approaches that of the general population, they will have the same life-span as other Americans and be subject to the same illnesses.

Indians no longer will be moved hundreds of miles to a hospital. Their own hospitals, including the four new ones at Shiprock, Gallup, Sells, Ariz., and Kotzebue, Alaska, are comparable to the hospitals built under the Hill-Burton program. "There has been a marked upgrading of hospitals, hospital staffs and supplies of all kinds" in the 9 years

that he has been in charge of the Indian health program, Shaw said.

The Indian health program is now and will continue to attract younger doctors, nurses, and laboratory technicians. An increasing number of Indians will be in this professional and semiprofessional group, Shaw said. Because of cultural differences, he anticipates that few young Indians will become doctors in the Division of Indian Health, but he does anticipate that a number of Indians will become doctors and will go into private practice on their own in non-Indian communities.

"The Division of Indian Health now operates schools to train dental technicians, nurses aids, sanitation aids, practical nurses, registered nurses, public health nurses, community health workers, and some specialists. This group will not only increase in number, but there will be an increasing number of Indians within it, and there will be an increasing migration of these trained Indians from their reservations to nearby communities," he said. "Many Indian nurses now marry in the community and do not return to their reservations," Shaw said. "This trend will continue," he said.

"The turnover of personnel in the Indian Health Service was once high because of inferior quarters. This is no longer the case, as 600 sets of quarters for the medical staff have been built along with new hospital, clinic, and outpatient facilities," Shaw said. Turnover will continue to decrease as modernization of Indian health facilities continues, he anticipates.

Shaw anticipates that the Division of Indian Health will continue so to elevate the level of Indian health as rapidly as possible. With better health and better education, Indians will achieve a greater measure of self-sufficiency sooner and many will automatically leave their reservations for better jobs in urban areas, Shaw believes.

Shaw believes that the Division of Indian Health must continue to have both a short-range goal and a long-range goal. Presently its short-range goal is to clean up all outstanding cases of chronic illness and illness due to poor sanitation on reservations. Its long-range goal is to make Indian health equal, at least, to that of the general population.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD CASTRO AND CUBA

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, our Nation's policy toward Castro and Cuba is of great concern to all Americans. The President at his recent press conference made our Nation's policy quite clear. The President has my complete support in any action he finds necessary to protect the Western Hemisphere.

The Daily Dunklin Democrat of Kennett, Mo., recently published a thoughtful editorial pointing out the many facets of the Cuban problem. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

CASTRO NO, FREEDOM SI

Most Americans have not thought the Cuban problem through.

There is reason for this. The President, who has thought the problem through, cannot talk about it in public without getting in trouble. He cannot lay all the American bargaining problems with the Soviet Union on the table.

But civilians can.

Fundamentally, American policy on Berlin is established.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18647

Fundamentally, American policy on Cuba is not.

The issue at Berlin is whether Communist power can break out of the East-West line—the military and political circle which holds it in place.

The issue in Cuba is whether the Communists can leapfrog over that circle and establish their power in the vast, unguarded territories behind the East-West line. They have often tried this kind of penetration. Up to now they have never, for very long at least, succeeded.

These are two different, though related, issues.

In the case of Berlin, there has never been any serious doubt as to where the West stood. Some persons would act to stop creeping aggression at an earlier point, some later. But the West stands strongly agreed on the fundamental. If the Communists cut Western access to Berlin and the right to keep West Berlin free and economically alive, the West will fight.

If the Russians make a military base out of Cuba, on the other hand, it is not decided what to do. Or if they stop short of creating a Soviet base and continue to build up Cuba as an ally, as the United States has armed Pakistan, there is still no decision on what to do with Cuba itself. The only firm decision is to prevent the use of Cuban force elsewhere in Latin America.

American public opinion is understandably on edge. Serious minded persons of all viewpoints are gravely concerned, some in a state of great alarm.

There are several conflicting concerns which the United States must resolve.

It must consider the threat to our own immediate security. How damaging is a nearby base?

It must consider Latin America. Would an American invasion of Cuba deliver significant, angry Latin American forces into the hands of Castrolism without firing a shot? Could the United States then invade those countries? Would time and persuasion, prior to a showdown with Cuba, prepare Latin American opinion for it?

The United States must consider American bases and military missions overseas. They ring the Communist island. They bring American land power closer to the heart of Communist strength than Communist land bases can approach their American targets. If the United States invades Cuba, will the Soviet Union invade a U.S. base or mission? What will the United States do then?

It must consider world opinion as well as Latin American. The peoples once colonized by Europe have a deep and indiscriminating mistrust of Western military action against small countries like Cuba. The Communists play skillfully on this. In dealing forcibly with one Cuba, the United States would have to be extremely careful not to create other and perhaps more damaging Cubas out of Asian and African resentment.

The Cuban question remains a peculiarly awkward one. When Castro communism seemed to be falling economically and politically, under United States pressure and a rising tide of anti-Castro feeling in the Americas, the Soviet Union converted it, by signing an arms agreement, into a military outpost. The special nature of this new type of threat, an armed satellite deep inside the free world, needs to be analyzed although it has not yet developed very far in the military direction.

Two fountainheads of enlightened thinking in the State, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and Republican Senatorial candidate Crosby Kemper, Jr., have demanded an immediate U.S. naval blockade around Cuba. We are certain both sources have been deliberate in their thinking processes and have considered all the ramifications

of such an overt act. Have they considered, for instance, the fact that a U.S. blockade is a unilateral action in the American hemisphere when this Nation has sought, over a period of many years, pacts against such action? For whether we realize it or not, other American nations are just as concerned over the Cuban situation as is this Nation. Multilateral action against Cuba is necessary if the future of American solidarity is to be safeguarded and preserved.

It may well be that a naval blockade will be necessary, but certainly at this point, until all the facts are known, overt military action demonstrates an inability to cope with communism in this hemisphere in but one way. Democracy must demonstrate to the world that communism will fail in all climates except where it is the sole ideology. A Cuba collapsing despite Russian assistance will offer a far more graphic picture to the world than thousands of Cubans starving because a U.S. Navy blockade has prevented them from receiving foodstuffs.

America was driven to war over Cuba, once before, and the single origin of this was hysteria. The cries of war were heard over the voices of reason on Cuba a little more than a generation ago. Let America not make the same tragic error it committed once before—let the voice of reason be heard over the land and let the freedom which America promises have full meaning to the rest of the world.

NONDIPLOMATIC ACTIVITIES OF REPRESENTATIVES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee is expected to schedule within the near future hearings on "Nondiplomatic Activities of Representatives of Foreign Governments."

In this connection, I should like to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, Senator EUGENE J. McCARTHY, for his cogent analysis of the role of the lobbyist in an article which recently appeared in the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times.

I personally feel this is an area amply in need of clarification, if not actual definition. I am convinced that confusion exists in the public mind as to the respective roles of the lobbyist and the foreign agent. Many people apparently believe they are one and the same. Such is certainly not the case.

Now, we are all cognizant of the fact that abuses and unsavory activities have occurred in the past in this field. Principally, this is why we now have stringent laws controlling the activities of lobbyists and foreign agents.

I think, however, that it is time that the role of the legitimate, responsible lobbyist or foreign agent be redefined and the constructive contributions which he makes to proper legislation be analyzed. That is why I am very glad that the Foreign Relations Committee is planning hearings on the subject.

I feel that many reputable practitioners of the art of public relations have been unduly maligned by being grouped together with overly aggressive and less conscientious individuals.

I think one of the most concise analyses of the role of the lobbyist was written by President Kennedy, when, as a Senator, he wrote the following in an

article prepared for the New York Times in 1956:

"Lobbyists are in many cases expert technicians and capable of explaining complex and difficult subjects in a clear, understandable fashion. They engage in personal discussion with Members of Congress in which they can explain in detail the reason for positions they advocate.

Lobbyists prepare briefs, memoranda, legislative analyses and draft legislation for use by committees and Members of Congress; they are necessarily masters of their subject and, in fact, they frequently can provide useful statistics and information not otherwise available.

Competent lobbyists can present the most persuasive arguments in support of their positions. Indeed, there is no more effective manner of learning all important arguments and facts on a controversial issue than to have the opposing lobbyists present their case.

Concededly, each is biased; but such a procedure is not unlike the advocacy of lawyers in court which has proven so successful in resolving judicial controversies. Because our congressional representation is based on geographical boundaries, the lobbyists who speak for the various economic, commercial and other functional interests of this country serve a very useful purpose and have assumed an important role in the legislative process.

I think that adequately explains the role of the lobbyist—a role, by and large, that most of us appreciate. Frequently, the prospect arises of legislation affecting areas which are beyond the expertise of most of us. Here is where the lobbyist often is invaluable, regardless of which side of the issue he represents. He is an expert on the subject, he is well informed, and he has all the facts at his command. He is capable of briefing the Senator in infinitely less time than would be involved if the latter had to do the research himself. Thus does he perform a service to those who must bear the responsibility of enacting legislation.

