

Services for Eisenberg, a retired businessman, former State senator and former deputy judge of the old Willimantic Police and City Court, were held at the Bank Street synagogue of Temple B'nai Israel. Rabbi Amos Edelheit officiated.

Burial was in the Congregation Sons of Israel Cemetery at Perkins Corner, Mansfield. State Senator Arthur J. Lucas Jr., of Chaplin, represented Gov. John N. Dempsey, at the rites.

A memorial week will be held at the home of his son, Marvin Eisenberg, of 21 Manor Lane, Wapping, where friends may call.

Eisenberg, who was 70, died Sunday at his home at 305 Pleasant Street. He was active until the end, visiting the Chronicle office a couple of days before his death.

He was treasurer of the Windham-Willimantic Democratic Town Committee, a post he held for many years. He also served as clerk of the city and police court, retiring in 1957. He also served as member of the city zoning board of appeals and was formerly a member of the board of directors of the Willimantic YMCA.

Eisenberg was president of the synagogue for two terms and its treasurer for many years. He was chairman of the United Jewish Appeal for several years, was a leader in the synagogue's Brotherhood and active in other civic and philanthropic agencies.

During his term as State senator from the 29th district, the nine southern towns of Windham County, in 1933-34, he was chairman of the Senate Aviation Committee. He was reelected registrar for another 2-year-term last November.

FORTY-FIVE YEARS A MERCHANT

Eisenberg had a 45-year career as a merchant here until his retirement due to ill health in November 1958. He operated Ben's Toggery Shop for 37 years. He started his business career by going to work for his father, Samuel Eisenberg, in the old Surprise Store on Jackson Street at the age of 16 and continuing there for 8 years.

For 5 years, from 1916 to 1921 young Eisenberg was on the road as a traveling salesman for a clothing house. Ben's Toggery was first located in the Clark Building, 51 Church Street and moved to Main Street following Eisenberg's election as senator.

The first Main Street location was the present quarters of Ben's Eagle Shoe Store, its home for 6 years. Eisenberg then moved to the Hall Block in 1939, taking over the old Bowman Clothing Store and renovating the front. He maintained that store until his retirement.

Eisenberg was born in Austria and brought to this country as a baby by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Eisenberg. They first settled in Haverstraw, N.Y., and moved to Willimantic in 1908.

In addition to his son, Eisenberg leaves a daughter, Mrs. Milton Case of Bloomfield; five sisters, Mrs. George Miller of West Hartford; Mrs. Thomas Gibson of Willimantic; Mrs. Morris Kalman of Willimantic; Mrs. Louis Pollack of Norwich and Mrs. Morris Brown of New Britain, and five grandchildren.

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin,
Jan. 7, 1963]

DEATH OF FORMER STATE SENATOR BENJAMIN EISENBERG

Former State Senator Benjamin Eisenberg died unexpectedly at his home, 305 Pleasant Street, Sunday morning. A resident of this city for many years, he came from Austria with his parents while a youngster, first settling in Haverstraw, N.Y., and then with the parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Eisenberg, came to Willimantic in 1908.

Ben, then 16, became employed in his father's Surprise Store on Jackson Street, remaining there 8 years. From 1916 to 1921

Eisenberg was a traveling salesman for a clothing house.

In September of the latter year he opened Ben's Toggery Shop at 51 Church Street and continued at this location until 1933 when he moved to Main Street. Later he took over the Bowman clothing store and continued this enterprise until retiring in November 1958. While he had been in failing health, his passing was unexpected.

Eisenberg had long been a faithful member of the Democratic Party serving the 29th district in the State senate, 1933-34. He was town treasurer of the democratic committee for many years, and served as judge and as clerk of the former city and police court on separate occasions. At his death he was democratic registrar of voters.

Eisenberg served as a member of the zoning board of appeals in this city and was chairman of the aviation committee. His other civic interests included being a member of the YMCA board of directors. Long a member of the Congregation Sons of Israel he was its president for 2 terms and treasurer for many years. He has been a leader in its brotherhood and for several years was chairman of the United Jewish Appeal.

Mr. Eisenberg was born February 22, 1892, and is survived by one daughter, Mrs. Milton Case, of Bloomfield, and a son, Marvin Eisenberg, of Wapping; seven grandchildren, five sisters, Mrs. Louis Pollack, Norwich; Mrs. Thomas Gibson, Willimantic; Mrs. Morris Kalman, Willimantic; Mrs. George Miller, Hartford; and Mrs. Morris Brown, of New Britain.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Jan. 7,
1963]

BENJAMIN EISENBERG DIES—FORMER STATE SENATOR

WILLIMANTIC.—Former State Senator Benjamin Eisenberg, 70, retired Willimantic businessman, died Sunday at his home at 305 Pleasant Street.

Eisenberg was State senator in 1933-34, serving as chairman of the aviation committee. He was treasurer of the Democratic Town Committee for many years and was clerk of the city and police court until his retirement in 1957. He also served on the zoning board of appeals.

OPERATED STORE

He operated Ben's Toggery Shop for 37 years before retiring in 1958 because of ill health. Before that, he worked for his father at the old Surprise Store on Jackson Street and was a traveling salesman for a clothing house.

At the time of his death he was Democratic registrar of voters.

Born in Austria, Mr. Eisenberg first settled in Haverstraw, N.Y., and then moved to Willimantic in 1908.

Mr. Eisenberg was president of Congregation Sons of Israel for two terms and its treasurer for many years. He was a leader in the synagogue's brotherhood and chairman for several years of the United Jewish Appeal.

ON YMCA BOARD

He was also a member of the YMCA board of directors and of numerous other civic and philanthropic agencies.

He leaves a son, Marvin Eisenberg, of Wapping; a daughter, Mrs. Milton Case, of Bloomfield; five sisters, Mrs. George Miller, of West Hartford; Mrs. Thomas Gibson, of Willimantic; Mrs. Morris Kalman, of Willimantic; Mrs. Louis Pollack, of Norwich; and Mrs. Morris Brown, of New Britain; and seven grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held this afternoon at 2 at the Congregation Sons of Israel in Willimantic. Rabbi Amos Edelheit will officiate. Burial will be in Congregation Sons of Israel Cemetery, Perkins Corner, Mansfield.

Friends may call during memorial week at the home of his son, Marvin Eisenberg, of 21 Manor Lane, Wapping.

Memorial contributions may be made to the donor's favorite charity.

The Weinstein Mortuary, of Hartford, is in charge of arrangements.

One-Price Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was unanimously adopted on Friday, February 15 by the executive committee and cotton policy committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the sentiments expressed by this resolution:

STATEMENT BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE REGARDING CURRENT COTTON LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

The American textile industry is deeply disturbed and disappointed over developments of the past week that resulted in a setback of legislation designed to achieve the announced intention of President Kennedy and his administration to "remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system."

The industry's alarm and disappointment is magnified by the resistance of the administration to that portion of the legislation which would have specified that American-grown cotton should be made available to domestic mills at the same price it is made available for export. The administration supported, instead, a provision that would give discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture in determining a spread between the domestic and foreign price.

It is the carefully considered opinion of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute that anything less than a clear-cut return to a one-price system will result in a continuation of the deplorable lack of confidence now prevalent throughout the cotton economy.

So long as the U.S. Government tolerates a policy under which textile mills in Japan, Hong Kong, India, or Europe can buy American-grown cotton at a lower price than domestic mills must pay for the same cotton, there is bound to be distrust, uncertainty and deterioration.

The entire cotton economy, including the millions of people involved with the price-handicapped textile-apparel industry complex, were heartened when President Kennedy announced his intentions to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system last fall.

To informed cotton and textile individuals everywhere, the extent of the inequity is the level of the export subsidy on raw cotton—nothing more and nothing less.

Prior to the export subsidy, American and foreign mills competed for American cotton on an equal basis. We seek only a return to that basis.

Today, the entire raw cotton industry is confronted with one of the most serious emergencies in history. Cotton consumption in the United States is rapidly declining; acreage is being reduced; cotton farm income is suffering; competing fibers and other products are rapidly taking over cotton's mar-

A868

kets; export sales of cotton and cotton products are declining; stocks of cotton are piling up in Government hands at exorbitant posts; many mills are on short time; payrolls are suffering; confidence in cotton and its future is at an alltime low.

Because the leadership of the entire raw cotton industry, from growing through manufacturing, from New England to California, recognizes this deplorable situation, there is virtually unanimous agreement on a course of action. This agreement was expressed 2 weeks ago when all segments of the industry including farmers, ginners, warehousemen, merchants, cottonseed processors, and mill men, participating in the annual meeting of the National Cotton Council, agreed on the need for " * * * action to make U.S. cotton available to American mills at the same price as it is made available to foreign mills under the present law."

With such widespread support this administration has a unique opportunity to reverse the tragic course of this vast agricultural-manufacturing complex, head it in the right direction, and restore to it the confidence that is absolutely essential to the creation of a vital, dynamic enterprise.

But a piecemeal approach will not do the job. It will not generate the necessary levels of increased cotton consumption; it will not materially offset the burdensome portion of imports now occurring specifically because of the unfair cotton pricing system; it will not justify the acreage expansion so essential to efficient and profitable cotton farming. In short, it will not restore confidence.

A discretionary, piecemeal solution will be viewed only as a handout, or a subsidy to the domestic industry. The American textile industry has never been and is not now in favor of a subsidy. It does not want it. Along with the whole raw cotton industry, and many of our friends in the Congress, we reluctantly agree to an equalization payments approach only as the very last recourse to eliminate the intolerable two-price system, thereby gaining a period of time for the cotton economy of this country to make the adjustments that are essential to the development of a sound future.

The American Textile Manufacturers Institute restates its firm conviction that a complete return to a one-price system is fundamental both to the cold realities of the current situation and to generating the support necessary to insure legislative action in the immediate future.

We urge upon the administration and the Congress immediate action to insure that an American textile mill, employing American citizens, can buy American cotton at the same price as it is sold abroad.

Cuts
Cuban Agricultural Experiment

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent events and the ever-present threat of communism, I call upon Congress to refuse to appropriate any funds which would be used either directly or indirectly to finance any U.N. project in Cuba or in any other Communist-dominated or controlled country.

The United States is paying 40 percent of the cost of the U.N. Special Fund, the account financing the Cuban

agricultural project of the U.N., and there is no way to differentiate between U.S. funds and other funds in this account. If this project is allowed to proceed, the United States will be contributing to the perpetuation of its own foes.

Of what value are so-called economic sanctions, quarantines, and other measures to halt subversion from Cuba if, at the same time, the United Nations finances efforts to enhance the agricultural economy of Cuba?

Such aid as this will merely assist Castro in his efforts to subvert Latin America, it will aid in the spreading of communism throughout the Western Hemisphere and the United States should refrain from giving aid and comfort to any such program by refusing to appropriate the necessary funds for the U.N. Special Fund.

If Congress is going to persist in appropriating money for the U.N. Special Fund, then it should at least place enough strings on such money to assure the U.S. taxpayers that none of their money will be used to assist, in any manner, Communist governments.

What Is a Farmer?

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege, as a result of the reapportionment changes that took place this year in the congressional districts in New York, to represent in this great body one of the most important agricultural districts in the Nation. I am proud indeed to be a farmer's Congressman and I shall continue to work and fight in the future as I have in the past in behalf of the farmers of upstate New York.

As a farmers' Congressman I was greatly impressed with an eloquent editorial I read the other day in the Cato Citizen of Cato, N.Y., for February 7, 1963. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial herewith:

WHAT IS A FARMER?

A farmer is a paradox—he is an overall executive with his home; his office; a scientist using fertilizer attachments; a purchasing agent in an old hat; a personnel director with grease under his fingernails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, amino acids, and antibiotics; a production expert with a surplus; and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze.

He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good foods, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, grasshoppers or helping with housework.

Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agricultural Department confuses them,

city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them and wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might as well put up with him—he is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fast-growing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon, having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: "The market's up."

Stock Mart Danger

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, of February 19, 1963:

**TAX LAWS TERMED "STOCK MART DANGER"—
 NEW YORK EXCHANGE PRESIDENT CRITICIZES
 CAPITAL GAINS LEVY IN BORREGO TALK**

BORREGO SPRINGS.—Tax laws affecting investors were one of the triggers in an actual day of panic that struck the Nation's stock markets last May 28, Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, told the annual conference of Copley publishers and executives here yesterday.

While Funston told a reporter that it is unlikely that the market stands in any similar danger today, he said oldtimers in the financial centers of New York found selling just as emotional and fear-ridden on that day as it was during the 1929 crash, with frenzy added to the selling waves by the effect of the capital gains tax.

Funston explained that the major selling was by medium and large, not small, investors who previously were "locked in" from selling stocks because of the existence of the 25-percent maximum tax on long-term capital gains.

When it appeared that the market might sink to new lows, these investors tried to be "the first to reach the door" by selling their stocks, either to conserve their capital or their longstanding profits, or to buy back in at a much lower level which still could allow them a benefit from selling.

Funston said the capital gains tax at its present rate, by its effect in "freezing" ownership of stocks or other investments, not only serves to accentuate market movements but also may be depriving the Government of easily obtainable revenues. "We feel that if the capital gains tax were cut in half the Government would get 2½ times as much revenue from it," he said.

Of President Kennedy's tax revision proposals, Funston said, "You have to give the Government credit for recognizing the stifling effects of the present tax structure on economic growth."

However, he predicted that Congress would insist on cuts in spending before accepting tax cuts of the magnitude suggested, and he also said investors "are going to fight with

No Need To Soak Taxpayers When Self-Help Plan Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in 1958, Public Law 85-875 was enacted to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage and assist in the establishment of clubs throughout the United States for young people especially interested in science, a most commendable objective with which all Americans can agree. The act provided that a corporation be granted a charter by Congress to help the Commissioner carry out this assignment and last year, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER introduced legislation to grant this charter to the Science Service, Inc., which has demonstrated most illustriously its fulfillment of the requirements indicated by Public Law 875.

The bill was passed by the House but was not considered on the floor of the Senate. However, Congressman WALTER has again introduced the proposal, H.R. 824, to grant a charter to Science Service, Inc., and I am very hopeful that this legislation will be enacted during the present session of Congress. In this connection, under unanimous consent, I insert an editorial from the Flint, Mich., Journal, of February 17 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since it states so well the excellent reasons for supporting this legislative request:

NO NEED TO SOAK TAXPAYERS WHEN SELF-HELP PLAN WORKS

Flint area students in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools are at work experimenting and preparing exhibits for the seventh annual Flint Science Fair at IMA Auditorium.

The fair is 7 weeks away, but projects are well underway at all schools. In some cases, preparations began last spring soon after the completion of the 1962 Flint Fair. Every exhibit by a budding scientist that will be judged in April will represent months of study, concentration, and hard work.

Last year's award winners received prizes totaling \$4,200. The amount will be more this time. Already, seven scholarships worth \$3,750 have been announced.

Flint's Fair, as are more than 200 other such local fairs across the country, is sponsored by area public and parochial schools, community service organizations and business and industrial firms with help and encouragement from Science Service, Inc., sponsor of the annual National Science Fair-International to which the Journal sends local award winners.

In 1958, Flint was host to the national fair. More than 30,000 persons attended to marvel at exhibits from 150 fairs in the United States, Japan, and West Germany. It did much to call attention to Flint's ever-expanding educational facilities and programs. It also stimulated greater interest in local science-fair participation and excellence.

From this new interest and continued motivation by Science Service, elementary school fairs were started to promote inter-school science activities and increase interest in the annual Flint Fair.

One concrete result was the more than 1,000 individual science projects by Flint area students last year. Of that number 875 were entered in the fair.

Science Service is responsible for motivating youngsters in other ways than through its sponsorship of science fairs. For many years it has promoted the science club movement in our schools, and more recently has conducted science talent searches from coast to coast.

Flint students participating in the talent search and science clubs in Flint-area schools are affiliated with Science Service, which provides literature, project materials and teaching aids at no cost to the schools.

Since it was founded in 1921, Science Service has been assisting in the establishment of such clubs and since 1941 it has broadened its scope to include sponsorship of the science fairs and other programs to foster science interest among this country's youth.

Now a bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives to provide Science Service a Federal charter. The bill, H.R. 824, is identical to the one the House approved last summer only to have it die in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

We are in favor of the bill. Its passage would preserve this nonprofit organization which has so successfully encouraged grass-root, self-help programs such as Flint's in schools and communities across the country.

Since 1958 the U.S. Office of Education has been after Congress to establish a Federal program of school science clubs under its direction and to appropriate funds for its operation. It still is eager to take over this program and the supervision of science fairs—at public expense.

We point to the tremendous growth in interest here among students, instructors, parents and local sponsoring agencies since Flint's first science fair was held in 1957 as an example of the excellent job Science Service is doing in helping promote science interest in U.S. schools. Its programs are in more than 20,000 schools in all 50 States.

There is no need for the Government to step in to take over the job at taxpayer expense. In fact, such tax expenditures by the U.S. Office of Education cannot be justified.

We urge passage of the bill to give Science Service a Federal charter so it can continue its work on a nonprofit basis.

Events in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there were many of us in the Congress talking about Cuba and what was happening and long before the President took action last October.

From information which was available to Congress as well as to the White House, we came to the conclusion that the signs of what was being done between Russia and Cuba pointed to the inevitable—that Russia was arming Cuba for offensive purposes.

Gen. Thomas D. White, former commander of the U.S. Air Force and now retired, has written one of the most succinct and direct observations of what has been happening psychologically in this country from the White House down to the lowest citizen. As General White

has so well put it, what happened in Cuba, instead of being an eye opener, should be a shocker to those in high position in the Government, as to the implications of what the future holds for us in the long pull with communism.

As General White has again said this "great national orgy of self-congratulation" could result in the greatest miscalculation for disaster in our history. Our naivete in believing that Russia was coming with 15,000 members of the armed forces to plant defensive missiles in Cuba almost brought us to a major disaster.

Constant vigilance is the price of survival in the nuclear age. We may not be as fortunate again as we were in October in Cuba in being able to locate offensive weapons. Our military leadership in the last 24 months has been greatly silenced. Many of us in the Congress hope that the military in the future will speak up when they believe they are right—even though this may not be popular at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

General White's article from Newsweek, January 14, 1963, is herewith appended:

GREAT NATIONAL ORGY OF SELF-CONGRATULATION

(By Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, retired)

"Placebo: Any harmless substance, as bread pills, given to humor a patient."—Funk and Wagnalls Practical Standard Dictionary.

Uncle Sam has long been suffering from a severe case of national apathy recently aggravated and climaxed in a high Cuban fever. His most dangerous sequela is overconfidence. As an aftermath of Cuba we may become more offguard than ever, tranquilized by our own nostrums and the propaganda pills constantly fed to us by Dr. Khrushchev.

Our Government acted courageously in the Cuban situation. But that is exactly what I expect the Government of the United States of America to do.

What seems strange to me is that we have been engaged in a great national orgy of self-congratulations. We congratulate ourselves over the confrontation of our sworn enemy who, armed with lethal weapons aimed at the very heart of this country, marched almost openly into our own front yard. It seems to me that rather than congratulate ourselves, we should soberly recognize that Cuba is surely one of the easiest of all the areas and circumstances of possible decisive confrontation with the Soviet Union. Instead of crowing over a 12th-hour decision, we should be taking stock of our national attitudes which permitted the immediate situation to arise in the first place.

I find it especially difficult to understand why our military authorities did not raise the alarm long before October. In my opinion, and I spent many years in the intelligence business, there was enough information to be found in the daily press alone to have led to a military conclusion that the Russians in Cuba were posing a serious threat to the United States.

Surely the stream of Russian ships to Cuba which began last midsummer should have aroused deep suspicion. Could anyone in uniform really have believed that the construction in Havana Harbor was for a fishing fleet? Did the evaluators of Soviet intelligence, who should be chosen for their cynicism, actually give credence to published reports that thousands of Russian troops in Cuba were there for peaceful purpose or that the U.S.S.R. would mount such an effort merely to arm Fidel Castro with defensive missiles? Was not the sum total of in-

dicators enough to raise the alarm long before it was raised?

I am perturbed that, whatever the current arrangement of intelligence organizations, whatever the Department of Defense policies on military expression of views, there should be such evidence of complacency among our professional military watchdogs.

There have been changes in our military intelligence setup, and the military voice has certainly been muted. Nonetheless I am confident that if our highest military authorities had stood up and spoken on this subject, the Commander in Chief would have acted promptly on their warning.

It bothers me also to know that the equipment for launching and guiding certain types of missiles can be hidden readily and that some missiles and aircraft themselves can be transported piecemeal and quickly reassembled. These factors and other clandestine capabilities of the U.S.S.R. in Cuba lead me to believe that as long as there is a Communist government in Cuba, the United States and all of Latin America are in jeopardy. Our naivete in believing otherwise has brought us close to a major disaster.

We may have been "eyeball to eyeball" and this time the other fellow may have blinked—but maybe he only winked. In any case, we may be sure that he is already plotting a next time. He will continue to feed us propaganda pills to lull our senses and will always be set to administer us a fatal potion. Khrushchev has sworn to bury us. Presumably he would prefer to bury us alive. But if necessary he would gladly bury us dead.

"Placebo": The opening antiphon of the vespers for the dead.—Funk and Wagnalls Practical Standard Dictionary.

Windfalls in Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial appearing in the Stevens Point Daily Journal, Stevens Point, Wis., attention was called to a mistake made by the Federal Government in designating Portage County in my district a "distressed area." I include that editorial as an example of the confusion that exists in the Federal bureaucracy concerning the proper administration of Federal funds under existing programs:

WINDFALLS IN FEDERAL AID, ALSO DISAPPOINTMENT

There is an old saying that one should never look a gift horse in the mouth. We are reminded of it by what has been transpiring over the past year or so regarding the status of Portage County as a "distressed area," making it eligible for grants of public funds for federally approved local projects.

It has been necessary to take a number of looks in the direction of that gift horse, to get some needed answers. If all started when Portage County, including Stevens Point, was classified as a distressed area on the basis of unemployment figures. But this turned out to be a statistical error and we were removed this week from that classification by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Meanwhile, a number of projects were set up, after local officials were given assurances that the eligibility continued in force, despite the mistake. This has brought a con-

siderable anticipated windfall to the community. It apparently means the city will receive a \$100,000 grant to pay about half the cost of a new city garage, and that Portage County may reap a benefit of \$485,000, half the estimated cost of a 90-bed addition to the new county infirmary. Believed suspended by the new classification is a city request for \$47,500 for half the estimated cost of a sanitary sewer project.

Also under a Federal program, the board of water and sewage commissioners received a grant of \$36,300 for a sewage plant project, but lost out on a bid for an additional \$27,000.

If local officials have any qualms of conscience as to taking advantage of a technically that made the city and county eligible for grants, although they should not have been, their composure can be readily restored. They were encouraged by Federal officials to apply for grants despite the uncertain status that clouded the picture, and were assured we were still eligible for benefits under the depressed area assistance programs. In view of these representations, the local projects continued to be submitted.

There was one outstanding development, however, that is disappointing. This involved strenuous work to obtain a large loan—not a grant—for the establishment of a \$2,770,000 food processing plant in the Plover area. The firm planned to contract for locally grown potatoes on a major scale. It would have provided steady employment for up to 400 persons, giving the area permanent benefits through this new industry. Local community leaders felt confident that under the formula laid down, the comparatively small sum required to be raised locally could have been obtained.

This project went down the drain, not as the result of the classification change but because Portage County never should have been designated as a distressed area in the first place. The Area Redevelopment Administration said: "We cannot in good conscience approve the expenditure of Federal funds when we know that Portage County would not be entitled to such funds except for the fact that an error had been made." That is the official explanation. We suspect however, that this may not be the real reason, and that other influences may have been at work in Washington to block this business venture with its spotlight on our potato industry.

Throughout the various proceedings, officials have learned something about the devious ways of Federal assistance.

Word is being awaited as to the fate of two other projects in Portage County, a municipal water plant for Junction City and a sewerage system for Rosholt.

H.R. 97, a Bill To Provide Certain Exemptions From Federal Excise Taxes for Nonprofit Organizations for the Blind Which Are Now Provided for Nonprofit Educational Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 88th Congress, I introduced H.R. 97, a bill to exempt nonprofit, voluntary associations and agen-

cies engaged in work for the blind from paying Federal excise taxes.

I sponsored this same measure in the last Congress. I have reintroduced it in this one because I believe these are worthy organizations doing a worthwhile work and deserve the small amount of relief from paying burdensome taxes that the enactment of my bill into law would provide.

Although substantial sums of money are appropriated annually by the Federal and State governments to provide special kinds of training and assistance to the Nation's nearly 400,000 blind persons, these funds are not sufficient to meet the need.

Therefore, there has developed, in just about every community in America, privately established, nonprofit organizations which fill in the gaps in the services provided to blind people by public authority.

These organizations for the blind—perhaps as many as 1,000 of them—serve as centers of activities for the blind. They serve as centers for groups of braille transcribers, volunteers who produce books in raised characters or on records and tapes for college students, or for blind children attending classes in local sighted schools—or even for general reading; these centers offer training in the skills and techniques of blindness; they provide social services, and serve as educational and recreational resources for their numerous blind clients.

Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with these fine institutions, and I am proud to say that one of the very best of them is the Industrial Home for the Blind, located in my district in Brooklyn.

Established nearly three-quarters of a century ago, this organization has gained a worldwide reputation for the pioneering work it has performed in the field of work for the blind.

One of the first to explore the possibilities of magnifier lenses for persons with very limited vision, there has grown within the Industrial Home for the Blind an optical aids service which truly helps the blind to see again.

Those who suffer the double handicapping disabilities of blindness and deafness have received much attention from this highly esteemed Brooklyn institution. Great advances have been made to help these people—shut away from the sights and sounds of the world—to help them achieve a larger measure of fulfillment in their lives.

The Industrial Home for the Blind also maintains a corps of nearly a thousand volunteers who copy textbooks into braille for blind students of all ages and in all manner of educational institutions.

These are but a few of the activities and accomplishments of the justly famous Industrial Home for the Blind. It also provides a great diversity of other services and activities to sightless men, women, and children, not only in our part of New York City and State, but to blind persons throughout the world.

And the Industrial Home for the Blind about which I speak with such familiarity—for I have known of it as far back as I can remember—the Industrial Home

Or maybe it is just because these fellows, and all of their fellows, and all of their ideas, are square.

When Dwight D. Eisenhower was President he appointed a Committee on National Goals to decide where we were all going. Perhaps a first step should be a commission on national heritage to make sure that some of us at least remember where we have been.

Arnold Toynbee, the historian, says that of 21 notable civilizations, 19 perished not from external conquest but from the evaporation of belief within.

Today, our country still has a choice. I believe it has already begun to make that choice. I believe it is going back to its old beliefs in such things as ideas, pride, patriotism, loyalty, devotion and even hard work.

We are great believers in statistics in this country—and while the things that really count can never be measured even by the most advanced computers—sheer head-counting seems to indicate that people are beginning to struggle for better things.

Twenty years ago, half of us belonged to churches. Today, 64 percent of us do. It is perfectly possible that the churches are full and the people are empty—but the statistics are on our side.

Sales of classical records have jumped 78 percent in the last 3 years. Advertising, perhaps, but the statistics are on our side.

Millions of people are visiting museums, millions more than a decade ago.

We spent over a billion dollars on books last year, and people are taking 670 million volumes out of our public libraries each year.

There are 50 percent more symphony orchestras than there were 10 years ago. And expenditures on all cultural activities have increased 70 percent in the past 10 years—to a total of more than \$3 billion.

You might point out to me that \$3 billion spent for culture, stacked up against \$50 billion spent for war, still isn't much. But you will have to admit that there is definite movement. And in the right direction too.

Since the turn of the century, the percentage of our population that has graduated from high school is up 10 times. And the percentage that has gone to college is up seven times. And the percentage in higher education who are in there trying to get higher marks is encouragingly higher than it used to be. Yes, there are indications that the day when it's smart to be smart is finally at hand.

But the greatest thing that has happened, of course, is that our Nation has a whole new set of heroes. Named Glenn and Grisson and Shepard. Named Carpenter, Cooper and Schirra. Named Crews and Bock and Twining; Smith, Sorlie and McIntosh; named Knolle and Hoover. The towns they came from have nice small names; Sparta, Boulder, East Derry, Mitchell, Shawnee, Brownwood.

These lads apparently lived too far from the big city and grew up to be squares. For who but a square would volunteer his life for his country's good?

They are not even ashamed of their feelings.

John Glenn says he gets a funny feeling down inside when he sees the flag go by. Imagine that.

He's proud of his small town, proud of his small college. Proud that he belonged to the Boy Scouts and the YMCA.

I hope that some of him rubs off onto the next generation.

For the forces of conformity are still strong. Too many of us are still sitting it out instead of sweating it out. Too many of us haven't got the guts to stand up straight and dare to be square. Because the opposite of square is round, and being round is so much simpler. Responsibilities and

problems roll off nice and easy. And we can just roll down the path without any bumps, being careful to stay in the middle, because that's where the most comfortable ruts are.

Too many of us know the short cuts, and too few know or care where the path leads. Too few of us dare to leave the path because the path is always the easy way, the way most people go. But there is no path to the future, no path to greatness, no path to progress. No path to outer space or to inner satisfaction.

How shall we fight for personal independence? How shall we avoid the group poop, the vortex of mediocrity, the great nothing of cynical sophistication and bored non-participation?

May I suggest that we all join the S.O.S.? The S.O.S.—the Society of Squares. It doesn't even exist but it could. Not a left-wing organization. Not a right-wing organization. Just an organization with wings.

We might have to go underground for awhile to avoid being trampled to death by the coast-to-coast rat-packs of cynical saboteurs and the canned-wit commandos whose devotion is to destruction.

But we would come out.

We might even have a secret handshake consisting mainly of grabbing the other guy's hand as though you meant it and looking him in the eye.

We would be for participation and against sitting life out, for simplicity and against sophistication, for laughter and against sniggering, for America and against her enemies, for the direct and against the devious, for the honest way against the easy short cut, for a well-done job and against the goof-off, for education and against the pretense of learning, for building and against tearing down, for the boys and girls who excel and against the international bedroom athletes.

We have, at least, the satisfaction of knowing that our problem is not new.

When Benjamin Franklin was told that the war for independence was over, he said, "Say rather the war of the revolution is over—the war for independence has yet to be fought." And today—179 years later—the war for independence has still to be fought.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, February, the shortest month of the year, is usually one of the busiest and this one was no exception. With Congress and its legislative duties, Defense Department briefings almost every day, and important daily requests from constituents, your Congressman has been very busy.

At the invitation of the Secretary of the Air Force, I inspected six major Air Force commands to get a firsthand look at our defense structure. The tour included the defense nerve center at Omaha, Nebr., a SAC alert demonstration at Vandenberg, Calif., a visit to the Atlas missile training site where two crews from Atlas AFB were undergoing training, and NORAD headquarters at Colorado Springs. Seeing our defense

systems in operation gives me confidence that the United States is more militarily secure than any time in its history.

I attended a series of high-level secret briefings by Defense Secretary McNamara, and, based on his statements, I am not worried about the future of the manned bomber. The manned bomber will always have its place in our defense structure.

Enclosed with this newsletter is a blue opinion card. In order that I may be aware of the desires of my constituents, please complete the card, apply a stamp, and mail it to me. This helps me to vote according to the wishes of those I serve.

Shortly after pro football star Norman Snead had been hired by the Peace Corps at a salary of \$75 per day plus expenses, I protested the hiring. Two days later Corps Director Sargent Shriver announced that Snead would work for nothing, that his hiring had been a mistake. It was gratifying to receive so much mail commending me for my action. It came from 31 States and my own Sixth District. Economy in Government demands constant attention.

The United Nations will give agricultural aid to Cuba, it was recently announced. No U.S. money will be used, but I firmly stand opposed to the U.N. giving Cuba aid in any way, shape, or form until Russia removes its troops, guns, and other weapons. The United States should make no contribution to any United Nations fund which would be used in this manner.

Six Federal agencies plan to spend more than \$157 million in the Sixth District during fiscal year 1964. Of this, more than \$148 million will be for military installations. In February, two contracts totaling \$1.7 million were awarded for construction at Fort Sill. Duncan's Halliburton Field was equipped with a new directional radio range, and a \$118,000 loan was approved for Sterling for water and sewer works.

The Post Office Department deserves commendation. I often receive mail addressed simply, "VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Washington, D.C.," but this month I received a letter with the envelope addressed only to "U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C." For faster processing, I urge constituents to at least put my name on the envelope. My address is 1421 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C. Remember, I am only as far away as your telephone. Anytime I may be of service, just phone, wire, or write.

The Right to Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian

A854

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 21

(Mich.) Daily Telegram of January 9, 1963.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

An editorial yesterday commented on the unusual news conference conducted by Defense Secretary McNamara to quiet uneasiness about the arms situation in Cuba. Ever since the Kennedy administration admitted it had "managed" some aspects of the news about the Cuban crisis, there have been disquieting rumors of a new Soviet buildup in Cuba. The upshot was that the Defense Secretary told us a great deal the other day about what our Government knows about Cuba and how it got the information. And he remarked that by so doing he may have put some handicaps on the future intelligence activities.

If that be so, the responsibility goes back to the Government and its "managed news" policy. Obviously in times of national crisis the Government cannot tell all it knows. Some information has to be restricted. But this can be done without limiting the information about their Government that the people need to know, have the right to have. For in the successful operation of democratic government the people's right to know is basic. When they do not know what the Government is doing and why, they are uneasy. Confidence in the Government wanes, may even be destroyed.

These observations apply to the local scene. There has been a spirited discussion of the arrangement whereby the Madison Township Fire Department is to take over the furnishing of fire protection to Adrian Township. Some Adrian Township residents are expressing misgivings, publicly and privately. Some are content with the fire protection contract.

But this point stands out: the Adrian Township Board did what it decided was the best thing to do, and most of the people in the township did not know what was going on. The township board presented its constituency with an accomplished fact, the township's own fire department is to be dissolved and the services of the Madison department obtained on a contract basis. Whatever the merits of the new arrangement; whatever the good reasons for making it, these were never presented to the people while the board was making the decision.

In other words, the people did not know. And that in essence is what the squabble is all about. The Adrian Township Board's big mistake was its neglect to let its people know what it proposed doing and why.

Administration Wrong Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs a Cuban exile leader testified yesterday that he had hard evidence that there may be as many as 30,000 to 35,000 Russian troops in Cuba today, not the 17,000 as the administration states. Dr. Manuel deVarona revealed this as indicated in the story in the Washington Evening Star, yesterday:

NEARLY 30,000 RUSSIAN TROOPS IN CUBA, REFUGEE SAYS—ONLY JOINT ACTION LED BY UNITED STATES CAN FREE ISLAND, DEVARONA SAYS

A Cuban exile leader said today that he had hard evidence that there may be as many as 30,000 to 35,000 Russian troops in Cuba today, not 17,000 as the Kennedy administration says.

Dr. Manuel deVarona, speaking through an interpreter, at first said he had received reports on 30,000 to 35,000 Soviet troops there. He testified before a House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee which is inquiring into Cuban subversion in Latin America.

Questioned further by Representative FARSTEIN, Democrat, of New York, Dr. deVarona said he would make the definite statement that there were more than 17,000 and as many as 30,000.

QUESTION REFUGEES

He said his group questions all refugees coming from Cuba and that there are 5,000 Russian troops in his own province of Camaguey alone.

"The Russians are seen everywhere, in the cities, in the country, at concentration camps," he said through the interpreter, Dr. Nester Carbonell.

In a statement read to the subcommittee by Dr. Carbonell, Dr. deVarona said "only joint military action from abroad, under the leadership of the United States, can liberate Cuba and restore peace to the hemisphere."

In a "supplement" also read to the group, however, he said a naval and air blockade should be imposed on Cuba first, "adequate military assistance" sent to freedom fighters on the island and abroad, with "collective armed action" against Cuba only as a third step "if needed."

ACT THROUGH OAS

Questioned further on the matter, Dr. deVarona said he felt such action should be taken through the Organization of American States, but that if all else fails, the United States has an inherent right of unilateral self-defense and should exercise it.

He emphasized military action only "if necessary," seeming to soften the previous statement.

He said his refugee group has no information that Russian troops have been used to put down any uprisings of Cuban people against Fidel Castro "as yet." He estimated 15 percent of the Cuban people remain loyal to Castro.

Dr. deVarona, who was president of the Cuban Senate in 1950-52, said his son and two brothers took part in the Bay of Pigs invasion.

In one of his "supplements," the Cuban exile said "well-informed sources in Vienna" reported Russia has established secret bases in two Latin American countries, one in the jungles of northwest Brazil and the other in a mountain region of Paraguay.