As the Senator from Minnesota pointed out in his article:

The most common method of lobbying is that of simply appearing before a committee of Congress or speaking to individual Members in an attempt to bring them to understand one's position or to influence them to support that position.

Elsewhere in his article, Senator McCARTHY writes:

Although lobbying does not usually involve a physical assembly—such as the 1932 veterans bonus march on Washington or current picketing of the White House—it does involve organization, a bringing together of citizens seeking a common objective. Thus the act of lobbying is basically an exercise of the right to petition the Government—a right set forth in the Constitution. Lobbying also involves, in a way, the exercise of the right of assembly.

I believe it is important that all citizens be informed of the proper functions of lobbying groups and I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for rendering this service with such an able presentation of the facts.

In this regard, I might mention that several unfortunate articles recently have appeared on the subject in the German press. It was obvious that these publications did not even comprehend the difference between a lobbyist and a

foreign agent, the latter being a public relations professional, a lawyer or a person who is registered with the Department of Justice as the U.S. representative of a foreign official body.

Some German newspapers went so far as to write that one of the most reputable foreign agents in the United States may be involved in "a court hearing by the State Department." This statement certainly reflects misunderstanding and confusion. Perhaps they were referring to the forthcoming hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee, but if so, something was very definitely lost in the translation.

I certainly hope that representatives of these newspapers will avail themselves of the opportunity to attend the Foreign Relations Committee's hearings.

This country spends many millions of dollars annually to protect a proper image of America in foreign countries. It is heartening that the Western European democracies are cooperating in encouraging mutual understanding.

In his foreword to the preliminary study, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, very properly points out: "In many instances, State Department officials themselves agree that legitimate representation by U.S. citizens on behalf of certain foreign governments is necessary due to the complexities of current international problems. However, it is believed that this committee has a responsibility to obtain for itself, for the Senate, and for the American people a full and accurate picture of activity of this kind, particularly since the tempo of such activity has increased in almost direct proportion to our Government's growing political, military, and economic commitments abroad."

When hearings on this subject are held, I believe they will accomplish a great deal in clarifying this entire area of activity.

While on this subject, Mr. President, I might say that in my opinion the distinguished Senator from Arkansas recently has made a most commendable and sensible suggestion that our country's law schools carry on what he termed imaginative and thorough research in the field of foreign representation in the United States. As he pointed out, there have been no cases at all under the labeling provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 and, since 1945, none have been brought under the act's full disclosure requirements.

Certainly an examination of possible loopholes in the act by our law schools is logical and quite probably would prove fruitful.

It is unfortunate that many people are wont to confuse the activities of one person such as Alexander Guterman, who represented the dictator Trujillo and was prosecuted for not registering as a foreign agent, when the actual foreign agent registration files in the Department of Justice include the names of some of the most prominent men in our country.

I might list just a few of these gentlemen, who either are or have been regis-

tered foreign agents: Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, the Honorable Thomas H. Dewey, John and Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, and Maj. Gen. Julius Klein.

I had the pleasure, incidentally of seeing General Klein just recently when he was invited to attend the luncheon which Speaker McCormack gave for General MacArthur.

General Klein, of course, is known and respected as a distinguished soldier and one of our leading citizens. He commanded combat troops under General MacArthur in the South Pacific and his personal decorations include the Soldier's Medal for Heroism, the Philippine Distinguished Service Star, the Legion of Merit, and the Bronze Star.

He was the author of the original Army combat public relations plan. This project, drafted before Pearl Harbor, was the foundation of our psychological warfare activities. After completing his tour of duty in the Pacific, he served with distinction after the armistice in a military capacity, as special assistant to the late Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, participating in the unification program which resulted in the establishment of the Department of Defense.

General Klein is a lifelong resident of Illinois, the good neighbor of my native Missouri. He also is a lifelong Republican. I can state unequivocally, however, that when it comes to matters involving the national interest, he is above partisan politics. General Klein is the type of American whose politics ends at the water's edge.

Many Senators will recall the wonderful job General Klein performed in 1954 as a special, nonpaid consultant to the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. General Klein's report, following his mission to Western Europe, called for increased military self-reliance by the United States, consolidation of American oversea operations, greater centralization of administrative functions, and the adoption of policies to encourage Western European nations in seeking solutions to their own military and economic problems.

General Klein's report, I might add, was highly praised on both sides of the aisle. In fact, if I recall correctly, its only critic was Pravda.

A former Chicago newspaperman and author, General Klein is a pioneer in the field of public relations. Much of his present activity involves industries within West Germany, where he enjoys also the confidence and respect of top officials in the Federal Republic.

In singling out General Klein, whom I have known for years, I wish only to point out—for the edification of those sufficiently interested—that there is nothing at all sinister or cloak-and-daggerish about a registered foreign agent who performs his activities above board, in the open and within the letter of the law.

I look forward to the hearings contemplated by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as I believe a public discussion of this whole area of activity is well overdue.

BAYONNE EXPERIMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have heard much of late about the language lag in our Nation. Justice William O. Douglas, in a recent statement, warned that we seem to be falling farther behind. Our educators sense the need, but there seems to be a lack of organized effort to produce a well-defined system for instruction in foreign languages at all levels of our educational system.

For that reason it is heartening to read about the efforts made in the primary school system of Bayonne, N.J. There, fifth grade pupils in some schools are studying Russian. School authorities believe that this project will help serve a definite need. We know, of course, that English is a major subject in many Russian schools. We know, too, that there is a need in this Nation for experts who are qualified to study Russian newspapers and documents. The Bayonne school system is to be congratulated for this experiment.

An editorial in the Jersey Journal of September 14, comments on the project. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

BAYONNE EXPERIMENT

That Bayonne experiment in teaching Russian to primary school pupils probably will be watched carefully by educators everywhere in New Jersey.

So far as is known to educational authorities, Bayonne is the only community in the State where fifth grade pupils in a number of schools are studying Russian. This is the logical level at which to begin, for children at age 10 learn languages faster than they do in high school.

There is a great need for Americans to understand Russian. Russian pupils long have been encouraged to learn English. As a result, the Russians know more about us on a level of direct communication than we know about them.

The stakes are big in this experiment. Success in Bayonne could stimulate similar experiments and successes in other school systems throughout New Jersey—and even beyond our State's borders.

This could do much toward eliminating the advantages the Russians enjoy over us in the language field.

A BIRTHDAY FOR OUR CONSTITUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, our Constitution has served us well for 175 years. It has given us protection and security, it has proven capable of change without compromise of basic principles; it has become part of our very thinking processes about liberty and hopes for this Nation.

We hear many comments during this week—Constitution Week—about the great document offered to the Nation in Philadelphia 175 years ago. These comments are significant, I think, because they indicate the continuing vitality of this document. We continue to argue about the Constitution; we continue to interpret it in different ways. And we find that there is room for such argument; there is room for such interpretation.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18679

ing the respective States to conserve or protect fishery resources, or

(4) takes any action, contrary to the principles of international law, to harass or otherwise interfere with the United States-flag fishing vessels engaged in lawful activities on the high seas.

On page 22, line 10, strike out "or" after the comma.

On page 22, line 13, strike out the period and insert ", or".

On page 22, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(C) take such action to adjust imports of products of such country or instrumentality as he deems necessary.

Castro
AMERICAN POLICY IN CUBA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield to me for about 5 minutes?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, for several weeks the American people have been listening to those who are on the other side of the aisle frantically seeking for some straw which, through magic—known only to themselves, can be turned into a campaign issue.

The oratory has been splendid—vivid—the flag has been waved vigorously and the voices have been loud—but, unfortunately for their purpose, the words and the logic, have been unconvincing.

The American people, wise in their understanding and mature in their judgment because of their heritage of democracy, recognize the purpose of this shouting and shadow boxing for what it truly is—a desperate search for an issue which can be used in the election campaign that is now upon us.

The issue that is being belabored is American policy in Cuba.

It is a strange fact of history that exactly 60 years ago our Nation was faced with the problem of another power-mad dictator also named Castro who, gripping the people of Venezuela by their throats, forced upon them a rule by corrupt and revolutionary methods.

Theodore Roosevelt, our President at that time, discarded the soft language of diplomacy in describing this Castro—the Venezuelan Castro—as an "unspeakable, villainous little monkey."

Somewhat the words evoke a similar image today. One must agree with the sage known as "the Preacher" who, nearly 2,000 years ago, in setting down his thoughts and reflections regarding man and his deeds—in what is called "Ecclesiastes" said: "There is no new thing under the sun."

This power-mad, blood-lusting Castro of 1902 refused to honor his debts and his commitments causing three powerful nations, Great Britain, Germany, and Italy to begin a combined naval demonstration off the coast of Venezuela.

President Roosevelt calmly, and from a position of strength, saw to it that the battleships were withdrawn and made the dictator Castro see reason and honor his commitments—not with arms, not with weapons, and not with troops—but through the power based upon his policy of "speak softly and carry a big stick."

Last Thursday afternoon at his press conference, President Kennedy—in measured and reasoned words—counseled watchful restraint.

His unruffled and impressive statement is in keeping with the policy of "speak softly and carry a big stick."