DIFFICULT TO REACH

Representative MAILLIARD, Republican, of California, said he assumed the countries involved would be aware of this and "I would think the establishment of a military base on someone else's territory would be an act of war."

Dr. deVarona said the reported bases were very difficult to reach and that may be the reason no action has been taken.

Dr. deVarona said the reported impending removal of several thousand Russian troops from Cuba would make little difference in its use as a base for subversion in Latin America, and that removal of all Russian troops should be forced by a blockade.

He said there was a "complete case" of Russian troops which left Havana and later

entered the country again through Santiago. He said this was reported by a White Russian who had spoken to the troops and came to the United States several weeks ago.

Asked by Representative Gross, Republican, of Iowa, if he feels the United States is "doing what we ought to do," the interpreter said, "Dr. deVarona considers that all measures that should be taken are not being taken and sees no decision that has been taken to liberate Cuba."

Miller & Rhoads and Thalhimers, of Richmond, Recognized for Public Service Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, two of the Nation's outstanding department stores, both of which happen to be located in my congressional district, have recently been honored by the National Retail Merchants Association and the Readers Digest for public service programs they have instituted. Miller & Rhoads and Thalhimers of Richmond, Va., have been recognized as semi-final winners for the role the retail industry plays in promoting a better way of life for our citizens.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the following comment on the prizewinning projects:

MILLER & RHOADS, INC.

For 10 years Miller and Rhoads have sponsored the Virginia high school forums. These programs feature outstanding students selected from high schools throughout the State together with foreign students attending school in Virginia.

Miller and Rhoads' public relations activities have always been geared to furthering the importance of good citizenship combined with a true recognition of the freedom our country enjoys.

Working with the Student Cooperative Association and Richmond and Roanoke public schools, Miller and Rhoads developed the details of the program, which has proven highly successful.

Not only do Virginia's high school students develop their basic beliefs in the workings of democracy, but the participating foreign students are able to pass along the ideas discussed in the forums when they return to their native countries.

THALHIMERS

Six years ago, Thalhimers in Richmond pioneered in a project designed to acquaint the community with scientifically correct information on the relationship between diet and good health.

This idea of nutrition forums was entirely new and the increased interest in the programs as the years go by has convinced Thalhimers that they are meeting a need in the community.

Although the idea for the forums was conceived by Thalhimers, they felt that they should have a cosponsoring group with established medical prestige, so the Virginia Council on Health and Medical Care joined the project.

1966

A835

orators have something going for them in the Cuban "mess" and in the intractability of General de Gaulle.

The truth of this should not be lost upon a man as experienced in politics as is Senator FULBRIGHT. After all, it has been only a bit more than 2 years since Candidate Kennedy was beating the bushes for votes by preaching the doctrine that the Eisenhower administration had made hash of our foreign policy and had wrecked American prestige in the process. We don't recall any complaints from Senator FULBRIGHT that Mr. Kennedy was practicing bad politics at that time. And we can't take his protests very seriously now—especially since Mr. Kennedy and not Mr. Nixon is in residence at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

KHRUSHCHEV TOSSES US A CRUMB
(By David Lawrence)

Premier Khrushchev has thrown President Kennedy and his critics a crumb—a promised withdrawal of a "few thousand" Soviet troops from Cuba. This is an unsatisfactory answer to the request of the United States that all Russian troops should leave the island and that the Soviets should give up their military base in Cuba. Leading Democrats as well as Republicans in Congress have voiced their dissatisfaction over the inadequacy of the Soviet action.

It is doubtful whether either the President or his critics will let the matter rest with a partial withdrawal of Soviet troops. For there is no way of knowing how many more Russian "civilians" or "technicians" will enter Cuba in the next few weeks to replace those who will have departed.

The congressional criticism has had its effect, however, and will continue. It is unfortunate that Under Secretary of State George Ball and some of the administration spokesmen in Congress recently chose to regard any criticism as partisan and called for bipartisanship. Actually, there has been bipartisanship among the critics. Much of what has been said in Congress in disapproval of the Cuban policy has come from Democrats. A few days ago, Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, Democrat, chairman of a subcommittee on military affairs, expressed the opinion that the criticism had been helpful and that the investigation of our Cuban policy undertaken by his subcommittee "will give strength to the President—and Khrushchev will realize it."

After the announcement of the coming withdrawal of a portion of the Soviet army in Cuba, Senator STENNIS, in a statement, said: "Even though this is an encouraging step, it is only one step. Our policy must be an insistence that they all be withdrawn. This is the only thing that will really remove the menace."

Other Senators in both parties—RUSSELL, of Georgia; LAUSCHE, of Ohio; SMATHERS, of Florida; MANSFIELD, of Montana, all Democrats; and DIRKSEN, of Illinois; AIKEN, of Vermont, and GOLDWATER, of Arizona, Republicans—echoed the same sentiment.

There are currently, of course, some partisans among the critics. These Republicans seem to have learned a lesson from the Democrats, who managed to make Cuba an issue in the 1960 presidential campaign. Those criticisms may have swung enough votes to be a factor in the close race that Mr. Kennedy won over Mr. Nixon. The Democratic presidential nominee's words, therefore, are being reread by some of the Republicans as a lesson in how to succeed in campaigning without really trying to be nonpartisan. Mr. Kennedy, for example, had this to say in a speech at Johnstown, Pa., on October 15, 1960:

"For the transformation of Cuba into a Communist base of operations a few minutes from our coast—by jet plane, missile, or submarine—is an incredibly dangerous de-

velopment to have been permitted by our Republican policymakers.

"This wouldn't have happened under Franklin Roosevelt, who warned the Nazis in 1940 to stay out of our hemisphere; this wouldn't have happened under Harry Truman, who warned the Communists in 1947 to stay out of Greece and Turkey."

In another speech, the Democratic candidate included Cuba in six key areas in the world in which he charged that the administration was "reacting too late." He repeatedly declared that American prestige was very low. There were speeches about the alleged "missile gap," and Mr. Kennedy often referred to surveys which, he said, showed that a majority of the people in several countries believed the Soviet Union was "ahead of us militarily and scientifically."

Even the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, whose chairman was Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, Democrat, issued a report on June 28, 1960, criticizing President Eisenhower for having used the U-2 surveillance planes. The committee claimed it didn't have all the information it needed, but then said anyhow: "The development, publication, examination and discussion of information such as this, it seems to the committee, is essential to the democratic process. When carried on responsibly, it can only produce beneficial results, even at critical moments in our foreign affairs. Only through a public airing of the facts can a representative government be held to proper account and its mistakes, if any, identified and corrected."

Many Republicans who in recent weeks have reexamined that paragraph in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee report took it to heart and tried to "air the facts" so as to "produce beneficial results." But Senator FULBRIGHT, nevertheless, has just denounced the Republicans as partisan. The truth is that in the Democratic Party several of the critics have been more severe in the castigation of the Kennedy administration's foreign policy than the Republicans have been.

Maybe if the bipartisan critics keep up their "airing of the facts" they will persuade Premier Khrushchev that American public opinion isn't satisfied with the continuance of a Soviet military base in Cuba and is demanding that it be abolished without further delay.

Critique of the President's Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for the RECORD a paper written by Jim Calland, age 14, a student at University High School in Columbus, Ohio. This young man displays a keen insight on one of the key issues facing this session of Congress, and it certainly is worthy of the attention of the Members. The paper follows:

CRITIQUE OF THE PRESIDENT'S TAX CUT

(By Jim Calland, University High School, Columbus, Ohio)

I am opposed to the tax cut as proposed by the President in his state of the Union message on which he has elaborated in subsequent addresses. If I may paraphrase Samuel Gompers: Economically it is un-

sound, socially it is wrong, industrially it is an impossibility.

The economic logic behind this says the tax cut will serve as a stimulus to the economy. People will keep more money and will, therefore, be encouraged to spend more money. We will move forward economically. The gross national product will become greater. The Federal Government will receive a smaller percentage of your paycheck, but you will be encouraged to spend more and thus stimulate the economy. The administration hopes to make up the loss in personal income tax with an increased revenue in business taxes.

Let us suppose that Mr. Kennedy is clairvoyant. Let us assume that he had psychic powers and can adequately predict the economic future of 180 million Americans. We shall say that all he has foretold is the gospel truth. Is it the whole truth?

Increased spending with a decreased income is not economically sound. Yes, the administration says, there will be a temporary deficit, but it will ultimately be offset by the increased future revenue. What is this increased future revenue?

If we accept Mr. Kennedy's extrasensory perception, we must assume that there will be a numerical increase in the tax revenue as predicted. There will be a greater number of dollars coming into the Government. This would be all right if the value of the dollar remained fixed, but it does not. What happens is this: Government places its interest-bearing I O U's in the commercial banking systems and receives in return "deposits" which become new money as the Government writes checks against them.

This new unearned money gets its value by diluting the value of all existing money. This new kind of money is not only as bad as greenbacks, it is worse, because (1) it bears interest, and (2) it must be paid back. We have created two additional tax burdens. The first of these is the tax money that is needed each year to pay the interest on the debt. The second burden (still to come) will be the taxes that will have to be collected to pay off the debt. For the tax cut to even bring in an increased amount of revenue, there must be extravagant spending on the part of a good many people.

Let's consider a young couple who have no faith in the long-term future, because the money is not sound, has no intrinsic value, and they rightly expect it to continue to depreciate. There is no use to save money just to see it lose its purchasing power. They begin to think of living for the thrills of the moment, of spending their money almost as fast as they earn it. This encourages the weakening of character. If they cannot win by integrity, honesty, and perseverance, they are tempted to take short cuts. Throughout history, periods of moral disintegration have followed the debasement of the monetary unit.

I am reminded of the words of Abraham Lincoln: "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift."

Then there is the idea that this tax cut will help business and industry: This quaint notion is nothing but a fairy tale.

To fully understand the effect of inflation on just the steel industry. Let's consider a 1940 steel plant that cost \$25 million. Today the plant has been written off and the company has in reserve the allowed depreciation, \$25 million. But now the new plant will cost \$60 million. This means that an additional \$35 million will have to come from somewhere and that somewhere should be earnings. Because earnings are taxed 52 percent by the Government, the company would have to earn an extra \$73 million in order to get the \$35 million needed for the new plant. If earnings before taxes are 10 percent of sales, the company would have to

sell an extra \$730 million worth of steel to get the extra \$35 million.

True, the taxes will be cut, but inflation, as outlined previously, is worse than paying high taxes.

What will the fate of America be? Will Congress pass this tax cut? If we let this happen and if we let the trend continue unrestrained, the United States can become a second-rate Nation.

As Thomas Jefferson has said: "To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude."

Why Let Red Troops Remain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Thursday, February 14, 1963:

WHY LET RED TROOPS REMAIN?

President Kennedy and his top advisers are a timorous lot or they are incompetent as heads of our Government.

There are valid grounds for the administration to insist upon the immediate withdrawal of Russian troops from Cuba. Insistence on the return of Soviet soldiers to Russia rests on the basis of Khrushchev's promises made at the time of the crisis last year.

If President Kennedy had the slightest perception of the soundness and validity of our position, plus a real determination to act, he would have informed Khrushchev long ago that the United States will not tolerate a Soviet base in Cuba or elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere.

The American people will not quit criticizing President Kennedy's uncertain and hesitating course in the Cuban situation.

The administration's attempt to quiet their fears and anxieties by television addresses failed to restore popular faith in a promise to prevent the Soviet Union from making Cuba a base for Communist aggression and terrorism in this hemisphere.

As long as Russians troops, military technicians and offensive weapons remain in Cuba, their presence will be a matter of serious concern to the American people.

No television speech by the President's advisers and no promise about the absence of a Russian threat will allay the apprehension of the people.

Many Americans still doubt whether the administration has given all the details of the Cuban situation to the public.

And a Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee also is unwilling to accept the argument of the Kennedy administration that the Soviet menace and threat in Cuba are gradually fading.

Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the committee said: "We are going right on. I don't see any lessening of military threat" of Russian men and equipment still in Cuba.

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, said that "Cuba is a Soviet base from which they will continue to operate for penetration of Latin America."

If Members of the Congress are concerned over the administration's failure to act, there is every reason why the American people should be disturbed.

Haiti Outlook Is Bleak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Clayton Willis entitled "Haiti Outlook Is Bleak."

The article follows:

HAITI OUTLOOK IS BLEAK

(By Clayton Willis)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI.—Haiti, that lush, tropical land of about 4 million people, is sinking into economic oblivion.

Unemployment, always high in this country with few industry-making natural resources, climbs daily. One of the reasons: few Americans come here anymore. I can report that the plush, tropical hotels that dot the mountains above this capital city, are empty. This means hundreds of thousands of American dollars are kept out of circulation and put a dent in that all important commodity—employment.

Take a look at the average yearly income of Haitians, who have the lowest standard of living in the Western Hemisphere, and it makes more sense; \$70. That's right: \$70 a year is the average guy's income in a year.

Most American tourists are scared off because the way Haitian President Francois Duvalier runs his Government. Duvalier is using many of the strongman tactics of a former neighbor who was assassinated May 30, 1961—old Dominican Dictator Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo.

Dr. Duvalier, an American-trained physician turned politician, is partly a victim of circumstances. As many politicians, he got in with the wrong people who are looting the country at will. And Duvalier, who knows his country well—he traveled it many years as a country doctor—has resorted to much of the repression technique that Trujillo mustered up to stay on top for 31 years at the opposite end of this island of Hispaniola.

One Duvalier slogan he knows how to use well. He, Duvalier, says he's a man of the people. To Haitians, who have a color question of their own, this means that he is not of the mulatto group, a minority here, which historically has controlled the politics and the economics of the country.

So, Haiti, with its long history of dictatorships and crippling illiteracy—about 10 percent can read and write—is in a bad way as far as Uncle Sam is concerned. Broke as Haiti is, the U.S. Government isn't expected to give Duvalier much of a boost in the few million dollars it supplies the French- and Creole-speaking country. As President Kennedy recently said in Bogota, Colombia, the United States is committed against aiding Latin American dictators. In fact, American businessmen in Haiti told me it's obvious Washington is trying to squeeze out Duvalier.

Meanwhile, a few token projects to improve the lot of the Haitian people go on. One, the construction of a town 30 minutes drive north of here is an example of President Duvalier's grandest effort to leave a

monument to himself. Named Duvalier-Ville, it is growing at a snail's pace because hapless Dr. Duvalier is having trouble financing it. And American businessmen in Haiti told me they aren't having much part of answer to his predicament.

Give him a fat payoff (one said he was asked for \$50,000 and refused to pay it) to build the town; and, of course, in so doing, line the pockets of Government hangers-on.

Maybe the most embarrassing note of all to Duvalier: the huge Peligre Dam has been built 75 miles' drive from this city. It was supposed to supply badly needed hydroelectric power which, it is thought, would attract American industry. But, Duvalier doesn't have the money to buy the generators.

One big hope on the economic horizon: Pan American World Airways is putting up about \$600,000 to build a jet airport 10 minutes' drive from this capital city. And, a bright spot on the health scene: Dr. William Larimer Mellon, a courageous, dedicated member of one of America's great industrial families, is doing wonders with his Albert Schweitzer Hospital.

Mellon opened the 50-bed hospital in 1956 some 85 miles from Port-au-Prince, and has since increased it to 120 beds. He was the first nonvoodoo witch doctor in the densely populated and poverty-ridden Artibonite Valley.

When newly sworn-in American Ambassador Raymond L. Thurston reaches Port-au-Prince January 6, he will have one of the toughest assignments in the Caribbean. Among the problems he will find confronting Haiti is that of Communist agents. They are already busy planting the seeds of revolution in Haiti's sun-parched soil.

Washington Interference in State Tax Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture, which has added more than 17,000 employees since January 1961, has decided that among its other futile efforts, it should put some of its employees to work making a survey, at taxpayer expense, of seven Midwestern States, and has come up with the recommendation that they depend more on State general sales and income taxes than on property taxes for their revenues.

The spectacle of the Agriculture Department, with its warehouses groaning with surplus commodities, spending \$7 billion a year and still producing lower general farm incomes, telling solvent States like Nebraska and South Dakota how to handle their tax money, borders on the fantastic.

Who asked for this survey in Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Colorado?

My colleague, Representative RALPH BEERMANN, Republican, of Nebraska, commented:

Washington bureaucrats have shown no great talent for managing the Federal finances. The economic planners in Washington at this time have the United States in

1963

3. Modifying the unemployment compensation system in the States to encourage retraining. Presently well over half of our States penalize the unemployed worker who seeks retraining by counting him as no longer unemployed when he starts a retraining program. Thus the individual is faced with a dilemma; if he takes the retraining course which may be his only way of getting a new job, his means of support is taken away from him; on the other hand, if he clings to the assistance he is receiving, he may be guaranteeing that he will never develop a marketable skill. Nineteen States and the District of Columbia have taken a different tack, however. Recognizing the problem of obsolete skills they will permit an unemployed worker to remain on the unemployment compensation list while he is in training for a new skill. A further common provision is that the individual may even reject a bona fide job offer and not lose his compensation payments so long as he is in training. I might suggest that a further step should be considered, taking those with obsolete skills off the unemployment compensation lists if they refuse to undertake a retraining program.

Finally, I hope at long last students of this subject will begin to look with a critical eye at our military draft law and the training and retraining they are engaged in. The military services constantly complain and with justification, that the business sector is constantly taking away the men they spend years in training. Certainly it is true that the biggest vocational educational programs being conducted today are the ones conducted by our Military Establishments. Frankly, I think a much better job could be done for the services through the civilian educational sector. But I am primarily concerned about the impact of the draft law upon motivation and education and training our entire youth. The draft law is up for revision this year. If the past is any guide, no one from the field of education will appear before the congressional committees to discuss its impact upon education and training. I will again testify however. I am convinced that the draft law has become a faulty crutch upon which the military rely to procure their personnel. They run a costly operation as the turnover of their personnel reveals. With a careful recruitment program, they could get all the personnel they need and they would be more apt to retain their youths and so cut down on the costly turnover rate. Certainly the removal of the sword of Damocles from over the heads of the youth of our country will result in a much better training and education for the whole society, particularly in these times of great need coming from great change.

Another Dubious First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Arlington (Minn.) Enterprise regards the new recordbreaking budget, particularly the sharp rise in nondefense spending, as a dubious distinction. Editor Louis Kill says it so well that I have requested it be placed in the RECORD for to see:

ANOTHER DUBIOUS FIRST

Besides submitting the biggest budget in history, the administration has rung up

another dubious distinction. It is far ahead of schedule since even the most extravagant predictions for budgetary growth—made less than a year ago—did not have the budget reaching the \$100 billion neighborhood until 1967.

The most disheartening and danger-ridden aspect of the \$98.8 billion budget for fiscal 1964, however, is the continuance of the sharp rise in nondefense spending requests. The latter accounts for \$43.4 billion which is deplorably close to the \$55.4 billion sought for national defense.

A comparison with the previous budgetary high, the \$98 billion of the 1944 wartime year, graphically demonstrates the way in which nondefense spending has soared. In that year \$81 billion went for defense and only \$17 billion for nondefense expenditures.

It is to be hoped that the great majority of Americans will not, repeat, will not get over their shock at the size of the budget without importuning their legislative representatives in Washington to apply some sharp cuts in the nondefense spending area.

Kennedy as Candidate and Kennedy as President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, during the presidential campaign of 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy was quite vocal and positive about the measures necessary to insure the removal of Castro from this hemisphere. The following is what he said at Johnstown, Pa., on October 15, 1960:

Only if we are strong as a nation—strong economically, strong militarily, strong educationally, strong in heart and purpose—can we assure our peace and security in an age where our enemies are overtaking us in missile power, are far surpassing us in broadcasts abroad, have penetrated for the first time into the Middle East and Africa, have outshone our efforts in science and space, and have rolled the Iron Curtain to 90 miles from our shores onto the once friendly island of Cuba.

Mr. Nixon hasn't mentioned Cuba very prominently in this campaign. He talks about standing firm in Berlin, standing firm in the Far East, standing up to Khrushchev, but he never mentions standing firm in Cuba—and if you can't stand up to Castro how can you be expected to stand up to Khrushchev?

Earlier this month, I reviewed the sorry story of how under our very noses, and in part as the result of our own policies, Cuba had moved from a position of good neighbor to a position of bitter enemy. We had been warned that anti-American feeling was rising, that the Communists were taking over the revolution, and that our security would be endangered by a Castro regime.

Mr. Nixon had been to Cuba on one of his famous trips. But Mr. Mikoyan has also been to Cuba. And while Mr. Nixon impressed the Cuban dictator, Batista, who has since been deposed, Mr. Mikoyan impressed Castro and others now in control of the Cuban Government. Mr. Nixon calls his trip experience. But the American people cannot afford many more such experiences.

For the transformation of Cuba into a Communist base of operations a few minutes

from our coast—by jet plane, missile, or submarine—is an incredibly dangerous development to have been permitted by our Republican policy makers. Havana, once a city bursting with admiration for Franklin Roosevelt, the good neighbor, is now a center of Communist press, propaganda, and broadcasts spreading anti-Yankee sentiment throughout Latin America. New groups of revolutionaries are being trained for undercover activities in other countries and the whole Western Hemisphere security system is drastically threatened.

This wouldn't have happened under Franklin Roosevelt, who warned the Nazis in 1940 to stay out of our hemisphere; this wouldn't have happened under Harry Truman who warned the Communists in 1947 to stay out of Greece and Turkey. And this would not have happened in Cuba if the Republican leadership Mr. Nixon represents had taken every step which foresight and experience should have directed them to take—in order to prevent a Communist victory only 90 miles from our shores.

I do not know how Mr. Nixon can talk of firmness in view of his party's record in Cuba. I do not know how he can talk of experience in view of his party's experience in Cuba. I do not know how he can seek the Presidency and avoid explaining what happened in this major foreign policy disaster.

But it did happen—and the question now is, What do we do about Cuba and Castro now? What can a new administration do to end this drift?

The first thing we have to do is let the Cuban people know our determination that they will someday again be free. We did not make clear to the Cubans our devotion to freedom during the brutal reign of the Batista dictatorship—and we are not making our position any clearer under the Castro dictatorship. We have no Cuban Voice of America broadcasts in Spanish at all, and only 1 hour a day in Spanish beamed in general to all Latin America. We must promptly initiate a major broadcast program for Cuba in particular, and more for the Americas in general.

Second, we must end the harassment, which this Government has carried on, of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands. While we cannot violate international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our Immigration and Justice Department authorities.

Third, we must let Mr. Castro know that we do not intend to be pushed around any longer and in particular do not intend to be pushed out of our naval base at Guantanamo, or denied fair compensation for American property he has seized.

Fourth, we must let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere—and that the Organization of American States will be given real strength and stature to resist any further Communist penetration by whatever means are necessary.

Fifth, and finally, we must strengthen the cause of freedom throughout all Latin America creating an atmosphere where liberty will flourish, and when Cuban communism will be resisted, isolated, and left to die on the vine.

One road to Havana ultimately lies through Rio and Buenos Aires and Mexico City. If the rest of Latin America is unsure of our stand on native dictators as well as Communist dictators; if they feel we are concerned only with our Soviet enemies and not their enemies of poverty, hunger, and disease, if they feel we respond not to their requests but only to Mr. Castro's threats, then the same policies of drift and neglect that preceded Castro's rise to power will continue to weaken our influence and prestige.

A834

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 21

We cannot write the Cuban people off as lost. Neither should we drive them inextricably into Soviet hands. But let us make the American Revolution the chief import of Latin America, not the Cuban revolution. And if we do so then someday on the island of Cuba itself, there will be a government constituted to secure the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Either Senator Kennedy then did not know what he was talking about or he deliberately deceived the American people for his own personal, political campaign gains.

In a presidential press conference on February 7, 1963, the following question was propounded and this amazing answer given:

HOPEFUL FOR A FREE CUBA

Question. Mr. President, what chances do you think or do you believe there are of eliminating communism in Cuba within your term?

The President. I couldn't make any prediction about the elimination. I am quite obviously hopeful it can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens. There are a lot of unpleasant situations in the world today. China is one. It is unfortunate that communism was permitted to come into Cuba. It has been a problem in the last 5 years. We don't know what is going to happen internally. There is no obviously easy solution as to how the Communist movement will be removed. One way, of course, would be by the Cubans themselves, though that is very difficult, given the police setup.

The other way would be by external action. But that is war and we should not regard that as a cheap or easy way to accomplish what we wish. We live with a lot of dangerous situations all over the world. Berlin is one. There are many others. And we live with a good deal of hazard all around the world and have for 15 years. I cannot set down any time in which I can clearly see the end to the Castro regime. I believe it is going to come, but I couldn't possibly give a time limit.

The shocking answer is an undeniable indication that President Kennedy does not know what to do about Cuba. Is it any wonder that our Latin American friends are thinking of the United States as a weakling when it comes to taking any action? If international communism can send military help thousands of miles to maintain its beachhead of destruction in Cuba, why is it that the United States refuses to send military aid to the patriots of freedom only 90 miles from our shores?

Insulting Our Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to invite the attention of Members of the House and other interested persons to an editorial entitled "Insulting Our Intelligence," written by A. Monroe Courtright,

the very able editor of the Westerville Public Opinion. The editorial follows:

INSULTING OUR INTELLIGENCE

(By A. Monroe Courtright)

I dunno—did you get the same reaction I did as Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara put on his television show last week and tried to downgrade the Communist menace now in Cuba?

As he talked and presented his excellent photographs showing how the missile sites had been destroyed since the crisis last October, I noted that each photo's description was ended with the phrase that told us we were not to worry about anything at this particular location.

Why does President Kennedy and his bunch of starry-eyed advisers continue to play the American people for a bunch of suckers and morons?

No intelligent American would disagree with the President's statement that we should not fear an invasion or attack from Cuba by Communist forces. Why then, take great trouble to put such a premise to rest and completely ignore that a Communist base in this hemisphere is of great potential danger to most all South American countries, and when each one falls to communism, our own position becomes that much more vulnerable.

Why try to whitewash the picture and make it appear otherwise?

Only a few weeks back Robert Kennedy, the President's brother who handles the Justice Department along with helping to run our entire Government, stated in a speech that "U.S. aircover was never promised for the Bay of Pigs invasion." The President himself affirmed what Brother Bobby said was right.

And so it was. No intelligent American who had read anything about the Bay of Pigs ever did say that U.S. aircover was promised to the invaders. What was promised was an airstrike by B-26 planes belonging to the invaders (not U.S. planes), but on that fateful Tuesday morning, President Kennedy himself called off the strike.

Why? No high Government official denies that the President called off the strike and to this day, no explanation has been given. Instead, platitudinous remarks are made and we are expected to believe them.

However, the most important doubt that kept popping up in my mind during McNamara's whitewashing job concerned the way the Cuban crisis was handled last October.

Is the President's memory so short that he thinks an intelligent American can forget—or overlook—the admitted fact that while a big meeting was being held in the State Department to play down the danger from Cuba, at the same time he and his Council were being briefed by Pentagon officers and being shown photographs of the missile sites in Cuba?

When newspaper reporters brought out the fact that doubletalk was going on, what should happen but that a high official named Sylvester admitted publicly that the news of the crisis had been doctored, and what is even more reprehensive in an American democracy, stated flatly that "managed news" had been, and would continue to be the policy.

In other words, we'll tell you what we want you to hear, whether or not it's true. If other Americans are like me, they may tell me what they want me to hear, but they can't make me believe it.

And this is what bugs me about McNamara's TV appearance. Government officials lied—and admitted they lied—last October.

By what logic do they expect us to believe

what we heard from the Secretary of Defense last week? Especially when all of the evidence indicates that he is being used as a part of the big lie too.

When President Kennedy was elected I wasn't too upset about the change in administration, and, in fact, felt at the time that his enthusiasm and earnestness might be good for our country. Now I'm not only sure that I was wrong—I'm downright scared.

I'm scared because he has surrounded himself with theorists and incompetent advisers who are endangering the future of our country and our very existence by their bumbling and inept planning, especially in the field of foreign affairs.

And mostly of all, I'm scared because a great majority of our citizens don't seem to be concerned enough about it to want to do anything about it.

Maybe I shouldn't be scared—maybe I'm crazy.

The Shoe Is on the Other Foot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic politicians who apparently are more interested in their party than in their country are now screaming "foul," because free discussion of our policy in Cuba is being carried on. An editorial in the Washington Evening Star of February 19 and David Lawrence's article in the same paper, the evening following, repudiate the legitimacy of the synthetic and strident voices.

The pity is that when Khrushchev tosses us a crumb, our President gratefully accepts it as if the former were really offering us something. The fact of the matter is that apparently President Kennedy has made another Yalta deal with Khrushchev in which, in my opinion, he has promised the following:

First. We will not invade Cuba.
Second. We will immediately withdraw our missiles around the world.

Third. We will about-face our previously strong, Eisenhower administration position on nuclear testing.

President Kennedy must bear the responsibility for these tragic moves of appeasement.

BAD POLITICS?

In his role as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT doubtless is a qualified judge of what is good and what is bad for American foreign policy. It does not necessarily follow, however, that he also is a competent judge of what is good, or bad, politics.

The Senator from Arkansas has denounced what he calls intemperate and irresponsible Republican criticism of President Kennedy's policies with respect to Cuba and General de Gaulle. He also asserts that this kind of partisanship "is not only bad policy; it is also bad politics."

This is a familiar phrase. But its validity is open to question. It may be true that the GOP has stepped over the line which should separate partisanship from foreign policy. It is also true, however, that the Republican

carried out under the direction of David Zeaman, Ph. D., professor of psychology at the University of Connecticut, by a staff of graduate fellows and students. While the major contributions of this project so far are essentially of value to the specialist, it is hoped that in the future the results will have direct bearing on learning processes of retarded children.

Other projects undertaken by the psychological staffs are directly related to the everyday problems of institutional administration. A punchcard system collating all pertinent data with respect to a given child, including medical, social, and psychological factors, was devised at Southbury. All residents of the training school have been fully assessed, and valuable population data have thus become readily accessible. Attempts at identifying successful and unsuccessful ward personnel have been made at both schools, and a number of graduate students have completed projects relating to mental retardation under the direction of the staff.

TEACHER EDUCATION

Both Mansfield and Southbury have been serving as preferred training centers for local schools of education for many years. The Southern Connecticut State College has held many courses at Southbury, and its students have practice teaching at both institutions. During the past summers the University of Connecticut has conducted workshops for teachers in special classes at Mansfield.

The utilization of the training school facilities is not limited to classroom personnel. At present a number of psychological examiners receive practical experience at Mansfield, and the staff of the Seaside Regional Center has contributed to graduate education of guidance counselors by demonstrating group counseling through one-way vision observation and closed-circuit television demonstrations at the University of Connecticut.

SOME FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

In the past, institutions had relied on the initiative of the staff and had capitalized on their geographical location in establishing mutually beneficial programs with universities. Thus Southbury has been closely associated with Yale and Southern Connecticut State College, both in New Haven. Mansfield has worked on a cooperative basis with the nearby University of Connecticut. Research was carried out independently within the confines of each institution and without the cooperation of a central coordinating agency.

With the creation of the Office of Mental Retardation, statewide research activities will undoubtedly be undertaken in the future. The addition of the large service list of retardates available to this Office should in itself constitute a major research resource. It seems logical that research in mental retardation will follow the trend of the services. The emphasis will shift from intra-institutional population studies to investigation of children receiving services in the community. Moreover, the expansion of facilities to include regional centers will enable the staff of these agencies to reach a larger number of professionals by instituting regional seminars. The educational and research activities are therefore likely to encompass the State as a whole, and thus serve as a model organization serving a greater number of training programs and investigating the problem of mental retardation on the broadest basis.

What About a National Surveyors Week?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate this month, was an outstanding surveyor as a young man. His training as a surveyor, in fact, was viewed by many who knew him as having helped to form the strong base on which he built a career without parallel in the history of freedom.

Not so well known, I am sure, is the fact that Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we also proudly celebrate this month, was a practicing surveyor for a brief period, after he had fought in the Black Hawk War. Lincoln, who has been called "the greatest of our mighty dead," was forced to discontinue surveying and to sell his transit and other equipment through lack of patronage in the sparsely settled area in which he lived at that time.

Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, who marked out the famous Mason and Dixon Line so vital in our early history were, of course, surveyors.

An interesting article "What About a National Surveyors Week?" by Douglas A. McIntosh, himself a land surveyor, appeared in the January 1963 issue of the magazine the National Surveyor, published here in Washington by Larston D. Farrar, a man well known to many of us in Congress. This article points out that surveyors once were high in public esteem, but have not enjoyed as much prestige as members of other professions in recent years. This is not due, as the author makes clear, to any character deficiency in surveyors, or to any failure of the profession to keep pace with the march of technology or the demands of modern methods. The surveyor is more vital than ever—to everyone who buys or sells a home, a lot, a farm, or builds anything larger than a doghouse.

Mr. McIntosh suggests that surveyors have failed to bring their good works to the attention of the public they serve in a way that will reflect credit upon their profession and the thousands of fine individuals who serve in it. He also recommends methods of achieving this goal.

Because of the universal interest in surveying, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this fine article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT ABOUT A NATIONAL SURVEYORS WEEK?

(By Douglas A. McIntosh)

(Would such a promotion help to dignify the public image of the surveyor and how best could it be worked? The National Surveyor presents this thoughtful proposal, from a noted practicing surveyor, as a proj-

ect for discussion by surveyors in all sections of the Nation. Your comments—for or against—will be welcomed.)

In recent years, surveyors throughout our country have been waging an ever-intensifying battle for higher standards of education and practice. Connected with this is the subject of recognition, by the general public, of the land surveyor and his role in our modern industrial economy. A most useful means of accomplishing this recognition or awareness, I believe, would be through sponsorship of what could be called a National Surveyors Week.

This would be a week officially designated for the publicizing and promotion of surveyors and surveying, giving the public new insight into the vital role our profession plays in modern life. This type of recognition program might be most effective on a national basis, and it would work equally well on a State or regional basis. However, unless the local surveying association is well organized, this type of promotion might not work out as well on a city or county basis, as it would nationally. Many professional groups—including the engineers—have found this form of "advertising" to be both professionally and ethically acceptable and to provide an effective public awareness program.

To set up, organize, and successfully execute a State or national recognition week is a formidable job. It requires the leadership of many persons and the time and effort of many more.

There are five basic media forms which lend themselves to this type of project: first, radio; second, television; third, personal talks and appearances; fourth, printed material; and fifth, newspapers.

Each of these in turn can be broken down into specific items.

Radio: (1) Spot announcements and news items, and (2) forum or panel discussions or other public service projects.

Television: (1) Spot announcements and news items; (2) short filmed presentation between programs; and (3) forum or panel discussions or other public service projects.

Personal talks and appearances: (1) Proclamation or other official announcement by the President, Governors, mayors, or other important public or political personages; (2) invitational meetings, banquets or dinners with a program properly slanted to the purposes; (3) personal discussions and talks by members of the profession at schools, colleges, meetings, etc.; and (4) displays of maps, pictures, various surveying instruments and tools, and other surveying products, results and material in store windows, bank exhibition rooms, public buildings, etc.

Printed material: (1) Booklets, leaflets, or brochures placed in public buildings, banks, schools, colleges, etc.; (2) printing, distribution and usage of stamps for sealing letters; (3) an attempt to have a U.S. postage stamp printed in recognition of the surveyor and Surveyors' Week; (4) the overprinting of National Surveyors' Week or other slogans on envelopes and other mailing covers; and (5) printing, distribution, and usage of posters for display on bulletin boards and the like.

Newspapers: (1) Nationally syndicated news releases; (2) comments on editorial page; (3) state news; (4) local news; (5) local story on hometown surveyors.

This breakdown is by no means complete, but it does list many of the basic methods of

promotion available. Under any circumstances all promotion and promotional materials should be strictly in good taste and always professional in nature.

The financial costs of a national program are not small nor are they staggeringly high. Much of the publicity is practically free for the asking. All that is required is to take advantage of this on a State and local level, under the overall coordination and supervision of a national committee. To be successful this national committee would require the finest cooperation and chain of command that could be mustered.

Whether it be a State or National program, the majority of the cost and time spent, and the resulting benefits occur at the local level. The overall plan, basic ideas and material furnished by a State or National committee will produce no results without local application. It is the kind of project that, if it is going to be done at all, must be done well. A failure would be worse than nothing.

There is no question but that such a project to be successfully completed would require outside help. The arrangements, contacts, artwork, layout, printing, etc., all require both skill and time beyond that available from the average surveyor. One solution to this would be the engaging of a firm whose business is this type of promotion program.

It is, of course, self evident that to accomplish the task of bringing surveying to the public we cannot depend or rely on the work of 1 week and do nothing the other 51. The materials and ideas generated from this Surveyors' Week are easily adapted to everyday use throughout the year.