What our Republican friends either have forgotten or purposely ignore are the facts of geography.

Yes, Cuba is only 90 miles from our shores. But remember and mark this well, we are firmly based on the island of Cuba.

At Guantanamo we have an impregnable position, manned by thousands of highly trained and skilled marines armed with the latest weapons. Hugging the shores and on the alert are units of the powerful U.S. fleet, including aircraft carriers.

Yes, Castro is only 90 miles from our shores, but we are in his kitchen—armed with a great big stick and looking straight down his throat.

Mr. President, is not ours a wise and clear-sighted policy? That, first spoken by Theodore Roosevelt—"Speak softly and carry a big stick."

President Kennedy spoke as a statesman—and a student of history.

I am grateful to the Senator for yielding some of his time to me after yielding time to other Senators.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, before the Senator from Indiana spoke, I was about to say that I did not know exactly where the Senate had been in the few minutes before that. I was about to suggest a cooling off period, since I proposed, in discussing my amendment, to take Senators below the briny surface of the ocean. But before doing so, I am minded to say that following the discussion among the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Minnesota, who is a close student of "Alice in Wonderland" and possesses a most retentive memory, suggested that the end result of the discussion might have been long since settled in "Alice in Wonderland." He referred especially to the caucus race recited in that book. Apparently the question was who had won the race. It was finally settled, said the Senator from Minnesota, in the deathless words of the dodo, who said:

Everybody has won, and all must have prizes.

Mr. President, I turn now to the amendment which I have offered, which is cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MAGNUSON], the chairman of the Committee

on Commerce, which has jurisdiction over all measures related to the fishery; and by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. The purpose of the amendment is to authorize the President to use the trade power given him under the bill for the purpose of conserving our fishery resources. The approach employed by the amendment is direct. It amends section 252(b) of the bill by adding two conditions under which the President may suspend trade concessions granted other nations. The amendment would permit the President after public hearing and within his own discretion to withhold trade concessions if he determines that a country is engaged in practices which tend to defeat our efforts to conserve fishery resources or if he determines a country is taking any action contrary to the principles of international law to harass U.S. fishing vessels on the high seas. In addition, the amendment supplements the present authority given the President under the trade bill by adding the power to adjust imports of products of a country thereby permitting the use of import quotas or embargoes.

Mr. President, this amendment was submitted and referred to the Committee on Finance 6 weeks ago, giving a full opportunity to assess the merits of the proposal. At the time the amendment was submitted a clear record was made of the need for this amendment. In joining me when offering the amendment the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] stated:

Surely the United States, which has a deep interest in fisheries and international waters, and which is a country that practices conservation, should have authority to allow the President to do what he can to persuade and influence other nations to do the same, and if necessary, to do it through economic sanctions.

I fully concurred with the Senator from Washington.

At the time the amendment was submitted I pointed out that the United States is an important market for foreign fish products, that we likewise are an important fishing nation. I felt then, as I do now, that it is imperative that we insist upon proper conservation of our fisheries and those international fisheries upon which we rely. We will be judged harshly if we, through inadvertence or for any other reason, give trade incentives and thereby encourage foreign governments to violate sound conservation practices, to overfish areas and stocks of fish and to use fishing gear and techniques contrary to proper conservation.

I pointed out then, and I do so again, that this is not merely an Alaska local problem. It is a serious matter of concern for the entire fishing industry of the Northwest, for the California tuna industry, the gulf coast shrimp industry, and the important fishing industry off the east coast. On numerous occasions my colleagues and I have pointed out with alarm the recent efforts on the part of not only Japan but Russia to accel-

erate their fishing efforts on the high seas.

The attention of the Senate, of the Nation, and, indeed, of the world was most forcefully called to this situation only a few months ago by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], who is now presiding over the Senate, in one of the most logical speeches that it has ever been my privilege to hear.

We would not be alarmed if this effort were directed only at tapping heretofore unharvested resources but such is not the case. Attention was also called to the ineffective efforts by our State Department to protect our own fishermen from harassment in the Gulf Coast and off Central and South America. Additional instances have been reported this month. At the close of my remarks when introducing this amendment I stated that so long as we do nothing to protect the rights of our fishermen on the high seas, we can only expect further aggression and further oppressive acts against our fishermen from foreign governments.

To avoid possible misjudgments as to the merits of this amendment, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I wrote the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of State advising them of the importance of the proposed amendment and soliciting their favorable consideration. In the letter we pointed out that the amendment is consistent with the purposes of the bill. It would encourage the expansion of foreign trade in fishery products by assuring the conservation of our fishery resources and defending our fishermen on the high seas. If our fishery resources are exploited foreign trade in fishery products will decline. We warned in the letter that our fishery resources will be devastated by a blind continuation of the sudden and tremendous surge by foreign governments on to the high seas with technologically advanced fishing vessels and gear. As evidence of this rush we cited that the world catch of fish increased 33 percent from 1955 to 1960. Just within the past 10 years Japan has entered the North Pacific to catch salmon on the high seas and has moved into the Bering Sea with factory ships in search of bottom fish. Research scientists have forecast that bottom fish resources in the Bering Sea will be destroyed within 10 years if adequate conservation practices are not followed by all Nations engaged in the harvesting of these rich resources. We will then be faced with the same bleak situation now threatening the bottom fish resources of the North Atlantic. Russia, too, has launched its commercial fishing fleet around the globe searching out the fishery resources off George's Bank, the Bering Sea and into the Gulf of Alaska.

As a dramatic illustration of the deterioration of the U.S. position in world fisheries, attention should be given to a recent report by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries indicating that the United States held second position only 10 short years ago and, as of 1961, had backed down to fifth position, bowing to the more energetic efforts made by Communist China, Peru, and the So-

viet Union. These facts were first called to our attention in this Chamber, so far as I know, by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH].

We stated that the amendment is consistent also with the organizational structure provided by the bill, in which wide discretion is given the President to solve these complex and interrelated problems. A broad range of economic responses must be available to the President, so he can tailor the remedy to meet situations involving any particular country at any time in the future.

In summary, we believe it obvious that there is a serious threat to our fishery resources, that the proposed amendment provides an effective answer to the problem, and that there is a direct relationship between fishery resources conservation and trade.

Mr. President, only 2 weeks ago the Department of State informed me that the Finance Committee had been notified that the administration considered the amendment unacceptable. In opposing the amendment the State Department informed me that fishery conservation is unrelated to trade agreements, and that there would be a risk of retaliation against our exports if the amendment were to be adopted. It was also stated that legislation independent of the trade bill was being considered, in order to accomplish the purposes of my amendment.

Mr. President, if my amendment is unacceptable to them, I should like to make it a matter of public record that their position is unacceptable to me. It is a further example of the disregard of the State Department of all our fishery problems.

I am perfectly willing to run the risk of commercial trade concession retaliation in order to conserve our public fishery resources. I presume that the President would use discretion in the exercise of such power. Under Secretary of State Ball testified before the Senate Finance Committee that military, economic, and political pressure had been exercised on other countries, to persuade them to adopt our concepts of commercial trade negotiation. If we are capable of such dedication and international leadership in this area, can we not use trade power to protect in a responsible manner our fishery resources? I believe it may be a matter of priority; and I, for one, place fishery conservation extremely high on my list of national goals.

Mr. President, the difference between fish and so many other products is this: Once fish are gone, they are gone forever, and are lost both to the United States and to all other nations in the world.

On first impression, the response of the State Department may sound genuine. What, it asks, has international trade to do with fishery conservation? My answer is that international trade sanctions have been recognized for years by prior administrations, and even by this administration, and on numerous occasions by Congress, as the only effective means of safeguarding fishery resources. Why? The answer is clear.

Fish move in and out of territorial waters and on the high seas. Salmon return to the inland streams to spawn. Conservation practices may be regulated, therefore, only by international agreement; and international agreements, like other agreements, can be secured and enforced only when adequate sanctions are available. Traditionally, trade sanctions have proved most acceptable and effective. This is a valid and traditional use of trade power. I call attention specifically to trade sanctions found in our legislation protecting our halibut resources.

Mr. President, I stated that the present administration has recognized that trade sanctions are required in order to protect fishery resources. I refer to the legislation, introduced in the 87th Congress, at the request of the State Department, to amend and strengthen the regulation of tuna on the high seas.

On September 14, 1 year ago, the Secretary of State wrote the Senate, requesting an amendment to the Tuna Convention. Sounding as if he represented Alaska himself, Secretary Rusk called for urgent action on his legislative proposal, so as to discharge the U.S. "general responsibility to the international community to follow sound conservation practices with respect to high seas resources." I shall not quarrel with that. I ask only that we do it. The letter from the Secretary of State included a draft of a bill which, among other things, provides:

That upon the promulgation of any such regulation and upon notification thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall promulgate regulations to limit or prohibit the entry into the United States, * * * of fish of species covered by the convention and taken from convention waters. Any such regulations to limit or prohibit the entry of such fish shall require the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

So we find that 1 year ago the Secretary of State proposed the use of trade sanctions, under his close supervision, to conserve tuna resources found and taken primarily in tropical Pacific waters. Japan is the world's exporter of tuna. This administration, as well as others, has recognized the necessity of assuring fishery conservation through the use of trade sanctions.

Mr. President, I also call attention to the numerous bills, which I and other Senators have sponsored, which would place a restriction on the importation of fishery products from countries which violate salmon conservation efforts in the North Pacific.

When I first came to the Senate, I introduced an Alaska salmon bill which in substance would do for Bristol Bay salmon what my present amendment would do for all fishery resources. That was in the 86th Congress. Hearings were held by me and by other Senators in Alaska and elsewhere. On May 6, 1959, the State Department wrote the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, expressing opposition to the bill, and giving five reasons why the bill would be ineffective, inappropriate, and, in fact, would endanger the free world's stake in the Pacific. The Department

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18741

IMPATIENT AMERICANS

Many years ago, the late Gen. George C. Marshall, testifying before Congress, attempted to summarize what he regarded as the characteristic impatience of the American people. Said he:

"They regard as a stalemate any problem which arises in the morning and cannot be settled by afternoon."

This is perhaps the mark of a youthful people, and we are still essentially that, for all our 186 years as a nation.

If this is so, then it suggests that we should comment with some restraint on the frequently exhibited impatience of many in the newly emerging or upward struggling nations of the rest of the world.

We cannot always easily curb our exasperation at some manifestations of this impatience in others. Peoples seek freedom before they are ready for its responsibilities—and thereafter throw themselves and their problems at the world's door. They demand status in the United Nations before their leaders' voices speak with effective authority within their own borders.

Their young men sometimes come to the United States, assailing our "failures and stupidities" in dealing with their problems. What this often means is that we have not shaped policies to their specific national taste. They forget that we are a great power which must weigh the broad world impact of everything it does. We have many concerns, while they seldom have more than one.

Yet, though we may have matured enough to be critical of impatience in other peoples, we evidently retain a large quota of it ourselves.

You would expect to find a lot of it in our youngsters—and you do.

A midwestern college lad was asking a Washington newsman about some of the key world and national issues of the day. The answers he got seemed to pile complexity on complexity. He finally smiled and said:

"I find it hard to get very interested in things on which you can't get a fairly immediate solution."

It did not seem to trouble him that he had just ruled out of bounds nearly all the great matters of the day—the cold war, disarmament, unemployment, the booming population.

But he has plenty of company in this land. For many, youth is still a time—here as elsewhere—for fast, sure, clean, rewarding answers.

The great trial lawyer, Clarence Darrow, once said:

"When you're young, you want to reform the world and you think you can. When you're old, you still want to, but you know you can't."

Maybe Darrow has it about right. But perhaps our impatient young folk get some good things done before they discover how impossible it is. Without their zeal for quick results, we might not make even the slow social advances we do.

HOW DEMOCRACY IS NUDGED AHEAD IN ECUADOR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the words of Madison Avenue, this country must project its image if we are to help freedom and democracy in the battle for men's minds.

This body is seldom hesitant to grant sizable sums to provide our friends or those who we hope will be our friends with military assistance. A tank or howitzer is a substantial piece of equipment and is easily pointed out in demonstration of value received for an expenditure. A radio broadcast or a news service item in a foreign newspaper are less

durable items and consequently harder to defend as worthwhile budget items.

I am convinced that we get more for our idea dollar than we can ever hope to get from our hardware dollar. This Nation is famous for an idea officially proclaimed on July 4, 1776. If we can sell that idea and the ideas that developed from it we will do mankind a great service.

A measure of our effectiveness in selling these ideas is found in an article entitled "How Democracy Is Nudged Ahead in Ecuador," which appeared in the September 17 issue of the National Observer. It is the story of a United States Information Service post in Guayaquil. This story shows how efficient and dedicated Americans, operating on limited budgets, can advance the cause of freedom.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOW DEMOCRACY IS NUDGED AHEAD IN ECUADOR

(By Hunter S. Thompson)

GUAYAQUIL, ECUADOR.—Fred Shaffer, chief of the U.S. Information Service office in Guayaquil, looked up from his desk as the visitor entered. "Did you see that little man who just left?" he asked with a smile. "Didn't seem very happy, did he?"

The visitor recalled the man, a small Ecuadorian with a large satchel. He had come out of the office, looking slightly sick, and nearly bowled over the receptionist as he fled through the door to the street.

"I think that man has troubles," Mr. Shaffer explained. "He owns a radio station that used to broadcast so much anti-American stuff that we nicknamed it the Voice of Moscow." He shook his head sadly. "Then he had some bad luck; suddenly all his advertisers quit him and now he's nearly bankrupt." He smiled faintly. "And he has the gall to come in here and try to blame it on me—can you imagine such a thing?"

The visitor detected a note of irony.

A CRISIS OVER DELEGATES

It was a hot afternoon in Guayaquil, where the year-round temperature averages 77 degrees, but in the USIS office no one had time to mop his brow. The scene was one of apparent chaos: Visitors were constantly arriving; the phone rang incessantly; and crises succeeded themselves in an apparently interminable progression.

Jim Smith, the press officer, entered the room and introduced another crisis. "Those women are outside, Fred," he said. "Did we get word on the other delegates?"

Mr. Shaffer picked up the phone and dialed a number. "Guillermo? We're waiting on your people—they coming over?" There was a pause, and a horrified expression crossed his face. "Great balls of fire!" he exclaimed. "I don't want you to think I'm pressing you on this thing, Guillermo, but we've set up this meeting four times now—can you give me some idea when you'll get around to appointing your delegates?"

He hung up the phone and fell back in his chair. Mr. Smith groaned and shook his head. "I can't face those women again," he said helplessly. "You'll have to do it, Fred—it's your turn."

Mike Eisenstadt, the cultural affairs officer, appeared in the door. "What about the elections?" he asked. "I heard we won." Mr. Smith beamed. "Right. Eighteen hundred to eleven hundred—how's that for an upset?"

Mr. Eisenstadt gave a mock salute and turned to go. "Tell me later on. I have

40 kids in my office, waiting to see the movie."

THE INSISTENT TELEPHONE

The phone rang; a sack of powdered milk, donated by an American welfare agency, had been found on the black market and the story was in the afternoon paper. The phone rang again; the USIS office in Quito was demanding photos of 15 dump trucks that had arrived that morning from the United States. While Mr. Shaffer checked on the milk, Mr. Smith went to see what had happened to the photos.

He returned with a long face; the film had not been developed because the photo lab man had taken a religious holiday. The receptionist reported that a local journalist, a friend of Mr. Shaffer, was demanding to know why he'd been refused a visa to go to the States. And the women were getting impatient.

Out in the hot sun, the cabs rolled back and forth like animals looking for meat, honking their horns incessantly at every walking prospect. Several American tourists were sitting at a sidewalk cafe talking excitedly about a Communist demonstration the night before. It had been broken up by a cavalry charge through the Plaza Centenario, the city's principal park.

At the Phoenix Club, where Anglo-Americans gather in the evenings to reaffirm their solidarity over beer and bridge, an unemployed helicopter pilot was idly tossing darts at a much-punctured board, killing time until somebody arrived to keep him company. For Guayaquil it was a day like any other day, with a lot to talk about and not much to do.

WHERE THE UNEXPECTED IS PREDICTABLE

Even at USIS, despite the apparent chaos, it was a pretty routine day. Nothing had happened that could not have been predicted—and at the same time everything had been unexpected.

The USIS is the oversea arm of the United States Information Agency, headquartered in Washington and headed by Edward R. Murrow. Each year, when Congress is asked to appropriate new funds for USIS, legislators want to know: "Why do they need all that money? What do they do with it?"

The agency's reply could easily be lifted from one of its own pamphlets: "The young officers, now being recruited, will carry out a mission long ago established—to submit evidence to people of other nations that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress, and peace. They must also be able to counter hostile propaganda."

Doing things like "countering hostile propaganda" costs money—especially when the propaganda is put out by such practiced craftsmen as the editors of Prensa Latina (Fidel Castro's news service) and the New China News Agency, both operative in Ecuador. And money is a commodity USIS officials would like in greater abundance.

When Mr. Shaffer was program manager of a radio and TV station in York, Pa., he points out, the station had an annual budget of slightly over \$300,000. The 1962 USIS budget for all of Ecuador, by comparison, is \$151,160. And for all of Latin America—20 countries—it's approximately \$4 million with almost one-fifth for Brazil.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

These figures are slightly misleading, however, because the USIS operation in South America is given a considerable boost by additional money spent in Washington. A good example is the Voice of America—which comes in very clearly, all over the continent, 7 days a week. The "Voice" transmits regular broadcasts from Washington, and also provides taped programs used by 235 local stations in 16 Latin American countries.

Another worldwide service is the USIA press wire, which sends out a steady stream of news stories for local papers. These stories are not so much slanted as selected. A recent day's fare, for example, included coverage of Ecuadorian President Arosomena in New York; a wrap-up of the previous night's Telstar activity; a report on the Disarmament Committee meeting in Geneva; and Senate comments on Puerto Rico's anniversary.