As in many things, the first one is the hardest and most expensive. Once the mold is made, it then becomes easier and less costly. This applies equally to the promotion of a National Surveyors' Week. Each successive year's promotion follows this same pattern.

It is not uncommon to select a theme or slogan to emphasize or pinpoint a particular item. Each year's theme should be different and be used in a preplanned logical pattern.

Abraham Lincoln said, "You can fool some of the people all of the time and all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time." By bringing surveying to the public we are increasing our exposure to more praise and criticism. This, in turn, increases our responsibilities. If we, as surveyors, cannot assume this new status, which we ourselves have created, then we will find that we are caught in the political and economical process of self-made self-extinction. We will have become guilty of trying to fool all of the people all of the time, ourselves included. Status and respect are not self-proclaimed virtues, but are bestowed upon us by others for what we are.

If such a week is to be considered on a national basis, the only organization now capable of this is the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping. At the annual meeting of the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping in Washington, D.C., in March, this proposal could be discussed and perhaps a national committee formed to prepare a report as to whether the congress would wish to undertake such a project, and if so, a plan of organization and accomplishment. If they should decide not to undertake the project, this committee report would still be most useful to State or local groups who might wish to consider such a program.

The Birch Society Aim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the Anaheim (Calif.) Bulletin, Tuesday, February 12, 1963. This editorial deals with the aims and goals of the John Birch Society and I challenge anyone to refute the statements made in this editorial. The John Birch Society is a target for every Communist-front organization and the so-called liberals who embrace the Communist ideology, if not the conspiracy. The John Birch Society is the most damaging organization to the un-American activities of the Communist conspiracy and its 400 fronts in America.

The editorial follows:

THE BIRCH SOCIETY AIM

Whether on the National, State, county, or local scene, each time that a group of liberals find their intended programs exposed to the public, immediately they put forth the cry that "This is the result of the John Birch Society."

The John Birch Society was founded for the sole purpose of combating communism. A group of dedicated, alarmed individuals saw that the Government was allowing the processes of propagandizing to alter the attitudes of the general public to accept a status of coexistence, tolerance, and actual submission to Russia. They found that pro-Communists had infiltrated the very top echelons of the Federal Government, mainly in the State Department, and that the actions and desires of the elected officials were not effective in controlling the policies of the Nation.

Through the founding of the Birch Society information, plans, strategy, legislation, and those persons responsible for the takeover became known to the general public. Through the medium of information and education the great powerful middle class were made aware of the ultimate designs of this minority group. They found that under the guise of socialism the United States was being transformed into a dictatorial government dedicated to one worldism and federalism that would be dominated by Russian action in such organizations as the United Nations.

Through the society these persons were informed as to effective action that they as individuals could take that would disrupt and destroy the takeover program. They became informed on the extent of the progress of the communism-socialism activities in all phases of life including the programs for churches, schools, city, county, State, and Federal Government. The educational program has proven highly successful in combating the liberal socialist.

It is natural that the liberals would attempt to destroy their enemy and their one main recourse would be to smear, discredit, and destroy the confidences the people were

placing in the reports and actions of the John Birch Society.

The Birch Society has grown, its membership increases due to the authenticity of their reports and the continual proving of the intent of the liberal-Socialist-Communists. They have but one purpose, that of repulsing Communist aggression within the Nation and this would include repulsing this danger in any phase or within any facet of life within the Nation.

Regardless of the smears and discrediting, no court or no investigation has found the John Birch Society established for any other reason.

Auto file
The U.N.: Wrong About Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, atop the editorial columns of Newsday is the following quotation from Proverbs 29: 18.

Where there is no vision, the people perish.

Vision, always clearer in the bright light of the facts, came to Newsday, I am happy to say, in its lead, full-page length editorial of February 19 entitled "The U.N.: Wrong About Cuba."

The editorial follows rather closely, I am also glad to observe, the general outline of facts which I have been providing to Newsday and its readers for a long time.

A staunch defender, nearly always of the United Nations and openly friendly to this administration, Newsday admirably stated in one paragraph of the editorial the undeniable fact that—

The people of the United States are sick of having a foreign base, whether used for espionage, subversion or masked aggression, just 90 miles off their shore. They regard a Communist Cuba as an insult to our national dignity and an armed Cuba as a positive danger.

Well said.

Newsday says that for the United Nations to be spending \$1,100,000 on an agricultural research station in Cuba "comes as a slap in the face to the United States."

Again, well said.

Then this:

Thus, once again, and to its own damage, the administration has given substance to the fears expressed—not by confirming suspicions of hidden missiles and aggressive Russian intentions in Cuba—but by indicating that its left hand knoweth not what the right hand doeth.

I am unwilling to agree with all of that paragraph, but I certainly do agree that this administration demonstrated—as it does time and again, day after day—that its left hand knoweth not what its right hand doeth.

And, I certainly agree with the obvious answer to the question put by the last sentence of Newsday's editorial. It asks:

Exactly how can we draw Castro's fangs when the U.N. and some of our responsible officers, are willing to go along with so outrageous a grant of funds?

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Newsday for having seen the light in this matter. It is a matter of some pride with me that I have been casting the light of these facts at Long Island and the Nation for a long, long time.

The full text of the Newsday editorial follows with one paragraph deleted under the rules:

THE U.N.: WRONG ABOUT CUBA

This Nation has faithfully supported the United Nations since its inception; in fact, the United States was the creator of the noble concept of a world parliament. When the Russians repeatedly sought to wreck the U.N. it was the United States that forestalled the disaster. We have loaned money to keep it afloat; we have faithfully paid our assessments when Iron Curtain countries have wretched or delayed. In every respect we have displayed our dedication to this organization.

It thus comes as a slap in the face to find the U.N. preparing to spend \$1,100,000 on an agricultural research station in Cuba. For Cuba is our enemy, and by its very nature a dedicated enemy of the peaceful purposes for which the U.N. was founded in 1945. The sum of money involved is perhaps trivial, but by providing it the U.N. is lending its prestige to Fidel Castro, who seeks through subversion and violence to alienate all Latin America and to divide in two the Western Hemisphere.

The money is to come from the U.N. Special Fund, to which the U.S. contributes 40 percent of the total annually. The director of this fund is a fine citizen of the United States, Paul G. Hoffman, but in going along with this grant he is acting with the utmost shortsightedness. He defends it on the ground that only foreign currency and no American money as such will be used to carry out the 5-year project. But of course it is the American contributions that permit this subterfuge to be indulged in. And, as might be expected, Cuba has never even met its \$55,000 per year commitment to the Special Fund.

The administration has not covered itself with glory in this sequence of events. The President at his press conference last Thursday swallowed and recited the no-American-money excuse. Other sources have explained that this is a voluntary project, and that each country may specify how its contributions are to be used. Congress, including many Democrats, is infuriated and justly so.

House Speaker JOHN McCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, rarely makes a public comment, but in this instance he expressed some views with which we agree:

"I feel the action as unwise, particularly in light of the situation that exists."

The people of the United States are sick of having a foreign base, whether used for espionage, subversion, or masked aggression, just 90 miles off their shore. They regard a Communist Cuba as an insult to our national dignity and an armed Cuba as a positive danger.

In fact while the administration was defending the U.N. grant, one of its own spokesmen was warning of violence to come. Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, has told a House subcommittee:

"The Castro regime has shifted the em-

phasis of its campaign in Latin America to one of open encouragement of terror as a principal weapon." This has been evidenced by the outbreaks within Venezuela, designed to prevent President Romulo Betancourt from visiting the United States—which did not. It had been further underlined by the hijacking of a Venezuelan freighter and its delivery to Brazilian waters. The Venezuelans of course will get the freighter back, but plainly Castro through such tactics hopes to stir up revolutionists in other countries, and so to disrupt Venezuelan life that the Betancourt government will fall.

Under such circumstances, it is essential that the United States sternly remind the U.N. of the things we have done for that agency, and seek the same support we received at the time of the Korean crisis. Then the U.N. was with us; now the U.N. is apparently in the clouds, neglectful of past obligations.

Cuba as a site for IRBM's may have had its teeth drawn, but Cuba still packs a lot of power as a disruptive force in this hemisphere. Exactly how can we draw Castro's fangs when the U.N. and some of our own responsible officers, are willing to go along with so outrageous a grant of funds?

"John and Martha Turnipseed Sez"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are in the so-called atomic age which seems to imply that we move at a rapid pace in all directions, and in all that we do. While it is well to keep abreast with the changing times, we must not lose the homespun faculty of realizing that it is the little things in life that mean so much. Let us not find that one day a quick pull on our bootstraps will awaken us to the realization that we do not know where we have been. This philosophy is so well expressed in the column "John Turnipseed" of the January 1963, issue of the *Prairie Farmer*, I commend it for your reading.

The column is as follows:

JOHN NOTES THAT UNCLE SAM'S BOYS ARE GETTING PESTIFEROUS

We Turnipseeds ain't had much to do with the Federal Gov'ment, what with us bein' half-retired an' livin' mostly on what we was able to put away in better times, but it sure seems like Uncle Sam has been pesterin' us in most every mall this past month.

It 'pears like he must hev a million clerks to keep busy, an' they all put in their time tryin' to figger how they kin bother John Q. Citizen. Mebbe they should listen to the advice of the wise old lady to the new bride: If the time come when you think you got to kill off your husband, get it over with in a hurry, don't peck him to death.

Well, Uncle Sam's boys in Washington is sure peckin'. I don't do much business with our farm co-op these days on account of I don't farm much, so my patronage refund check which come in the mail the other day was jest \$17.84. But what do you know. When I cash my check I got to put my social security number on it on account of the Gov'ment is afraid mebbe I will try to cheat.

Now I am an old hand at turnin' the other cheek, so I didn't let it bother me too much, but a few days later I come home from town an' found my wife Martha sputterin' like a drop of water on a hot stove.

It so happens Martha owns a few shares of stock in her own name, jest enuf to make her a small capitalist, but not enuf to make us rich like some people in Washington I could mention. She got a dividend of \$25 an' with it come a notice from the company to right away send in her social security number so they kin report her income to the Gov'ment by number. If she ain't got a number, go git one right away.

Turnipseed, Martha sez, glarin' at me like I was responsible, you're a citizen, why don't you do something about this outrageous monkey business.

Them people in Washington, she sez, are gettin' so persnickety about us ordinary folks, purty soon they will insist every last person has got to wear a license number like a car. They will tattoo it on you front and back so they kin ketch you comin' an' goin'. When they got it tattooed on your behind they will pass a law that you got to go around with your rear bare so it will show, or mebbe it will be bare anyway because they got all your clothes money.

I don't know when I hev seen Martha so mad. The picture in my mind of people runnin' around with a license number tattooed on their rear end was so funny I started to laugh but that was the wrong thing to do. Instead of arguin' I decided this was a good time to go out an' clean the henhouse.

President Kennedy's Shameless Political Blackjacking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is a great talker about how we must have higher education of our youth. According to yesterday's *Washington Evening Star*, in a copy-righted article by Joseph Young, it appears that a young citizen today does not need education to get along in this world. He just has to be a Democrat.

The White House has now taken personal control of 10,000 temporary summer jobs for college students and the requirements will not be ability but what political leader's OK the applicant has received.

Since the parents of Republican students pay taxes which supply the salaries of these 10,000 temporary positions and since Republicans will no longer qualify for these positions, I wonder if President Kennedy is going to rebate a portion of the taxes paid by these American citizens.

It is difficult to believe that a President of the United States would do such things.

The article referred to follows:

WHITE HOUSE TO CONTROL STUDENT JOB PATRONAGE

(By Joseph Young)

The White House has taken control over the patronage of the more than 10,000 student summer jobs in Government.

A830

At a White House meeting last week, which was held without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, some of President Kennedy's aids met with the political appointees of various agencies who are involved in patronage work.

A clearance system was set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House.

The State from which the student hails, plus the college he is attending (if any), will be included in the information sent to the White House.

WASHINGTON JOBS

The jobs mainly are in Washington and last from June through August.

Mrs. Dorothy Davies, a White House staff assistant, who was in charge of the meeting, said the purpose of the new system was to assure "coordination" in order that the agencies could make best use of the students' talent.

Mrs. Davies did not deny that political patronage is one of the aims of the White House clearance system, but declared that the Kennedy administration's primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when they graduate.

Civil Service Commission officials have privately expressed dismay at the latest turn of events.

While there has always been quite a bit of personal patronage involved in summer Government jobs, applicants have had to pass civil service exams for clerical, typist, and stenographer jobs. And in the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in connection with what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

TOP YOUTHS CERTIFIED

The feeling among Government career personnel officers is that it is wrong to play politics where young people are concerned, particularly among college students who are the Government's hope for the future as far as filling key career jobs are concerned.

It's no secret that a goodly portion of the summer student jobs are filled on a personal patronage basis each year. Government officials—political and career—have hired their own sons and daughters as well as the children of friends or Members of Congress. However, the CSC has been careful to certify only the top qualifiers on the student trainee exam.

The White House job clearance system may be an effort to channel these jobs in a more political patronage area, whereby more sons and daughters of Democratic Members of Congress and key Democratic supporters and contributors may get summer jobs in Government.

Congress has shown increased interest in these summer jobs. Last year the House approved a bill to apportion these jobs on a State-by-State basis. This would have the effect of giving most of these jobs to students outside of the Washington area. However, the Senate failed to act on the bill before adjournment.

This year a half dozen bills have been introduced in Congress to achieve the same objective.

In discussing the White House job clearance system, Miss Davies said in was a move to channel the best possible talent to the places in Government where it could be used most effectively.

She said that, for example, if an agency finds that its summer job vacancies are all filled up, a place for a bright student could be found in another Government agency through a coordinated placement system set up in the White House.

Miss Davies refused to answer directly whether the program also involved political patronage, other than saying that there always has been some patronage in summer student jobs in Government.

Presumably, students still will have to pass an exam to get the summer jobs.

Last year's Government summer job program for students was given great emphasis by the administration, with President Kennedy and other top Government officials addressing the students.

Betrayal of Cotton Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unjust and inequitable problems in this country today is the two-price cotton system under which American cotton is sold to foreign textile producers at a lower price than the same cotton is made available to American textile mills. Foreign-produced textiles are flooding the domestic American market and U.S. textile mills are thrown into an impossible competitive position. Destruction of a once flourishing industry, impoverishment of the communities which depend upon cotton mills, and dispossession of thousands of American workers who look to this industry for a livelihood are the consequences.

Clearly, this problem is created by calculated Federal policies which have attempted to be all things to all people. The wreckage of an industry is being strewn along the way. There can be little doubt that a continuation of two-price cotton will also bring grave retribution upon the cotton farmer—the group the policy was originally developed to help. With the handwriting on the wall so plainly, we must return to a one-price system for American cotton. In the meantime, we must protect an American industry from further erosion resulting from Government policies. The Federal Government must stop attempting to gloss over this bad situation and address itself to the root problem—two-price cotton.

I wish to call to the attention of the Congress an editorial which appeared in the Sunday, February 17, edition of the Daily Independent of Kannapolis, N.C., which discusses this problem in thoughtful detail. The editorial is as follows:

SUAVE NEW FRONTIER SEDUCES AND BETRAYS COTTON INDUSTRY

There's a bale of cotton in the lobby of Cabarrus Bank & Trust Co. here and another in the reception room at Cannon Mills Co.'s main office.

Inappropriate places for cotton, you might say. But are they? The principal raw material used by Cannon Mills is cotton. Therefore the basis of Kannapolis' economy is cotton and the Kannapolis banks, of which Cabarrus is one, are active middlemen in the commercial operations here that flourish on that economy. It might be a good idea to give your children a look at that cotton.

The stuff might be as extinct as the steam locomotive by the time four grandchildren grow up.

The bales were placed in these prominent places to help emphasize the disparity between raw cotton costs for American mills and for their foreign competitors. This is a deadly differential, due to the United States unique system of price supports for the benefit of cottongrowers. It now amounts to \$42.50 per bale. In other words American cotton costs American mills about one-third more than American cotton costs foreign mills. This is a flagrant injustice that has already led to the loss of many American jobs and which is sure to bring about the loss of more unless the situation is corrected.

An expedient to give the cotton textile industry some relief from this unfair competitive obstacle without upsetting the grower subsidy system so dear to the hearts of vote-conscious Congressmen was proposed by the industry—through the American Textile Manufacturers Institute's cotton policy committee which is headed by C. A. Cannon, of Kannapolis. It seemed to have the blessings of the Kennedy administration, which had mouthed concern over the plight of the textile workers, but it was emasculated by the House Agriculture Committee. It will be worthless as relief to the industry and its workers in its present form.

The ATMI's executive committee Friday said it was deeply disturbed and disappointed over the committee's failure to endorse the one-price cotton proposal. It took President Kennedy to task for his failure to lend administration support to an equalization of cotton costs between American and foreign mills. Instead of supporting a clear-cut return to a one-price system, as representatives of the industry had been led to believe would be done, the administration supported a provision that would give discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture in determining a spread between the domestic and foreign price. In other words, a continuation of the present system with the price spread perhaps narrowed a little.

Gerald L. Dearing, cotton market expert for the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal, puts it a bit more forcefully, and with equal truth:

"The seduction of the cotton industry by the New Frontier ended as all such ill-advised romances end," Dearing wrote, "with betrayal and rejection."

Dearing continued: "No starry-eyed maiden taking her first step down the primrose path was filled with more hope and anticipation than was the cotton industry when it began its affair with the New Frontier.

"The industry feared the New Frontier when it came into its life. It rejected its courtship when the New Frontier sought to shower it with gifts from the public treasury in the form of higher support prices.

"But the New Frontier was wise in the way of wooing. It admitted that it was wrong, that it should not have taken the approach it had taken. It talked of reversing its approach, of undoing the wrong that it had done.

"The industry maintained faith when the promised price reduction in 1962 failed to develop, bolstered by the promise that there would be import restrictions which would make things better. Like the promise of the price cut, the import restrictions were mostly promises and little accomplishment.

"The head of the New Frontier registered indignation that the promises were not fulfilled and he made new promises.

"These included a one-price system for cotton, a revival of the industry and a revitalization of the cotton economy. The industry was enraptured at the prospect, willing to forgive and forget past deceptions. It turned against those who maintained that

Whereas the aforesaid stamps when issued were of a special or commemorative nature and therefore limited in printing which has made them now obsolete and no longer available for purchase: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Knights of Columbus through their patriotic Fourth Degree Order petition the Congress of the United States to authorize the Postmaster General to have on hand always in the post office in Washington a sufficient supply of stamps bearing the likeness of the Stars and Stripes unfurled, whether of a special issue or ordinary postage stamp issue and of a first-class rate denomination, to satisfy the just demands of patriotic groups or any individual for their use; and be it further

Resolved, That when such a program is resolved that the Postmaster General shall announce at once and thereafter at least once each ensuing year through the Department's post offices that a permanent patriotic stamp service is available upon request at the post office in Washington and/or at its philatelic sales agency in Washington.

JOHN WILLIAM MURPHY,
Navigator, Bishop B. J. Eustace General Assembly, Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus.

WILLIAM D. STILLWELL,
Master, St. Isaac Jogues Province, Second New Jersey District.

(Resolution adopted April 18, 1962, after presentation by the maker, Paul P. Zachary, an officer of the assembly.)

Ban on Foaming Detergents Backed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 2105, would wipe out one important cause of water pollution in this country by banning from interstate commerce after mid-1965 all synthetic detergents that do not meet standards of decomposability to be set by the Surgeon General. This would not require a costly, inconvenient reversion to soap as the main cleansing agent used by Americans. Rather, it would demand a switch to detergents that do decompose after use. Such decomposable detergents have already been developed in West Germany.

In addition to a great many favorable letters from citizens, private organizations and municipalities throughout the Nation, *The Day of New London, Conn.*, recently wrote this editorial in support of H.R. 2105:

BAN ON DETERGENTS

Drinking water with a head on it is no joke, though the term has been used to get and hold attention before now. Increasingly serious problems with the never-ending, sudsing qualities of various detergents now on the market for anyone to buy and use, cause this phenomenon. It has led to proposed Federal legislation.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS, a Milwaukee Democrat, has introduced a bill in the House of Representatives in Washington which would ban the sale of certain types of detergents. The reason: Even when wash water is disposed of through conventional approved city systems it eventually finds its way into rivers, lakes, and so on. And once it gets there it begins to froth all over again.

Disposal of wash water in country dry well or septic tank installations brings the eternal sudsing qualities to light even sooner. Eventual seepage of detergent-laden wash water into wells gives precisely what was first indicated—drinking water with a head on it.

The difficulty is not confined to this country. It isn't something resulting simply from chemical discoveries, applied to washing powder manufacture and trade, as concerns U.S. residents. A year from now West Germany is going to ban certain hard detergents from all further use, permitting a type which does not give this endless sudsing effect.

Law already on the books in West Germany, Representative REUSS points out, will prohibit further sale of hard detergents after December 31, 1964. Considering the fact that in some sections of the country well contamination is already a very serious problem for householders, regulation of sales of this type of soap substitute plainly is called for.

What To Do About Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy bemoans the fact that his critics on his Cuban policy do not offer a solution.

All the people of the United States want President Kennedy to do is to carry out his campaign pledge of 1960.

In Tuesday's edition of the *Washington Daily News*, an excellent editorial offers a very sensible solution which can be put into effect now, if President Kennedy has the courage to do it. In this, he would have the overwhelming support of the American people.

The editorial follows:

WHAT TO DO ABOUT CUBA

Mounting public concern over U.S. policy as to Cuba is completely misunderstood, in our opinion, by J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

And he misstates his case when he implies criticism mainly is prompted by partisan Republican motives. High-ranking Democrats also are numbered among the critics.

Senator FULBRIGHT discounts Cuba as a military threat to the United States and there isn't a great deal of argument about that. The 17,000 to 20,000 Soviet troops on the island would be overwhelmed by U.S. forces in event of armed conflict. Repeated emphasis on this military threat, or the lack of it—offensive or defensive missiles—serves merely to distract attention from the real menace of Communist Cuba.

That menace is the establishment of a hostile foreign power almost within sight of U.S. soil. It is the existence of a Communist police state within the Americas—something President Kennedy once said we would not tolerate.

We do not know why the Soviets maintain this large military force on Cuba but believe it to have two purposes: to hold over the Cuban people the threat of Soviet tanks, as in Hungary, if they try to revolt against the Castro tyranny; to train subversive agents for sabotage and revolution in the Latin American States, carrying ex-

plives and small arms, transhipped from this bustling arms depot.

This subversive campaign isn't a theory. Castro boasts of it. The effects are plain in, for instance, Venezuela where there have been Communist-led riots, dynamitings and most recently, the hijacking of a Venezuelan ship by Communist pirates. Cuba is little more than a rowboat ride from the island of Hispaniola, occupied by the bitterly misruled nation of Haiti and the Dominican Republic, the latter struggling to establish democratic rule after a long generation of vile dictatorship.

These only hint the dangers inherent in a Communist Cuba. The imminent menace extends to the militarily weak, small nations of Central America, to economically troubled Brazil—in fact to most of Latin America.

Among those urging highest priority to forcing the Soviet troops out of Cuba is JOHN STENNIS, a Democrat and head of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee investigating the Cuban military buildup.

He does not urge invasion. In our opinion few would approve that, at least at this time. But there are effective measures the administration could take, short of invasion. These call for tough economic and diplomatic sanctions to isolate Cuba, with reimposition of the blockade as a next-to-last resort.

Naturally these steps involve dangers; but doing nothing, or next to nothing, involves still worse dangers. Basically we think growing U.S. discontent is inspired by a feeling that the administration, after vigorous blockade action, has gone soft on Cuba—that it is submissive to repeated Soviet affront, that it even has relaxed the sternness of measures in preparation before the big missiles were photographed.

By one method or another this increasingly dangerous infection must be rooted out of the Americas and the longer we delay the wider it will spread.

Fino Asks for Referendum on National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release:

FINO ASKS FOR REFERENDUM ON NATIONAL LOTTERY

Congressman PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York, No. 1 advocate of a Government-run lottery to reduce taxes, today introduced a bill calling for a national referendum on the question of whether or not the Federal Government should sponsor a national lottery.

Congressman FINO, in urging a referendum on this important question, said:

"Although several nationwide polls have shown that a majority of the American people favor a Federal lottery as a means to cut taxes, fear among Members of Congress that this type of bill is a 'hot potato' has prevented legislative consideration.

"Because of this unfounded fear among my colleagues, the taxpayers in this country continue to suffer from the discriminatory and unconscionable taxes imposed upon them.

"Up until now, the voters in the United States who support this painless and voluntary form of taxation have had no direct voice on this tax relief measure.

A816

"In urging a referendum on this vital question, the American voters will be given an opportunity to express their desire with respect to a national lottery.

"I am sure that if the American people are afforded the chance, they will overwhelmingly indicate their approval of this kind of legislation. An expression of approval by a majority of the American voters will be a clear-cut mandate to the Congress to enact a national lottery.

"I urge all unhappy taxpayers to write to their Congressmen and demand full support of this bill."

Insulting Our Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more apparent each day that Americans at the grassroots level are not being duped by the gaseous diffusion which emits from Foggy Bottom, our State Department. That we are not being told the truth in the Cuban fiasco is coming to light more and more. Last fall, Russians in Cuba were technicians. Now they are plainly referred to by this administration as troops. In this maze of contradictions a free press and the American public are gradually piecing together the grand design of appeasement and stupidity which has marked the handling of the Cuban situation from the Bay of Pigs to the present time.

Mr. A. Monroe Courtright, publisher of the Public Opinion, Westerville, Ohio, has written a very sound editorial which penetrates the issue with great clarity and depth. I commend it to my colleagues:

INSULTING OUR INTELLIGENCE (By A. Monroe Courtright)

I dunno—did you get the same reaction I did as Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara put on his television show last week and tried to downgrade the Communist menace now in Cuba?

As he talked and presented his excellent photographs showing how the missile sites had been destroyed since the crisis last October, I noted that each photo's description was ended with the phrase that told us we were not to worry about anything at this particular location.

Why does President Kennedy and his bunch of starry-eyed advisers continue to play the American people for a bunch of suckers and morons?

No intelligent American would disagree with the President's statement that we should not fear an invasion or attack from Cuba by Communist forces. Why then, take great trouble to put such a premise to rest and completely ignore that a Communist base in this hemisphere is of great potential danger to most all South American countries, and when each one falls to communism, our own position becomes that much more vulnerable.

Why try to whitewash the picture and make it appear otherwise?

Only a few weeks back Robert Kennedy, the President's brother who handles the Justice Department along with helping to run our entire Government, stated in a

speech that "U.S. air cover was never promised for the Bay of Pigs invasion." The President himself affirmed what Brother Bobby said was right.

And so it was—no intelligent American who had read anything about the Bay of Pigs ever did say that U.S. air cover was promised to the invaders. What WAS promised was an air strike by B-26 planes belonging to the invaders (not U.S. planes), but on that fateful Tuesday morning, President Kennedy himself called off the strike.

Why?

No high Government official denies that the President called off the strike and to this day, no explanation has been given. Instead, platitudinous remarks are made and we are expected to believe them.

However, the most important doubt that kept popping up in my mind during McNamara's whitewashing job concerned the way the Cuban crisis was handled last October.

Is the President's memory so short that he thinks an intelligent American can forget—or overlook—the admitted fact that while a big meeting was being held in the State Department to play down the danger from Cuba, at the same time he and his Council were being briefed by Pentagon officers and being shown photographs of the missile sites in Cuba.

When newspaper reporters brought out the fact that doubletalk was going on, what should happen but that a high official named Sylvester admitted publicly that the news of the crisis had been doctored, and what is even more reprehensive in an American democracy, stated flatly that managed news had been, and would continue to be the policy.

In other words, we'll tell you what we want you to hear, whether or not it's true.

If other Americans are like me—they may tell me what they want me to hear, but they can't make me believe it.

And this is what bugs me about McNamara's TV appearance.

Government officials lied—and admitted they lied—last October.

By what logic do they expect us to believe what we heard from the Secretary of Defense last week? Especially when all of the evidence indicates that he is being used as a part of the big lie too.

When President Kennedy was elected, I wasn't too upset about the change in administration, and, in fact, felt at the time that his enthusiasm and earnestness might be good for our country. Now I'm not only sure that I was wrong—I'm downright scared.

I'm scared because he has surrounded himself with theorists and incompetent advisers who are endangering the future of our country and our very existence by their bumbling and inept planning, especially in the field of foreign affairs.

And mostly of all, I'm scared because a great majority of our citizens don't seem to be concerned enough about it to want to do anything about it.

Maybe I shouldn't be scared—maybe I'm crazy.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, if it had not been for Russian aggression in 1940 Lithuania would be celebrating this week the 45th anniversary of her independence. Instead, only those Lithuanians

no longer living in their homeland can freely celebrate this national holiday.

It was on February 16, 1918, that the little Republic declared herself free of the ancient Russian tyranny. Twenty-two years later this freedom was brutally betrayed by a new tyrant, Joseph Stalin.

Yet the memory of liberty survives in Lithuania and the other Baltic States.

Soviet propaganda asserting that these captive peoples rejoice in their slavery to Moscow fools no one.

These nations cannot be rescued from their serfdom at the cost of a third global war, for the price would be too great for humanity to pay. But they will not be forgotten in the free world. Some day, when the Communist empire has crumbled, they will be free again. In the meantime, we take every opportunity to confirm our friendship with Lithuanians everywhere and salute them for their past and future victories.

News Flow Under Pressure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of February 13, 1963:

NEWS FLOW UNDER PRESSURE

Reacting from the continuing bipartisan congressional pressure, the administration is cracking its wall of managed news and as a result Americans are gaining more and more insight into the forces that threatened the Nation several months ago and the capabilities of the men responsible for the Nation's well-being.

In a recent issue, U.S. News & World Report magazine summarized the various estimates of Soviet manpower in Cuba published by Government agencies following the period of crisis. On October 16 one Government agency noted that there were almost 5,000 men of the Soviet armed forces on the island. On November 7 that was increased from 8,000 to 13,000 men. A Government source on November 29 noted that there were 8,000 to 10,000 men in Cuba; by December 20 the figure had increased to 9,000 to 15,000 and on January 24 there were 16,000 to 17,000 Soviets on the island. Then on the February 6 Defense Department briefing, Secretary McNamara said there had been 22,000 Russian military personnel in Cuba during the November peak, but that 5,000 have left and 17,000 remain. On the same day, CIA Director McCone used the same figure.

Even as Government agencies can't seem to get together in their information policies, apparently there are personnel within the agencies who interpret information in a different light than administration policymakers. For it has been revealed that much of the information Sen. Kenneth Keating has been disclosing, both recently and before the Cuban showdown when he correctly estimated Soviet intentions, has been coming from sources within the Government and not, as was first supposed, from Cuban refugees.

Now there is new information regarding the Defense Department's knowledge of the

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A817

Cuban-Soviet missile threat. During the nationwide television briefing by Defense Department intelligence specialist John Hughes, the Government revealed that it received its first hard evidence of Soviet missile base construction on October 14. This varies with previous statements that the Government was unaware of Russian intentions until almost a week later.

Yet in a tabulation of U.S. military moves directed toward Cuba, newspaperman Fletcher Knebel writes that "As early as September, Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., head of the Tactical Air Command * * * and his staff had drafted an air offensive plan, should a Cuban airstrike be ordered. General Sweeney briefed Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, on the plan in Washington on September 26, and General LeMay ordered SAC to be battle ready by October 20. By October 10 such Air Force supplies as bombs, rockets, napalm, forklifts, frozen food lockers, folding cots and high explosive 20-millimeter ammunition began moving to Florida by plane, truck and rail. On October 15 the Air Force established a unified command post at Homestead Air Force Base, Fla."

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, for more than 120 years, from 1795 until 1917, the Lithuanian people longed for their deliverance from czarist oppression. Then they saw their long-cherished dream come true in 1918. When the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, they were free. Lithuania proclaimed its national independence on February 16, 45 years ago.

Thenceforth for more than two decades these proud Baltic people enjoyed their well-earned independence. They organized a democratic form of government, rebuilt their war-ravaged country, revived their national institutions, and made distinct advances on the social, economic, political, and cultural fronts. Their country grew prosperous and strong. Lithuania thus once more became an honored member of the free community of nations.

Unfortunately, however, the hopeful Republic thus born and reared under the care of patriotic Lithuanians was not to have a long life. In the world turmoil of the late 1930's Lithuania's independence was put in jeopardy. In the fall of 1939, she was forced into a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union, and in the summer of 1940 she was incorporated into the Soviet Empire. An independent Lithuanian Republic then ceased to exist.

Ever since the Lithuanian people have been denied freedom in their homeland. During the last war the country was under Nazi occupation for 3 years; in 1944 the equally dreaded Red Army returned, with its commissars and secret police, and there it remains to this day. The hapless Lithuanian people have been cut off from the outside and the country has been forcibly and pitifully estranged

from the free world. Such is the unhappy lot of these gallant and gifted Lithuanians. On this 45th anniversary of their Independence Day I know free people everywhere hope and pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny at the earliest possible moment.

Housing for the Elderly an Urgent Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the critical social needs in our country is adequate housing for the elderly. The Portland Housing Authority is completing a 13-story Northwest Tower Apartment which provides an important beginning in meeting the housing needs of our older citizens.

Because of the urban renewal and highway programs adequate housing for the elderly is a critical problem at this time. Highly informative hearings were held last fall in Portland by the Senate Committee on Aging. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS and I had the opportunity to view the critical needs and the progress that is being made. This new apartment building in Portland is only a beginning in meeting the need.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over housing legislation, I am particularly aware of the changes in this field. Further action is needed, not only by the Federal Government but also by State and local governments, if this problem is to be solved. Additional funds for Federal low-interest loans should be provided for cities, States, and local units of government.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the progress being made in this field in my home city of Portland, Oreg., and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Progress Refugees," which appeared in the Sunday Oregonian of February 3, 1963.

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

PROGRESS REFUGEES

One of the new buildings whose completion this year will alter the Portland skyline is the 13-story Northwest Tower, the Portland Housing Authority's project for the housing of elderly, low-income men and women.

The concrete skeleton of the half-finished building, towering over Northwest Portland, is imposing. But the fact is that it scarcely scratches the surface of the problem that prompted its erection.

The Housing Authority's general director, Gene Rossman, told a Portland audience last week that his agency already has almost 600 applications, all qualified, for residence in the building, which will accommodate only one-fourth that number.

And this is not the whole story. A recent survey by the Housing Authority revealed that three out of every four of Portland's

5,000 recipients of old age assistance live in substandard quarters. There are other thousands of oldsters living on minimum social security payments and meager income of various sorts.

Many elderly, low-income couples and individuals live in westside and near-eastside areas, where cheap housing is available within walking distance of services and entertainment. They cannot afford to live elsewhere, if for no other reason than transportation. The Portland Development Commission has found that a surprisingly large number of those displaced by the South Auditorium urban renewal project moved into quarters as near as possible to their former homes. Now, some of these have been jolted out again by the Foothills Freeway right-of-way.

There's the rub. The downtown freeways appear to covet the same neighborhoods enjoyed by the aged renter seeking a decent housekeeping room within easy reach of the stores, the theaters, the libraries and museums. It is an unequal contest, that between the highways and the old men and women. The winner is foreordained. The losers must scatter before the bulldozers, their vulnerable positions made more precarious still by the worry and expense of finding new quarters within their means.

Portland city authorities have taken some steps to help such displaced persons. But state authorities, who have at least equal responsibilities in some circumstances, apparently consider that the human problem is no part of the job of building highways. Neither the city nor the State can overlook the fact that housing for the aged is a problem in large part created by the demands of the times—demands that are altering the faces of our cities. It will not be solved by building low-rent quarters for 150 family units. For the freeway's victims alone will be counted in the thousands within the next few years.

The Numbers Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, almost weekly, there is a new estimate by the Kennedy administration of the numbers of Soviet troops in Cuba. In the February 19 issue of the Washington Daily News an article by Jim Lucas indicates that a majority of the Western Hemisphere countries have fewer men in their armed forces than the Russians have troops in Cuba. I wonder if the American people are as naive as the President of the United States when he says that most of these Russian troops are technicians or defensive.

When will this administration wake up?

HEMISPHERE ARMIES HAVE FEWER MEN THAN
REDS IN CUBA

(By Jim G. Lucas)

A majority of Western Hemisphere countries have fewer men in their armed forces than the Russians have troops in Cuba.

Early this month, CIA Director John McCone told the Senate Armed Services Committee there were 17,000 Soviet regular troops in Cuba.

A check today shows that nine hemisphere nations—Bolivia, Costa Rica (which has no

(armed forces), Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Nicaragua, Panama, and Paraguay—have fewer than 17,000 men under arms.

Seven—Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Venezuela—have more. Totals for El Salvador, Honduras, Peru, and Uruguay were not readily available.