There's locally originated USIS material, too—and newspapers welcome it. "Our function is propaganda," says Frank Dean, press officer in Quito, "but we don't like to use that term because of its unfortunate connotation."

Whatever the material is called, however, USIS places a lot of it. The Guayaquil branch, distributing to 3 local papers and 18 in the coastal provinces, placed 12,540 inches during June alone. Mr. Dean's office in Quito, serving 3 papers in the capital and 31 in the mountain provinces, racked up another 13,000 inches.

What kind of propaganda? In Guayaquil, the June breakdown included 1,396 inches of science news (space achievements, medicine, and so on); 464 on U.S. foreign policy; 2,370 on "inter-American subjects" (Organization of American States activity, news from other countries); 404 on sports, and 1,934 on "Cultural, Educational, and Agricultural subjects," a catch-all category covering everything from Pablo Casals to trenchmouth in the Argentine.

LOCAL SUBJECTS GIVEN BIG PLAY

There's outright anti-Communist material, too, of course—2,103 inches of it, including photo stories on the Berlin wall, food rationing in Cuba, famine in China, and so forth. And the month's biggest news category is local subjects (3,317 inches), which means stories from Guayaquil and the nearby provinces. Most of these center on the Alliance for Progress, what it means for Ecuador, and specific ways it's being put into effect.

A tremendous amount of USIS effort goes into what the handbook calls personal contact. This is a gray, uncertain area where imagination, quick wits, and a good sense of humor can tip the balance between triumph and disaster. If the businessmen of Guayaquil didn't respect Mr. Shaffer, for instance, he couldn't have reduced the "Voice of Moscow" to financial ruin in a few short weeks—which he did.

The station was a steady outlet for Prensa Latina material. Its viewpoint was patently anti-American, yet most of its advertising revenue was coming from representatives of American-owned firms whose interests do not lie in exactly the same area as those of Prensa Latina.

SPONSORS QUICKLY WITHDRAW

So Mr. Shaffer became a regular listener—with a tape recorder. "In 5 days," he says, "I picked up one open denunciation of our point 4 program; one of Irv Rubenstein, the point 4 labor representative; one of the Peace Corps; one of the Alliance for Progress; and one of the Empresa Electrica, a U.S.-owned light and power company—all preceded and followed by advertisements for American products."

He then notified the companies involved, asking if they were aware of what their advertising dollars were sponsoring. They were not, but they quickly withdrew their commercials.

Another example of improvised USIS work was a recent election for the presidency of the Guayaquil chapter of FEUE, the national association of university students. Mr. Smith, who does a lot of work with various student groups, was convinced that Luis Bonini, a rabid Leftist, was going to win—not because he had a majority, but be-

cause the pro-democratic students were split into seven or eight factions.

Although USIS maintained a strictly hands-off stance, Mr. Smith worked hard in private conversations to convince the anti-Bonini students that their only hope was in unity. And Marcello Santos, a staunch pro-American, upset Bonini by a vote of 1,800 to 1,100.

Still a third aspect of this personal contact is a USIS-sponsored community center taking shape in Guayaquil's barrios suburbanos, one of the worst slums in the Western Hemisphere. The community center idea, one of the biggest factors in the USIS program, is basically a self-help concept: The people of some community—usually a lower class one—get together and undertake projects to lift themselves up by the bootstraps. Usually this involves building houses or schools.

For sometime, Guayaquil has had a makeshift center functioning in several rooms of a barrios municipal school. Now land has been donated for a new building, and roughly \$12,000 has been pledged to build the structure. Some of this money will come from USIS; most, plus the land donation, comes from local American and Ecuadorian businessmen. Last month, a Peace Corps contingent arrived to help build the center and get it underway.

During the day of apparent chaos at USIS described earlier, Mr. Smith was trying for the fourth time to set up a meeting of the center's board of directors. Three earlier attempts had failed, because the businessmen's representatives had not appeared. Now the fourth meeting would also be called off. The only people on hand were the three women from the barrios suburbanos, and somebody had to tell them it was another false alarm.

Getting people to honor appointments is only one of the USIS's frustrations in Guayaquil. Another, probably the biggest, is trying to convince them they can solve their own problems. Progress is slow, and all of it comes in spite of daily Communist harassment. The people themselves are often exasperating; there is never enough money; and sometimes a tiny detail will stall an entire program.

Anyone in Guayaquil for any length of time, though, is encouraged by what he sees. It is on this sort of level—in the barrios and the daily papers and local student elections—that the battle to make democracy a reality in South America will be won or lost.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GORE BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this afternoon our colleague, Senator GORE, made his first address as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations.

It was a message of congratulations and welcome to four new members of the U.N. Because of its importance in the growth of this organization I commend Senator GORE's statement for the information of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address by Senator GORE printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GORE

Mr. President, on behalf of the United States it is a pleasure to congratulate you, Mr. President, upon your election and to

proffer our hearty cooperation in the work of the United Nations.

Outside the U.S. Senate Chamber, in which I am privileged to serve, there is a stately bust of former U.S. Secretary of State Cordell Hull, my fellow townsman, friend, and benefactor. On the base of this bust appear these words: "Father of the United Nations." I know Secretary Hull would have been pleased to have foreseen the growth of this organization to a membership more than twice that at its beginning.

In common, I believe, with mankind of the world, the people of the United States regard with hope, not unmixed with awe, the marvelous growth of the United Nations organization. Today we welcome to membership four nations, each newly possessed of the fruits of self-determination, real independence, and genuine national sovereignty. Two of these countries rest in the midst of a sunny ocean close to our shore.

Two of them are nestled in the majestic reaches of the central African highlands, almost half a world away. Yet, for all the distance that separates them Ruanda and Jamaica, Trinidad-Tobago and Burundi share a common strain of blood and experience. And today, joining with us in the U.N. each of them makes a commitment to the single community of man which in previous epochs was obscured and hidden, but which today is plain for all to see and which best explains why each of us and all the countries we represent are here.

So, Mr. President, on behalf of my countrymen and the President of the United States I congratulate and welcome the representatives of Ruanda, Jamaica, Trinidad-Tobago and Burundi.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

An additional bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. HART:
S. 3729. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Konyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

USE OF ARMED FORCES WHERE NECESSARY TO DEAL WITH COMMUNIST BUILDUP IN CUBA

Mr. SCOTT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 396) authorizing the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States where necessary to deal with the Communist buildup in Cuba, which was referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly, as follows:

Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared to the Congress that we should consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety"; and

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that "an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18743

or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations"; and

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the Parties further agreed that: "If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extracontinental or intracontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the Continent"; and

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the Parties further agreed that "the measures on which the Organ of Consultation may agree will comprise one or more of the following: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephone, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed force"; and

Whereas the Charter of the Organization of American States, signed in Bogotá in 1948, states: "If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by an armed attack or by an act of aggression that is not an armed attack, or by an extracontinental conflict, or by a conflict between two or more American states, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the American states, in furtherance of the principles of continental solidarity or collective self-defense, shall apply the measures and procedures established in the special treaties on the subject"; and

Whereas the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 unanimously declared: "The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extracontinental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union"; and

Whereas the international Communist movement is increasingly extending into Cuba and its political, economic, and military sphere of influence; and

Whereas the Government of Cuba is now a part of the international Communist movement, defined by the Caracas Conference of 1954 as of "anti-democratic nature and * * * interventionist tendency * * * incompatible with the concept of the American freedom."; and

Whereas the Declaration of Caracas condemned the activities of the international Communist movement as constituting intervention in American affairs and expressed the determination of the American States to take the necessary measures to protect their political independence against the intervention of international communism, acting in the interests of an alien despotism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States in addition to his authority as Chief Executive, is specifically authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Castro regime from exporting its aggressive purposes to any part of this hemisphere by force or the threat of force;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported offensive military base capable of endangering the United States naval base at Guantanamo, free passage to the Panama Canal, United States missile and space preparations or the security of this Nation and its citizens;

(c) to work with other free citizens of this hemisphere and with freedom-loving Cuban refugees to support the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cuba for a return to self-determination; and

(d) to use such measures as may be necessary to halt, impede or counter the buildup of Cuba with Communist arms as a Communist military base, including the use of economic and military boycott and blockade.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KERR proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 11970) to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment in the nature of a sub-

stitute for the amendment of Mr. KERR to House bill 11970, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE CONSERVATION OF FISHERY RESOURCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 14, 1962, the names of Mr. GRUENING, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. JACKSON were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 392) to express the sense of the Senate on International Conference on the Conservation of Fishery Resources, which was submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators) on September 14, 1962.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes a.m. on Wednesday, September 19, 1962) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the previous order, until 12 o'clock meridian of the same day.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, September 18, 1962:

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the sixth session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The following-named persons to be Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the sixth session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency:

Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey.

Robert E. Wilson, of Illinois.

James T. Ramey, of Illinois.

William I. Cargo, of Florida.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6895

America's greatest invention was a creature of compromise from start to finish, and yet the invention created a strong Central Government, and protected the liberty of citizens and retained the authority of the States.