TANKS, ETC.

Mr. McCone told Congress some Cuban-based Russians were "manning tanks and other weapons of mobilized, armed units." Others are "specialists in charge of an extensive surface-to-air missile system." Still others are in army, navy, and air force training units, he said.

The United States is deeply concerned about this. President Kennedy has asked the Russians to call their troops home. But the White House and Pentagon insist neither the Soviets nor the Cubans constitute an offensive threat to this country at the moment.

The stated mission of these 17,000 Russians is to advise, train, and equip 275,000 Cubans. Mr. McCone said Castro has 75,000 regulars, 100,000 militiamen, and 100,000 home guards. All of these are under more or less continuing mobilization, although the number on duty may vary from week to week and month to month.

This 275,000-man force gives Cuba the second most powerful military machine in the Western Hemisphere—second to the United States with our 2.6 million men in all services. Brazil is right behind Cuba with 250,000, followed by Canada with 126,000, Argentina with 105,000, Mexico with 55,200, and Chile with 45,700.

Cubans not only have the manpower edge over most hemisphere armies, they also have received a lot more modern arms. Although massive Soviet deliveries had slackened off, Mr. McCone told Congress, they had not ceased altogether. He said the Soviets had given Cuba "tanks, field artillery pieces, and jet military aircraft." He said they had built Cuba "an integrated air defense system employing surface-to-air missiles, complex radar, antiaircraft batteries, and jet fighters."

The Cubans, he said, have 24 missile sites, each with 8 launchers for a total of 500 missiles "manned entirely by Soviet personnel." They have 100 Mig jet fighters, including 42 which fly twice the speed of sound, 150 coastal defense missiles on 4 operational sites, 12 guided-missile patrol boats, and 4 mobile armored groups equipped with "advanced type tactical rockets" with ranges of 25 miles.

Other than the United States and possibly Canada, no other American country has such a variety of modern arms.

Whose Victory in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Muncie Star, Muncie, Ind.:

WHOSE VICTORY IN CUBA?

Cuba has provided Soviet Russia with a site for early warning radar capable of covering many of the missile sites in the United States.

This is another part of the military victory won by the Reds when they established their Caribbean base. It is another reason to wonder who won a victory when President Kennedy announced his October agreement with Khrushchev.

The Reds now have available a site that is much closer to the continental United States—and the Titan and Minuteman missile batteries—than they have ever had before. A circle of 2,000 miles from Tucson and Phoenix in the West, north past Denver and up into the Dakotas and over the entire Nation east of the Mississippi River.

How early warning radar works can be learned from what is publicly known of American installations. According to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, the two stations at Clear, Alaska, and Thule, Greenland, are now in operation. A third at Flyingsdale, England, will join the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System in a few months. They are at least 3,000 miles from the locations most often mentioned as probable Russian missile sites.

If we can find Russian missiles 3,000 miles away, the Reds can locate ours, from Cuba, over the shorter distance of 2,000 miles. Public testimony to date indicates that the advantage of a few minutes additional time would be invaluable in an exchange of nuclear rockets. The need to get information as quickly as possible about any attack across the North Pole is what caused this country to build the BMEWS line in Alaska, Greenland, and England.

There is no way to know, at this time, whether the Reds will make use of Cuba as an early warning site against missiles in this country. Yet, geography is not subject to change. Why shouldn't the Russians capitalize fully on their advantage? If Khrushchev failed to press his opportunity to the fullest, it would be the first time he has failed to do so.

So—the availability of Cuba as an early warning site next door to the missile batteries of the United States is another important strategic victory for the Kremlin.

Safety or Bureaucracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record a very thought-provoking editorial from the AOPA Pilot, issue of December 1962. It highlights in very graphic form some of the problems facing the small aircraft owners and pilots in America. I commend it to the Members of Congress:

SAFETY OR BUREAUCRACY?

Before long the FAA will submit its next annual budget for congressional consideration. There is little chance it will reflect any interest in economy; it almost certainly will be higher than the \$766 million they got for the current year. As we said in March, the fiscal year 1963 budget almost defies comprehension: it has cost every U.S. man, woman, and child about \$4.32, and was more than the cost of the entire U.S. Government for any year from 1789 through 1916.

We expect the FAA's fiscal year 1964 budget to surpass that. They've had a 5-year plan for some time that called for an ultimate of 57,000 employees (they pres-

ently have 45,000), and an annual budget of a round billion dollars. Mr. Halaby, himself, expressed concern at this, and recently cut that ultimate goal back to 53,000 employees and \$900 million.

It is time for AOPA's membership to take an active, aggressive part in stemming this outpouring of public funds.

First, it is essential that the facts be known. From time to time in the past AOPA has published current statistics showing that general aviation represents over 90 percent of the country's active civil aircraft, and accounts for the great majority of active civil pilots, flying hours, aircraft movements, and whatever other pertinent statistics we can find.

While Mr. Halaby's administration is the first to actively recognize general aviation for the first time, it still is overwhelmingly true that a major percentage of the FAA is slanted toward the jet airliner, gigantic airports, often incredible traffic control concepts based on the handful of jet airliners, and so on.

Despite the fact that the majority of the costliest FAA expenditures are intended primarily to serve this distorted concept, general aviation is nevertheless made an unwilling party to all this. Ultimately, it will be expected to foot a substantial share of the bill if, as we pointed out in March, the Government finally forces through a program of user charges in an effort to offset these incredible costs.

AOPA members must be constantly aware of one overriding fact: general aviation, despite its size, is rarely consulted about these expenditures. Rarely, if ever, are general aviation's representatives asked about general aviation's actual requirements—although all such expenditures are predicated on an arbitrary FAA statement to an unsuspecting Bureau of the Budget, and to congressional appropriations committees themselves, that these expenditures do meet some assumed general aviation requirements. Invariably, they not only are not needed by general aviation, but general aviation actually disagrees with the FAA, and would oppose the expenditures if they were asked. Examples: Dulles Airport (an estimated \$175 million), the still unused data processing central computer (\$8 million), and miscellaneous millions here and there for such things as a supersonic airliner, emergency arresting gear for jet airliners, visual approach lights for jet airliners, and so on.

Virtually the entire traffic control system—probably the most expensive single section of FAA—is predicated on such distorted assumptions. And whenever anyone, either in the Bureau of the Budget or Congress, questions such expenditures, the answer is the same: "It's essential to safety."

Nowhere in recent Government history, outside of perhaps the Department of Defense, has so much money been taken from the taxpayers in the name of safety. Yet no one, to our knowledge, has ever probed deeply into the facts, and whether the facts justify these colossal expenditures. In the last 10 years, for example, 9,616 people were killed in all segments of civil aviation—including the Grand Canyon and Staten Island collisions. In 1960 alone, twice as many people were killed by falls, 1,700 choked to death on food; 854 died due to medical-surgical mishaps. There were 38,200 people killed and 1,400,000 disabled by motor vehicles in 1961—about four times as many dead as all the people killed in all civil aviation in those 10 years—yet Congress hasn't seen fit to create a Government agency to cope with this slaughter. If the FAA can be justified largely on the basis of an average of 961.6 deaths per year, then certainly the U.S. Government should long ago have reacted violently to just the auto which, in the same 10-year period, killed 379,382 humans.

belief in its usefulness as an instrument of national power. But the vital questions are: What is being planned for the future? Are the new ships and new fleets being created that will maintain U.S. supremacy at sea everywhere on this globe?

The United States is a maritime power and part of an oceanic alliance. It cannot afford to settle for naval parity with the Communist world, but must possess clear naval supremacy. That means in the Indian Ocean as much as in the North Atlantic.

In searching out Mr. McNamara's intentions with regard to seapower, one must look at nuclear propulsion in the Navy's ships. Despite America's lead in developing such propulsion, not a single new surface ship in the new defense budget is slated to be nuclear-powered. Can anyone believe that the Russians will fail to take advantage of Mr. McNamara's reluctance to let the Navy forge ahead into the era of nuclear-powered ships?

A book could be written on what is not being done to advance U.S. seapower. The lack of a big drive for improved antisubmarine warfare is a scandal. No new supercarrier will be built this year, despite proved need for such ships in remote areas of the globe. Nor is money that is not being spent on a carrier devoted to amphibious ships. The new construction budget is \$600 million under last year's.

One can only conclude that, as in the area of nuclear weaponry, Mr. McNamara is infatuated with the idea of a stalemate. But a stalemate at sea would be a disaster for the United States. Without ships to project American power overseas, this country soon would be an island encircled by advancing foes.

[From Human Events, Feb. 23, 1963]

**DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S "INTELLECTUALS"—
McNAMARA'S POLICIES JEOPARDIZE NATIONAL
SECURITY**

(Reprinted by courtesy of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly)

Of all the members of the White House official family, perhaps none has enjoyed so favorable a press as Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. A hard-driving executive of the Ford Motor Co., he won widespread kudos 2 years ago, when, at heavy financial sacrifice, he cheerfully swapped tailfins and chrome for the Pentagon's brass. His businesslike approach to procurement ruffled feathers among the military, but struck the civilian observer as worthy of applause.

Last December Secretary McNamara gained what is probably the most impressive honor which the fourth estate these days can bestow: an article by Stewart Alsop in the Saturday Evening Post. Wrote Mr. Alsop in a rare burst of admiration: "There's not much doubt he has the highest IQ of this century's public officials."

On Mr. McNamara's mental prowess—in Detroit he and his executive team were widely known as the whiz kids—Barron's cheerfully accepts the prevailing view. However, we also confess to a mounting disquiet lately as to whether what was good for Ford Motor is good for the country, and vice versa.

The doubts surround both the Secretary's tactics and his grand strategy. On the first count, the muzzling of professional soldiers, a dubious maneuver at best, apparently has been carried to dangerous extremes. Washington correspondents last week could find nobody in the Air Force, despite its well-known opposition to official moves, who dared, on or off the record, to criticize the current U.S. posture of defense.

Nonetheless, as outlined by the Secretary to the House Armed Service Committee (recently), that posture, on military and diplomatic grounds alike, falls far short of ideal. For one thing, it rests on a persistent bias toward conventional weaponry; the most significant contribution to the Nation's arms this year appears to be an experimental air assault division, a mobile striking force, mounted on helicopters, which the Army itself likens to cavalry.

Disturbing to many in the Pentagon and Congress, the unilateral shift in strategy seems even more ominous abroad, where it is widely regarded as a retreat from previous U.S. commitments to the defense of Europe. Unreasonable or not, such fears are bound to multiply at the sight of U.S. diplomats, without public demur from Mr. McNamara, playing fast and loose with the principle of adequate safeguards in a frantic effort to reach agreement with the Soviets on a nuclear test ban.

War, said Clemenceau, is too important to be left to the generals. In an atomic age, the national security is far to precarious to be placed so completely in the hands of civilians who like to be known as defense intellectuals.

Aphorisms aside, few would care to deny that the Nation, in military matters, fared better with a general in the White House. President Eisenhower, upon taking office, inherited a Navy just emerging from World War II mothballs and an Air Force largely comprising piston-engine fighter planes, obsolete B-29's and the useless B-36. Eight years later he left his successor a jet-powered air arm, a growing arsenal of intermediate and long-range missiles and the first of a fleet of nuclear-powered, Polaris-firing submarines, an invaluable weapons system which the supposedly indolent Eisenhower administration succeeded in putting into service 3 years ahead of time. As a Presidential candidate, John F. Kennedy talked endlessly of a missile gap, which, one safely elected, he made haste to disavow. "A myth of national weakness has been destroyed," Secretary McNamara is quoted in the Statepost as saying blandly. A colleague was blunter. "As one defense intellectual put it, 'What we are living with now is what we inherited from Ike.'"

INADEQUATE WEAPONS OF WAR

Unfortunately, however, McNamara and company is living off its capital. For with the myth of the missile gap exploded, the Defense Department has concentrated on building up so-called conventional forces. Toward this objective the Army has expanded from 11 combat-ready divisions to 16. The Pentagon, as noted, has devised an air assault division, a tactical throwback of doubtful value (in South Vietnam helicopters have become sitting ducks).

Most startling of all, an appraisal of the defense budget reveals, Secretary McNamara is making a massive investment in the future of conventional weaponry. In the last Eisenhower budget, outlays for military research, development, testing and evaluation ran to \$6.4 billion, of which \$3.2 billion, or half, was devoted to missiles. By contrast, out of aggregate research, outlays of \$7.4 billion scheduled for fiscal 1964, only \$2.2 billion, or 30 percent of the total, will go for missile research.

The main thrust of U.S. military science, in short, has shifted to less sophisticated, less powerful—and in the final analysis, many would argue—inadequate implements of war.

According to apologists, the McNamara doctrines aim at providing the United States with alternatives to nuclear war, or options. To date, however, the options have all been

picked up by the enemy. Emboldened by the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961—which, in any version, shows the defense intellectuals in a dismal light—the Kremlin that summer precipitated the Berlin crisis.

WEAKENED DETERRENT TO COMMUNISM

Last fall, by treachery and deceit, Moscow nearly succeeded in turning Cuba into a missile base, a move which would have outflanked the United States-Canadian distant early warning system. Even now, after its presumed retreat, an estimated 20,000 Russians occupy the island.

Mr. McNamara, to be sure, is not wholly responsible for the vacillation and timidity of the State Department or the White House. However, he cannot avoid the blame for policies which, by downgrading nuclear power, have weakened the sole effective deterrent to Communist aggression.

The same policies have also strained the fabric of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Whatever the merits of the command decision to scrap Skybolt—a judgment which ran counter to the preponderant view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—it was reached without so much as a by-your-leave to London. Hasty substitution of the Polaris one day may fill the military breach; it cannot repair the political damage inflicted upon a staunch ally. The growing stress on conventional warfare has had far more destructive effects. For it has convinced some highly placed foreign officials—notably Gen. Charles de Gaulle—that they can no longer depend upon this country to take up the shield (a holding force of NATO troops) and the sword (massive U.S. nuclear retaliation).

The foreigners may be wrong. Nonetheless, the fact remains that with no encouragement whatever—"the allies have turned a deaf ear," he once complained—Secretary McNamara has been steadily chipping away at a jointly agreed-upon strategy for the defense of Europe.

Skybolt and the rest may be nothing worse than bad judgment. However, in failing to protest the incredible on-again, off-again suspension of nuclear testing, as well as the test ban talks themselves, the Department of Defense has come perilously close to dereliction of duty. On this score, Dr. Edward Teller, father of the hydrogen bomb, had some chilling things to say last week. A test ban treaty with the Soviet Union, he warned, "would prevent vital improvements of our atomic explosives," as well as foreclose the development of antimissile systems like the Nike-Zeus and Nike-X. It would not keep the Russians from cheating. Such a treaty, in sum, "would endanger our security and help the Soviet Union in its plan to conquer the world."

These are grave words; a man like Dr. Teller does not use them lightly. Secretary McNamara, the Congress and the American people had better pay heed.

**ST. AUGUSTINE QUADRICENTEN-
NIAL COMMISSION—APPOINT-
MENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The Chair announces, on behalf of the Vice President, the appointment of Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS to be members on the part of the Senate of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, pursuant to 76 Stat. 386, Public Law 87-586, approved August 14, 1962.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, the Chair has announced, on behalf of the Vice President, the appoint-

ment of the two Senators from Florida to be members of the St. Augustine Quadracentennial Commission. I wish to express to the Presiding Officer and the Vice President the appreciation of both the Senators from Florida. The Quadracentennial celebration, which will take place in 1965, has important significance not only to our State, but to the Nation, as well.

In the first place, St. Augustine is the first spot in the continental United States which was permanently settled by people of European origin, and of course it will have importance from that standpoint.

Next, we think that in these days when our relationships with Latin America are of such vast importance, and when all of us know that several of the Latin American nations have antecedents or connections with their mother country, Spain, that even predate the settlement at St. Augustine, this will be a very appropriate time to celebrate the connection between our Nation and Latin America and Spain.

Third, I wish to say that we are happy to announce that the Government of Spain and also the Roman Catholic Church, both of which participated in the original settlement of St. Augustine, have already signified their intention to participate actively and on a sizable scale in this quadracentennial celebration.

So, Mr. President, speaking for both Senators from Florida, let me say that we shall be glad to have even a small part in this matter; and I am glad the Government of the United States has decided to participate in the celebration, which has great significance to our national life and to our hemispheric relationships.

Cuba file

BETANCOURT VISIT—APPROPRIATE MOMENT FOR ACTION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during the past 2 days we have been honored with the visit of a distinguished statesman and neighbor, President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela. He comes at a time when his country is undergoing a brutal Communist campaign of terror and subversion. Venezuela, with her rich resources and strategic location, is now, in the words of President Kennedy, "communism's No. 1 target" in our hemisphere. And there is general agreement that Cuba is the base from which these subversive activities are being conducted. It therefore seems to me that this would be a particularly appropriate time for the United States to act affirmatively, to stop drifting, to move to stop communism in this hemisphere. Press reports indicate that this is precisely what President Betancourt—and many of our other neighbors to the south—are praying that we will do.

In their joint communique, issued yesterday, President Kennedy and President Betancourt declared that they had considered the "gravity of the situation created by establishment in Cuba of an alien, antidemocratic stronghold from which emanate threats to the independence and sovereignty of each of the free American Republics."

Those are fine words. But they require action.

Now, before I go any further, and before someone may cry partisan politics, or worse, I would like to read a statement made by President Kennedy when, as a candidate, he spoke in Grand Rapids, Mich., on October 14, 1960. He said:

Let me make it clear that I regard bipartisanship not as a means of stifling debate, not as a means of preventing discussion of the problems that face us, but I regard bipartisanship as putting the interest of our country first. And I can assure you that in this campaign when we discuss the foreign and domestic opportunities and responsibilities which are facing our country, we do so from the best interest not of our party but of our country, which is the obligation of all of us.

On another occasion, the President has been quoted as saying:

Bipartisanship does not mean—and was never meant to mean—rubberstamping of every executive blunder without debate.

Although I may be critical as I pursue this subject, I wish to make it clear that I firmly intend to keep within the bounds set by President Kennedy himself. They will be my guidelines, rather than the emotional outbursts of those who demand silence on the part of myself, and many others—not all of us Republicans—on matters crucial to our Nation's very survival.

I do not equate effective opposition with silence, nor do I equate good citizenship with silence in a time of danger. Indeed, how can some administration spokesmen demand silence, when statements by other, and supposedly responsible, administration spokesmen are, at a minimum, contradictory and confusing?