William Gladstone said the U.S. Constitution was the greatest work ever struck off by the mind of man.

Considering the obstacles, the rivalries, open warfare, suspicion among the States, it is all the more remarkable that the Convention of 1787 should have produced this "Fifth Symphony" of statesmanship. As Washington had predicted the event was in the hand of God.

Surely a power greater than man contrived to resolve the antagonisms of the day and to inspire those 39 men to create in this greatest of all American inventions a shield for liberty that would survive the test of time and become an example for others to follow.

Here indeed was raised a standard to which the wise and honest can repair—in 1787—and in 1962. How fully we understand and appreciate this great charter will determine in large measure how well we fulfill our stewardship in keeping high the torch of freedom.

The great historian of this period, John Fiske, concluding his study entitled "The Critical Period of American History," had this to say: "In some future still grandeur convention, we trust the same thing will be done between States that have been wholly sovereign, whereby peace may gain and violence be diminished over other lands than this which has set the example."

Fiske wrote these words 80 years ago. And today leaders in both political parties speak hopefully and confidently of this still grander convention Fiske foretold.

"Sail on, O ship of state.
Sail on, Union strong and free.
Humanity in all its fears
In all its hopes for future years
Hangs breathless on thy fate."

[Signature]
Cuba: Watchful Waiting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am glad that Walter Lippmann, with his usual clarity and good sense, has spoken up on the Cuba issue. I commend his article appearing today in the Washington Post to the attention of my colleagues—and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

CUBA: WATCHFUL WAITING
(By Walter Lippmann)

Although there are some who say that we are doing nothing about Cuba, the fact is that we are doing just about everything that can be done short of going to war.

Besides the economic embargo, we are keeping the island under surveillance. We are watching every ship that comes to and goes from the island, and we are keeping a close watch on the loading and unloading of these ships. We have accurate and current records of building operations and the

deployment of aircraft and tanks and artillery.

There may be some doubt whether we have located every missile site in the vastness of the Soviet Union. But in Cuba, unless our cameras are failing us, we are completely informed.

As a result, we are quite able to know about the development of anything like a Soviet missile base directed against the United States, and what may be more realistic, we are able to spot anything like an expeditionary force against Cuba's neighbors in the islands and in the Caribbean.

Our policy at the present is to keep ourselves completely informed, and to wait and see whether Castro and his Soviet helpers do any overt act, against the United States or its neighbors. Beyond this, there is no serious action the United States can take to remove him that would not be an act of war.

The United States is, of course, able easily to blockade Cuba. But stopping ships under threat of seizure or sinking would be an act of war not only against Cuba but against the Soviet Union. For we would be seizing or sinking Soviet ships.

The invasion of Cuba would, of course, be an act of war against Cuba. To be sure, the United States could easily win a war against Cuba. We could close the Cuban ports within a few hours and we could occupy very quickly Havana and a few big cities. The countryside might be another story.

But what we could not be sure of doing is to prevent the retaliatory moves to which we would have laid ourselves wide open, moves against Berlin, or against Turkey, or against Iran.

For we would have acted on the rule that a possible threat against our security or our interests justifies us in going to war.

We would be saying that because Cuba, which is only 90 miles away, is in the grip of an unfriendly European power, we have a right to blockade or occupy the island; we would be saying too that the Soviet Union has no such right to act against the American military positions in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, right on her own frontier.

Let us not fool ourselves. Such an argument will not wash. It would be rejected, probably even laughed at, not only by all neutrals but by powerful elements among our closest allies.

There are some who think foreign opinion doesn't matter. But when it comes to war, it means a great deal to the belligerent who is for him and who is against him. We could go to war if Castro injures us. But we cannot go to war, even against Castro, because of what he may conceivably do in the future.

We cannot wage a preventive war against Castro without establishing the rule that a preventive war is legitimate against our military position in Berlin, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Thailand, South Vietnam, Taiwan, Okinawa, South Korea and Japan.

It is true, of course, that the Soviet lodgment in Cuba is a gross violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Yet we cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Why not?

The Monroe Doctrine declares that "any interposition" by a European power in this hemisphere would be "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

But, and this is the crucial point, the American claim for the isolation of the Western Hemisphere was coupled with a renunciation of American interest in the Eastern Hemisphere: "In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do."

This fundamental passage in Monroe's message is, of course, a restatement of the principle laid down by Washington in his

farewell address: "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote relation."

This basis of the Monroe Doctrine disappeared in the 20th century, in the two World Wars, the Korean war, and the cold war. We cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine without meeting the question of what we are doing all over Europe and Asia.

Our right to put Cuba under surveillance, and if necessary to blockade and invade it, rests not on the Monroe Doctrine but on the elementary right of a people to insure its own security.

For two centuries the British felt that way about the occupation of Belgium by an unfriendly power. The Russians felt that way about Turkey. This right can, however, be exercised only when there is a clear and present danger.

Castro is an insulting nuisance but is not, and is not now remotely capable of becoming a clear and present danger to the United States. So we must practice watchful waiting, and hold ourselves in readiness, never for a moment forgetting the vastly greater dangers elsewhere.

In a time of watchful waiting, Congress and the newspapers are compelled to remember that the President is conducting a delicate and dangerous operation, and that he is seriously interfered with if he is forced to dot every "i" and to cross every "t" in advance of a decision.

The President should not be asked to say whether he will go to war. He should not be driven to say that he won't go to war.

A certain mystery and uncertainty are desirable, and will be deterrent to our adversaries.

Role of Lawyer in Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no organization has as potent an influence on hemispheric thinking as the Inter-American Bar Association. William Roy Vallance is the secretary general of the association. Mr. Vallance retired a year or so ago after an outstandingly distinguished career with the State Department.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an address by F. V. Garcia-Amador at a meeting of the Inter-American Bar Association on September 13, 1962, at the National Lawyers' Club in Washington. Mr. Garcia-Amador is the Director of the Department of Legal Affairs of the Organization of American States.

His address follows:

The great undertaking in the hemisphere today, the one to which all our attention is turned, is the Alliance for Progress. As you are well aware, the Alliance for Progress programs for economic development and social improvement are of such magnitude and profound transformations in the legal institutions of the Latin American countries are inevitable. As a matter of fact, these changes, particularly as to land reform and taxation, are explicitly contemplated in the Punta del Este Charter. The question which concerns us is what is the role of the lawyer in this program? What can we do to aid the transformation and adaptation of the exist-

A6896

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 18

ing legal institutions so that they can better serve the ends and the aims of the Alliance?

We, at the Pan American Union, occupy a very strategic role in the development of the Alliance. We have the facilities of the entire hemisphere at our disposal, and we can speak in an impartial voice to the entire hemisphere. We recognize our role; we recognize our responsibilities. It is, however, so vast an undertaking that we cannot possibly begin to do it all ourselves. To the contrary, it is a never-ending task in which the more help we will have, the more we will have to do. That is why the most important thing which I have to say to you today is that we of the legal department at the Pan American Union welcome your help. We welcome your suggestions, your cooperation. We welcome you and invite you to join with us in attacking these problems which must be solved before the political stability and well-being of our entire hemisphere is to be secure.

What are some of these problems? Let me name a few to you. To begin at the base of the structure there are the legal rights and role of the new national planning agencies. These agencies are comparatively new in administrative law. What is their legal status to be? What will their administrative role be? Are they to be created simply to make recommendations, formulate plans, and then disintegrate? Should they take the form of an overall commission on the order of the great Tennessee Valley Authority here in this country? Is it better, in the alternative, that they become some sort of superagency to oversee and administer other agencies which will carry out the work? If so, what sort of powers will be available to them to insure that their plans and recommendations are properly carried out? Will they be able to investigate, to correct and compel? Should they be insulated from political pressures and influence? And if that is a desirable end, how can it be accomplished? We have here, you see, a myriad of problems relating to this one initial aspect of the program, the purpose, role, and functioning of the development agency itself.

In the substantive field, the list is potentially endless, and it touches all phases of economic activity and cooperation. To mention just a few there is the pressing problem of agrarian reform. What are the different possibilities in fair and equitable yet unincumbent agrarian reform laws? What legal protection can be devised for the new land owners, many of whom will be illiterate, against those who may seek to take advantage of them, while, at the same time, safeguarding bona fide creditors' rights. How shall the new programs of agricultural credit be administered and protected? What about insuring good title, and simplifying methods for clearing title?

In tax law, I don't have to describe the problems to you. Even the most developed of developed countries have their share of problems here. What kind of tax laws most effectively suit the needs of the Latin American nations: Direct taxes as you have in the United States, or indirect? What are the rights to be established to ascertain that all levels of Government, National, State, and local, get their proportional share of the revenues, and to what extent is it possible to insure that those revenues are properly allocated on the local levels. The obvious problems of improving the administration of tax laws and the elimination of tax evasion are ever present in our consideration. There is also the great problem, as economic activity between nations increases, of avoiding double taxation and inadvertent burdens on the type of economic activity which we desire to encourage. Much fine work is already being done on the problem, especially by the Harvard University tax program. But the work is still unfinished.

There are also the problems of commercial law, techniques of public control of business, including the problems of monopoly and restraint of trade about which you here have so much to teach us. The problem of expropriations and of nationalizations is one which will be with us for a long time. How can this be handled in a fair manner with aggravating international tensions? What can the law do to promote and facilitate the flow of capital across national borders?

What means can be devised for encouraging small business while, at the same time, preventing fraudulent operators and professional manipulators from taking advantage of those laws? What are the possibilities for protecting international creditors, improving the security of secured transactions? Is there a possibility for paving the legal road to international security transactions in stocks and bonds so that private investors may be encouraged to put their money into the public securities of foreign firms? What about labor law and protection for honest, responsible labor unions?

There are, gentlemen, all these and more, I haven't even begun to mention the possibilities in banking regulations; improvement of judicial procedures and remedies both within the individual countries and in international intercourse; improvement of the civil service laws; the problems of the law of civil rights; methods for improving the election laws and procedures, and many others. Some of these problems are already being dealt with in respect to individual countries; in others general studies are well underway.

Many things remain to be done. Preliminary studies will have to be made. There are no general solutions which will serve in all countries. The existing record will have to be detailed so that we can know the existing situation in all of the Latin American States. This means research and digging at a moment when we have little time for research and digging. We must begin to act, but we have also to understand fully the kind of action we must take. We must know what we are talking about—what problems we are facing—and what we are going to do about it. We must acquaint the lawyers of the hemisphere with these problems. This means discussion, seminars, exchange of ideas.

We at the legal department of the Pan American Union are getting ready to undertake a vast program in this sphere. It is simmering now, and we invite you to join with us in making it a reality. We invite your suggestions and proposals of topics, plans of action, and methods of disseminating our call to the lawyers of the hemisphere. You have a conference scheduled in Panama early next year. That conference could make a tremendous contribution to our progress and we should like very much to discuss the possibilities with those of your officers who are responsible for it. Together, let us hope, we can begin to chip away at the tremendous task in front of us.

I thank you.

Captioned Films for the Deaf

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. **Mr. Speaker**, as a cosponsor of this legisla-

tion in the House and as chairman of the subcommittee that considered this bill, I am an enthusiastic supporter of the proposal to expand the program of captioned films for the deaf.

The New Jersey State School for the Deaf, which is outstanding among such institutions in this country, is located in my district and I have long had an interest in its work. They use the present loan service of captioned films to the fullest extent possible, but they are well aware of the great potential in this medium for making significant strides forward in the education and training of the deaf.

The value of this legislation to the deaf population of our country has been well stated by Mr. August P. Herdtfelder, from the National Fraternal Society of the Deaf. I would like to include at this point Mr. Herdtfelder's statement to my subcommittee:

Representative THOMPSON and honorable members of the committee, I am August P. Herdtfelder, of Silver Spring, Md., and the appointed representative of the National Fraternal Society of the Deaf, a fraternal life insurance association of deaf men and women. This society is based on the lodge system and has branch lodges, called divisions, in over 100 principal cities in the United States.

The National Fraternal Society of the Deaf is strongly in favor of the legislation now being considered by your committee to expand the captioned films for the deaf program. Thousands of deaf people of all ages stand to benefit from an expanded program. Since its inception 3 years ago, the captioned films program has played an increasingly important role in the lives of deaf people everywhere. The realization that the present program is inadequate is the basic reason for the wide, general movement for a larger organization better adapted to meet the social, cultural, educational, and training needs of the deaf.

Educationally the deaf child stands to benefit the most. There is much potential for enhancing his educational achievement through the use of captioned educational films. The young deaf child does not acquire language through normal channels and often does not acquire any language at all until taught by special methods when first attending a school for the deaf at approximately 6 years of age. This lag in the development of language is difficult to overcome, but through the use of captioned educational films the deaf child will be exposed to experiences and language simultaneously providing an opportunity for growth and understanding.

We, deaf people, have always been proud of our independent role in that we have held full-time jobs, raised families, owned homes, driven cars, and paid taxes just like anyone else. And just like anyone else we are concerned with the advent of automation which will undoubtedly result in the loss of jobs for the deaf worker as well as the normal-hearing worker. Retraining of the deaf worker will not be so easy because of the communication problem. Thus there is a growing need for specialized materials for the adult deaf and an increased captioned films program will be able to take the proper steps toward the development of training and educational films for the adult deaf resulting in the opportunity for the deaf to prepare themselves for technical changes and the chance to compete on the labor market.

I strongly urge in behalf of the deaf of America that every consideration toward the enactment of this legislation be given.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6911

nation. The U.N. plan offers real promise for a settlement under which the United Nations can work itself out of the expensive job of peacekeeping and policing the country and into the constructive job of economic and technical assistance.

Once this transition is accomplished, we will have made a major contribution toward lasting peace and security, not only in Africa but throughout the world.

This is what we hope will be achieved through the United Nations Congo plan of reconciliation. And this is why we are giving our full support and best efforts toward making this plan succeed.

We hope you will join us in support of this endeavor.

Peace

Appeasement in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, both Roscoe Drummond and David Lawrence, in the September 17 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, discuss the history of authoritarian grabs for power and the current dangers in President Kennedy's do-nothing policy on Cuba:

PEOPLE SHOULD BE INFORMED: WHAT ACTION WILL BE TAKEN AGAINST THE REDS IN CUBA?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—In pouring a massive volume of Soviet arms, including military men and missiles, into Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev is embarking on a policy of brinkmanship, the end result of which cannot possibly be foreseen.

One thing is clear. The planting of Soviet power in Cuba is creating a depth of uneasiness and anxiety among the American people which can hardly be overstated. It is evident in the country; it is evident in Congress; it is evident in private conversations.

Quite properly, President Kennedy has addressed himself to this uncertain and frustrated state of public opinion. At his latest press conference, he appealed to the American people to "keep both their nerve and their head."

Mr. Kennedy is hopeful that this new stage in the Cuban crisis will not become a lacerating partisan issue in the coming elections. I know of only one way it can be prevented. That is for the President to convince the American people that they will get an absolutely straight and frank account of the gravity of what is happening and that the administration will take measures equal to the danger.

It is my present conviction—which I put down for whatever it is worth—that the administration is not yet forthrightly stating to the country the gravity of the challenge we now face, nor embracing an adequate course of action to counter and to liquidate that challenge.

For my taste there is too great a tendency to belittle the problem and to pretend that it is something we need only meet in the future, rather than something we have to begin to deal with now.

At the outset of his statement, designed to put the Cuban situation "in perspective," the President pointed out that "it is Mr. Castro" who is in trouble. This is accurate but, as I see it, exceedingly irrelevant. It is true that Castro's communism has failed so

totally and has turned most of the Cuban people so implacably against the regime, that Castro has only two choices before him. One choice was to turn Cuba over to the Cubans and submit himself to a popular election. The other was to turn Cuba over to the Kremlin and remain as its figurehead.

Castro chose the Russians, and what confronts the United States today is not a deteriorating Castro dictatorship but a powerfully armed Soviet satellite which the Kremlin can now use in its own way at its own will for its own purposes, and if Mr. Castro gets in the way that will be just too bad for Mr. Castro; he will be a dead deviationist.

Castro's troubles don't ease our troubles one iota, now that Castro's Cuba has become Khrushchev's Cuba.

Spokesmen for the administration continue to suggest that the Monroe Doctrine will be applicable and will surely be invoked if Soviet arms in Cuba become big enough to be "offensive" and are turned against other American nations. The truth is that the Monroe Doctrine has already been breached by the very takeover of Cuba by a foreign power. On this point the influential Washington Post goes to the heart of the matter in saying: "The ships and arms that Khrushchev has sent to Cuba are as menacing as the fleet that Emperor Alexander gave to Spain to help her subdue her former American colonies in 1818. This country resisted Russia then, it must resist its penetration of the Western Hemisphere today."

President Kennedy rightly counsels against provocative talk and rash action. But the only thing which will counter both is adequate action by the administration to resist and in the end liquidate Soviet penetration of the Western Hemisphere. Thoughtful people will agree, I think, that unilateral military intervention is not the beginning of such a course—but the last resort if other steps fail.

Obviously the Soviets approve intervening to deprive a people of their freedom—as in Hungary—but oppose others intervening to restore freedom.

Mr. Khrushchev threatens war if we do anything to lift the Khrushchev-Castro dictatorship from the backs of the Cuban people. I think the American people are not going to scare very easily.

TODAY IN WORLD AFFAIRS: COMMUNIST GRAB IN CUBA: THE 1930'S ALL OVER AGAIN?

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Is it the 1930's all over again? Fear of war led then to inaction by the West—and this brought on the big war itself. Will history repeat?

The parallel with events from 1935 to 1938 is startling. Then, as now, a dictator—Mussolini—grabbed Ethiopia. Just as Khrushchev today has grabbed Cuba. The West protested feebly in 1935, and the League of Nations voted 50 to 1 for an economic blockade in November of that year. But the United States was indifferent, and the commercial interests of the world succeeded in causing an abandonment of the blockade after 8 months of spasmodic effort.

Then, as now, in respect to Cuba, a blockade was characterized as useless unless all nations participated wholeheartedly.

Then, as now, the pacifists and appeasers expressed in speeches and newspaper advertisements the fear that a blockade would bring on war and implied it was better to recognize the steps taken by Mussolini as "accomplished facts." The Chamberlains and the Baldwins led Britain into a mess, out of which war became inevitable.

CHURCHILL'S WORDS

The United States wobbled then, too. Let Winston Churchill tell the story. He writes it frankly and bluntly in his book, "The

Gathering Storm," published in 1948. He refers pointedly to the economic blockade of Italy as a means of persuading Mussolini to lay off Ethiopia, previously called Abyssinia—a country which also was a member of the League—and declares:

"A large number of commodities, some of which were war materials, were prohibited from entering Italy, and an imposing schedule was drawn up. But oil, without which the campaign in Abyssinia could not have been maintained, continued to enter freely, because it was understood that to stop it meant war. Here the attitude of the United States, not a member of the League of Nations, and the world's main oil supplier, though benevolent, was uncertain. Moreover, to stop it to Italy involved also stopping it to Germany."

Mr. Churchill then criticizes the failure of Britain to back up her economic blockade with naval power, and adds: "The Italian armies in Abyssinia would have famished for supplies and ammunition. Germany could as yet give no effective help. If ever there was an opportunity of striking a decisive blow in a generous cause with the minimum of risk, it was here and now."

BLUFF SUCCEEDED

"The fact that the nerve of the British Government was not equal to the occasion can be excused only by their sincere love of peace. Actually it played a part in leading to an infinitely more terrible war. Mussolini's bluff succeeded, and an important spectator drew far-reaching conclusions from the fact. Hitler had long resolved on war for German aggrandisement. He now formed a view of Great Britain's degeneracy which was only to be changed too late for peace and too late for him."

What Mr. Churchill describes as the "irresoluteness" of those days finds its counterpart in what is happening today. Here is a brief extract from a summary by William L. Ryan of the Associated Press in Sunday morning newspapers this week:

"Moscow today just about owns Cuba—lock, stock, barrel, and beard. Inexorably, Soviet communism is closing its steel grip. Challenging the United States in the sensitive Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere, Moscow has given the world a lesson in imperialism. When the Russians colonize, they colonize for good * * * the Soviet takeover will be complete when Fidel Castro is shoved aside * * * this will be a slow and cautious process, but signs of party conflict are clear."

ALLIES INDIFFERENT

The United Press International reported last Saturday from Washington as follows: "The United States has been making quiet diplomatic efforts for more than 6 months to persuade allies in European countries and elsewhere to help isolate Communist Cuba."

"The Kennedy administration was receiving little encouragement today from Latin American and European allies in its attempt to tighten the diplomatic and economic squeeze on Cuba."

A London dispatch by the United Press International on the same day said: "Britain has politely but firmly discouraged any American ideas that it join the United States in an economic blockade of Cuba, it was reliably learned today. Other European member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were reported also to have backed away from tentative soundings as to whether they would go along with the United States in any possible embargo against Cuba."

KENNEDY BACKS AWAY

Thus, as in the 1930's, the free world is in disunion, and the enemy dictators are taking advantage of such disunion.

President Kennedy, meanwhile, has also backed away. He has disregarded the all-important principle in the Monroe Doctrine

A6912

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 18

which declares against European colonization or imposition of their system in the Western Hemisphere. He says the Doctrine means only resistance to an armed attack against the United States or against other countries in this hemisphere with the aid of a European power. This gives Khrushchev a free hand to infiltrate any country in America, take over the government there with a puppet ruler, and send in military supplies and forces without running the risk of any countering action by the United States.

For all practical purposes has the Monroe Doctrine now been buried, as Khrushchev in 1960 said it would be? Resolutions in Congress introduced last week by administration leaders, still mention the doctrine in their "whereases" but not in the text of the conclusions reached. Their theory evidently is that only if America is attacked should any action be taken.

Communist imperialism is thereby given the unchallenged opportunity to extend its system anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. If the United States will not fight when historic American policy is being violated 90 miles away from its shores, the dictatorship in Moscow may conclude that pacifism has won a big victory in the Americas and the West, and that there will be no resistance to Communist aggressions anywhere else in the world, including Berlin. It could be the 1930's all over again.

Urban Mass Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, one of President Kennedy's proposals earlier this year called for Federal assistance for improvements in mass transportation for urban areas. There is an increasing need for this legislation in many sections of the country, and, of course, I am particularly interested in and familiar with the problem affecting my own city of New York, and the many thousands of my own constituents in Queens County.

The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962 was favorably reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency on July 3 of this year, and since that time has been waiting for a rule from the House Rules Committee. The bill would provide \$500 million in Federal assistance over a period of 3 years to State and local governments for the construction, acquisition, and improvement of mass transportation services, facilities, and equipment. The grants can cover up to two-thirds of the project costs, and the remaining one-third must be contributed in cash by the local community. The measure would be an expansion and continuation of the temporary program currently in effect under the provisions of the Housing Act passed by the Congress last year, which authorized \$50 million for a loan program for facilities and equipment in an effort to meet mass transit needs.

It is true that the passage of this bill would mean much to New York City, but strong support for it has come from

varied sources including large and small communities, public officials, private transportation companies, and others. For New York City, it could mean that millions of dollars of Federal money could be made available to help meet the urgent need for new and improved facilities in our metropolitan area, now served by the New York City Transit Authority. With the thousands upon thousands of New Yorkers residing on the fringes and in the suburbs—and I refer primarily to those residents of my district in Queens County—who must use public transportation to and from Manhattan and other parts of the New York City area, it would facilitate travel and would mean a tremendous savings in time, energy, and money.

An efficient and economical mass transit system is absolutely essential if we are to provide those who live in urban areas with adequate means of transportation. Our cities have been experiencing fantastic population explosions, and lack of adequate transit facilities has caused an increased use of private passenger automobiles, which in turn has resulted in traffic congestion and a transportation problem which is growing more serious year after year. I believe that it has been estimated that traffic congestion and traffic jams cost the country about \$5 billion each year in time and wages lost, fuel consumption, vehicle depreciation, et cetera. We must take prompt action in effecting a solution to the problem. In my own area of Queens County, a Queens transit committee, composed of prominent civic and business leaders, has been formed for the purpose of pressing for transit improvements in Queens, which is the largest borough in New York City.

The mass transit bill is only 1 of some 22 bills which have been bottled up in the House Rules Committee during the 87th Congress awaiting action, even after the attempted reform of the committee last year. I believe that this more than demonstrates the need for further changes in the rules of the House to permit the orderly and prompt consideration of legislation, which otherwise would never reach the floor for debate. It is my understanding that an effort to bring the bill up under the Calendar Wednesday rule will be made in the House of Representatives tomorrow, and I shall certainly do whatever I can to force consideration of this legislation. I sincerely hope that it will be possible for the majority of my colleagues to support this move to bring this necessary and desirable bill before us.

Fire Island National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 11, the New York World-

Telegram and Sun wrote an excellent editorial on the question of Fire Island and the importance of bringing a portion of the island into the national park system.

The New York World-Telegram and Sun has been progressive and ahead of the times on this subject, as on many others.

The article follows:

FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL PARK

In the few weeks since he announced it, Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of Manhattan, has drawn heavy popular support for his proposal to establish Fire Island as a national park.

This is LINDSAY's alternative to the Robert Moses plan to build a highway on Fire Island as a means of controlling erosion. The highway proposal is bitterly assailed by many, and probably most, residents of the island and nearby communities—and by visitors and prospective visitors throughout the metropolitan area.

Moses could be 100 percent right from the engineering standpoint, but his plan bats just about zero in emotional and esthetic appeal—or even suffrance.

Under the circumstances, a sensible alternative becomes a must. Representative LINDSAY seems to have it.

Congress' approval last year of the Cape Cod National Seashore bill was designed to protect the beaches and dunes against both natural erosion and commercial ruination. The same principle motivates support for Representative LINDSAY's Fire Island bill.

Congress should give that bill at least its preliminary blessing before this session adjourns.

Chester Bowles Found

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people were wondering what had happened to Chester Bowles. No one had heard of him since he spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on his African jaunt.

This is the same individual who was the disappointed nominee for Secretary of State and was shifted almost daily within the Department of State. He is one of the best friends Communist China has.

Sunday, in a speech at Pittsburgh, Mr. Bowles called all those who want to protect our American rights "hot blooded and hot headed extremists." This is the same Chester Bowles who advocated our surrender in Laos and who is dedicated to defeatism insofar as communism is concerned.

It is no wonder that in the September 18 editorial of the New York Herald Tribune it is aptly pointed out that Kennedy censorship of this subject is not the answer. Let there be free discussion.

The editorial follows:

TYING OUR HANDS ON CUBA

The Kennedy administration has still a good deal to learn about the conduct of foreign affairs.