On the subject of Cuba as a basis for the subversion of Latin America, for example, during Secretary McNamara's 2-hour television program, the announced purpose of which was to clarify the Cuban situation to the American people, the Secretary was asked to comment on the possibility of Cuba's being used as a training base for subversion in other Latin American countries. His reply was:

I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries.

He continued to say that the Government was carefully watching developments along this line.

I should like to compare that statement with the statement made by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball on October 19, 1962. Mr. Ball said, with regard to Cuba as a base for subversion:

It has value to the Communist bloc primarily as a base for the subversive activities of international communism in the Western Hemisphere. The policy of the U.S. Government is directed toward nullifying Cuba's usefulness as a source of infection for international communism.

I believe that Assistant Secretary of State Martin also made the point that Cuba is, in fact, a base for subversion of the Western Hemisphere. The President himself called this to the attention of the people in his February 14 press

conference, in which he pointed out the significance of a recent confidential OAS report which I shall discuss later. At that time the President said:

I think the part of the report which is most significant is the emphasis they put on subversion in the continent, the movement of men and money against the constituted governments. This is a matter which the U.S. Government is giving its greatest attention to this winter, the question of lessening not only subversion that may come from Cuba but from other parts of the hemisphere.

It seems to me that these three statements deal with Cuba as a base for subversion in three different ways. The first denies categorically that evidence of subversion exists; the second no longer takes such a definite stand, but talks about "nullifying Cuba's usefulness as a source of infection"; the third, if I interpret it correctly, talks about "lessening" subversion from Cuba, which implies that there exists subversion which must be cut down or eradicated.

So long as highly placed and responsible officials continue to contradict one another, the Republican Party—the "loyal opposition"—is totally within the boundaries of fairness when levying responsible criticism, for subversion is most certainly spreading from Cuba.

I have in my hand some pages from a special OAS report. Let me read a few paragraphs. The report is expected to be published probably on Washington's Birthday, when most Members of Congress will be out of town. The report contains some very interesting material. With respect to the establishment in Cuba of training centers for subversion, the report states:

1. TRAINING CENTERS

There can be no doubt that the creation and maintenance of a Communist government in Cuba facilitates to an extraordinary degree the subversive action of international communism in America. This is true not only with respect to the spread of the Communist ideology, but also—what is more dangerous—because it constitutes a center quite nearby for training agents of every kind whose function it is to develop subversion in the countries of the hemisphere.

It is an obvious fact that as the Communist regime became consolidated in Cuba, a series of schools and centers of training in the techniques of Communist subversion were organized, in which instruction is being given not only to Cubans but to many other Latin Americans for carrying on subversive activities in various countries of the hemisphere.

Among the many training centers that now function in Cuba, mention may be made of the following:

Blas Roca School, in Los Pinos, Havana Province.

Marcelo Salado School, in the Luyanó section of Havana.

El Cortijo School, in Pinar del Río Province, especially for military personnel.

La Cabaña Fort, in Havana, especially for young people.

Minas Rio Frio School, for training guerrillas.

San Lorenzo School, in the Sierra Maestra, Oriente Province, for training guerrillas.

Ciudad Libertad School, in Marianao, Havana Province, under Russian instructors.

Boca Chica School, in Tarará, Havana Province, Director General Alberto Bayo.

Julio Antonio Mella School, in Mar Bella, Havana Province, for training and instruc-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2703

ing leaders of the Confederación de Trabajadores de Cuba Revolucionaria (CTCR), [Federation of Workers of Revolutionary Cuba].

A large number of Latin Americans attend these training centers, where they receive instruction not only in Marxist-Leninist theory, but also in propaganda techniques, the use of arms and explosives, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, and so on.

It should be pointed out that the corps of instructors in these schools is made up not only of Cubans or other Latin Americans, but also of instructors from other Communist countries; these speak Spanish.

It is clear that Cuba is being used as a base for training in communism and its spread in America.

That activity of international communism, and particularly on the part of the Cuban Government, is greatly facilitated by the lack of suitable measures, and of cooperation among the American countries, to check the constant and heavy stream of travelers to and from Cuba. The importance of this problem makes it necessary to devote a special section to it.

Mr. President, that gives an idea of how the Communist regime is of primary importance to this program.

There are certain constructive alternatives to the courses which are being taken. I propose particularly that we implement the resolution of the Organization of American States dated October 23, 1962, which was formally authorized by the Council, by a vote of 19 to 1, with one abstention—which I think was Uruguay, although Uruguay later joined in the resolution—to carry out the quarantine of Cuba.

The Council, before taking this action, granted itself emergency powers as a ministerial-level organ of consultation. This was required under article 6 of the Rio Treaty of 1947. Inasmuch as this article of the treaty is particularly applicable in the present case, I shall quote it in full:

If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence or any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extra-continental or intercontinental 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.

Also, on October 23, 1962, the OAS Council voted to call for immediate dissolution and removal of all weapons with any offensive strength; recommend that the member states take all measures, including the use of force, needed to insure that the Government of Cuba cannot continue to obtain from the Soviet powers military materials and related supplies which may threaten the hemisphere.

Therefore, I propose that one clear and justified alternative to our present Cuban policy would be the full implementation of the OAS October resolution. President Befancourt has indicated that Venezuela needs help against the exportation of Cuban communism. Such help, in

the form of action under the OAS resolution, would be clearly within the scope of the Rio Treaty of 1947, as well.

We could also demand that Chairman Khrushchev carry out his pledge to remove Soviet troops in due course. Some words uttered by a certain gentleman, who recently utilized the press to attack me and a number of my fellow Republicans for our views on the administration's foreign policy, are quite pertinent today. These words were uttered on August 6, 1958. He said:

Time and again we have drifted until circumstances reached an intolerable state, and then we have rushed to the brink.

That sentence quite precisely describes events in Cuba prior and up to last October. We now seem to be right back on the same path.

The gentleman also observed, in the same statement, that the Eisenhower foreign policy was "inadequate, outmoded, and misdirected."

I am sure, of course, that there was no divisive partisan intent.

In another statement, during that same period, the gentleman who is now so concerned with "divisive partisanship and irresponsible attacks" said, with reference to problems then facing the Eisenhower administration:

They are not going to be met unless this administration turns off the television, comes in from the playground, and gets down to the hard work of running this Government and constructing a more substantial peace, and sheds the sodden, dangerous apathy in which it now wallows.

That brings to mind the charge made last week by the same gentleman that we Republicans have been engaging in "harsh accusations that compensate with intemperance for what they lack in substance."

But again referring back to his statements in 1958, he was, I think, prophetic when he observed:

We have become singularly unappreciative of the feelings and fears of others, friends and nonfriends alike.

That certainly describes the situation with many of our friends today. Our relations with allies, old and new, have deteriorated to a unprecedented degree. If there is to be any improvement, if we are to fend off the disaster which seems to be facing us from many directions—not only from Cuba—then there must, I believe, be relevant discussion and relevant criticism.

The times may not require a great debate, but they certainly require some debate—although, as I have said, within the bounds laid down by the President himself.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE SENATE ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn to the concluding portion of my remarks on the Senate establishment.

It will be recalled that yesterday I placed in the Record—at page 2530—a table outlining the names of certain Senators who had requested various committee assignments as their first, second, or third choice, and compared the committee assignments they actually received—if any—with their position for or against a change in rule XXII, to enable the Senate to terminate unlimited debate by a smaller number of votes than those presently required under that rule. The factual conclusion which this table demonstrates is that eight nonfreshmen Senators—Senators BARTLETT, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, HAYDEN, JORDAN of North Carolina, MCGEE, SMATHERS, and THURMOND—who opposed a change in rule XXII, submitted eligible bids for new committee assignments, and seven of those eight received the new committee assignments they had requested. Six received committee assignments which represented their first choice. Only the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was disappointed.

On the other hand, 14 nonfreshmen Senators who favored a change in rule XXII, and therefore favored cloture, applied for new committee assignments. Only five of them received them. Those Senators were Senators MANSFIELD, HART, PELL, Young of Ohio, and myself. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the majority leader, received his first choice. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] received his third choice. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] received a committee assignment which he did not request and did not want. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] received his second choice. I received my second choice.

I drew no conclusion from that statement. However, I think it raises some interesting speculations.

I should like now to continue my theme that the South is overrepresented in the committee structure of the Senate in terms of geography and also in terms of the ideological convictions of Members on the Democratic side of the Senate. The overrepresentation has resulted from the strict carrying out of that rule of seniority which the steering committee so frequently violated—on nine committees to be exact—in the course of making committee assignments for the present session of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement showing the overrepresentation may be 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:

SOUTHERN CONTROL OF KEY SENATE COMMITTEES

There are 23 Democratic Senators from the South, including the 11 States of the Confederacy and Oklahoma and Arkansas. The southern Senators make up 34 percent of the 67-man Democratic block in the Senate at present. The 23 Senators from the South have far more than 34 percent of the

seats on the 4 most important standing committees of the Senate, however, and more

than their share of the seats of the Democratic leadership committees.

Committee	Southern seats	Entitled	Overrepresentation
Appropriations.....	9 (60 percent) out of 18.....	6	3
Armed Services.....	5 (42 percent) out of 12.....	4	1
Finance.....	6 (55 percent) out of 11.....	4	2
Foreign Relations.....	5 (42 percent) out of 12.....	4	1
Policy.....	3 (23 percent) out of 9.....	3	0
Steering.....	7 (47 percent) out of 15.....	6	2

Mr. CLARK. It will be noted that 50 percent of the members of the Democratic representation on the Appropriations Committee are southern Senators; 42 percent are on the Committee on Armed Services; 55 percent are on the Committee on Finance; 42 percent are on the Committee on Foreign Relations; 47 percent are on the steering committee.

I make the comment, not in criticism of any southern Senator, for surely they are entitled to press their own claims for membership on important committees. I make the comment only to show the extent to which the Senate establishment, led by Senators from the South, but very ably abetted by northern Senators of the Republican Party, led by the intrepid minority leader, has a stranglehold on the four most important legislative committees—Appropriations, Armed Services, Finance, and Foreign Relations—and on the very important Democratic steering committee. It is my contention that if we are to advance the program of the President and do justice to the fair claims of Senators from other sections of the country or of a different ideology, the stranglehold of the bipartisan Senate establishment must eventually be broken; and I believe it will eventually be.

I turn now to the proposed change in rule XXV, which is set forth in Senate Resolution 90, cosponsored by the majority and the minority leaders. That proposed rule would change the existing rule in a number of particulars. It would make the Committee on Government Operations a major committee and increase its size from 9 to 15. To that I have no objection. It would make the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences a major committee. That should have been done at the time that committee was established. Failure to do so has entrenched Members of the establishment in an additional area, since aeronautical and space sciences have become a pertinent matter for a legislative committee. So, of course, I have no objection whatever to that change.

The change would also make the Committee on Rules and Administration a minor committee instead of a major committee. I have no quarrel with that. It has enabled me to become a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration for which I otherwise would not have been eligible.

GRANDFATHER CLAUSE IN SENATE RESOLUTION 90
But I should like to point out what the changes do in terms of creating what we might call a preferred list of Senators. I should like to call attention to the so-called grandfather clause, which has been interjected into the rule

under the joint leadership of the majority and minority leaders.

Some of us are old enough to remember the derivation of the "grandfather" clause. It was utilized by my southern ancestors from Louisiana shortly after the Civil War. My great grandfather, Daniel Dudley Avery, and my grandfather, Dudley Avery, were both supporters of the Confederacy. They and their Reconstruction day companions utilized the grandfather clause to prevent the Negro from voting. I suggest that the grandfather clause is being utilized today in the Senate for a not entirely dissimilar purpose. But it is a rather obscure purpose and requires some clarification. The grandfather clause as it appears in Senate Resolution 90 provides that—

Provided, however, That those Senators who, as of January 9, 1963, were members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Government Operations—

Which I interpolate are the two minor committees now to be made major committees— shall be entitled to serve on three of the foregoing standing committees.

The "foregoing standing committees" referred to are the major committees. It includes all of the legislative committees of the Senate, except the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the Committee on Rules and Administration. Note that it also excepts the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, a legislative committee which, for reasons quite obscure to me, is excluded from consideration with the other legislative committees. It is said that that is because it is a joint committee with the House. But I suggest that that is a distinction without a difference. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is one of the most important legislative committees in the Senate. It was created by Public Law 703 of the 83d Congress, which provides:

All bills, resolutions and other matters in the Senate or the House relating primarily to the Commission on Atomic Energy, or to the development, use, or control of atomic energy, shall be referred to the Joint Committee, whose members shall report from time to time, if they are Senate Members to the Senate, if they are House Members to the House, by bill.

Such bills are placed on the calendar and are treated like any other bills.

So it seems to me that there is no adequate reason why the Joint Atomic Energy Committee is not a major committee.

The "grandfather" clause reveals publicly a condition which has existed pri-

vately for some time, and that is that there is a class of 21 preferred Senators who are permitted to hold positions on more than 2 major committees.

To some extent this situation has existed for a number of years, but it will exist to an even greater extent from now on, if and when the "grandfather" clause becomes a part of the rules of the Senate.

Fifteen of these 21 Senators are Democrats, and 6 are Republicans. Scattered like stars on the list are the names of many Members of the Senate establishment. However, the list does contain the names of Senators who I think would deny, and correctly deny, that they are even remotely connected with the establishment, although there are not many of them.

In a moment I shall ask unanimous consent to have the list printed in the RECORD, but I cannot refrain from pointing out the very successful efforts of several Senators to advance the interests of their home States by getting on as many committees as possible.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], for example, serves on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, a major committee; the Finance Committee, a major committee; the Government Operations Committee, a major committee; the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which is in fact if not in law one of the most important major committees of all; and, in addition, on the Rules and Administration Committee which is now a major committee, but will become a minor committee if and when the proposed change in the rules is adopted. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is in a class all by himself. No other Senator serves on five legislative committees.

My beloved friend, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], runs him a good second. The Senator from Georgia serves on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; and he also serves on the Democratic steering committee and the Democratic policy committee. He is the only member of the Democratic Party except the elected leadership who serves on both the policy committee and the steering committee.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is up in front with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I commend him for his ability to serve the interests of his State by becoming a member—and, indeed, in at least one instance the ranking minority member—of very important Senate committees. He serves on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list showing the committees on which these 21 Senators serve may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

1963

was that it was an emergency procedure brought about by the publication of a civilian report on construction industry research needs.

I have since learned that the report on which the Commerce Department based its claim for funds was in fact a quite preliminary one carried out by a small committee of the Building Research Advisory Board of the National Academy of Sciences. This BRAB report, as it is called, still has not been distributed throughout the 100,000 firms in the construction industry and therefore by no manner of means represents the industry.

I submit that the irregular procedure that was adopted had a much simpler purpose: It prevented debate on the merits of the proposal during the regular appropriations process.

Even when the civil industrial technology program was revealed to our subcommittee, it was only vaguely outlined. Since that time I have closely scrutinized descriptions of the program in the budget appendix, in the Economic Report of the President, and in numerous statements made by Commerce Department officials. I confess I have been puzzled by the wide variation and differing interpretations to be found in these different documents and statements, and can only conclude that the continuing vagueness of this program's outlines is purposeful.

THE COMMERCE DEPARTMENT'S JUSTIFICATIONS

Unable to satisfy myself and my constituents with the bits and pieces of information and interpretation that I was able to collect in that way, I have since discussed this matter at length with a number of construction industry leaders and also conducted my own investigation.

In the informational vacuum that seems to have been deliberately created, I think that Members of the House may be interested in the sharp contrast between what the Commerce Department says about this program and what I have been able to find out.

First, the Department of Commerce proposes to inaugurate a program of governmentally sponsored research directed toward encouraging more deliberate, imaginative, and extensive use of technology not only in the construction industry but in other industries as well. At present, the other two industries for which funds are sought are textiles and machine tools. By prescribing this economic pep pill for these three patients, the Commerce Department maintains, labor productivity will be increased and U.S. products will become more competitive in foreign trade—especially with the Common Market.

To institute the program, a total amount of \$7.4 million is now requested for the fiscal year beginning July 1 and a supplemental request of \$1,250,000 is contemplated for expenditures during the remainder of the present fiscal year.

The basis on which the Commerce Department justifies the proposal is stated in the current report of the Council of Economic Advisers, which claims that there is an urgent need to stimulate more rapid development and fuller uses

of technology in those sectors of the civilian economy which, despite high potential returns to the Nation, have not been able, or have not been motivated, to seize the opportunity without assistance.

THE FOUR-POINT PROPOSAL

The report further states:

With the exception of a few manufacturing firms, most enterprises neither undertake much research and development nor have trained technical manpower to take advantage of the research and development done by others.

It concludes:

Government has a responsibility for maintaining a suitable environment for private research activity and for supporting programs which are in the public interest but which are not adequately stimulated by private market opportunities alone.

The report claims that this responsibility is made more crucial by the fact that "defense and space efforts have accounted for more than three-fourths" of the increase in the total expenditure for research and development in recent years.

Shedding these same crocodile tears, the Commerce Department developed a four-part program which includes these major activities:

First, Supporting the training of personnel at universities for industrial research and development through research grants; second, stimulation of research in industry institutions, which would include generating research beneficial to an industry or an industry segment which would not be properly undertaken for profitmaking reasons alone and "providing additional research services and facilities for those firms"—I repeat, firms—"which do not have a broad enough spectrum of products or services to support an independent research and development program of efficient size."

Those are just two of the four activities. The others include developing an industry-university extension service much like that of the Agriculture Department's, and supporting technical information services to supply industry with knowledge about technological activities and developments.

Those are the broad outlines of the program that will save the construction industry from itself. But now let us examine the program under higher magnification and see what some of those sonorous phrases really mean.

THE VAGUE DEFINITIONS

Basic to all this are some arbitrary assumption and decisions. Who has determined that the construction industry is lagging? What definition of the word has been applied, and against what had the construction industry been compared? It is certainly true that the technology of American industry has not reached its ultimate development, and I speak here of all American industry. But this does not mean that Government aid is either necessary or would prove effective in speeding an advance.

Construction industry leaders with whom I have spoken point out that the

industry is presently carrying on a substantial amount of research and development work and they insist that it is far in excess of a Commerce Department figure which seems to have no basis in fact.

The definition of "lagging" is only the first of the subjective definitions that seem to appear everywhere in this program's outlines.

Not only does someone high in the Commerce Department's technological ivory tower decide which industries to tinker with, but he also would apply other subjective definitions such as: "stimulating," "segment of an industry," "broad enough spectrum of products," and "selective program."

Who decides, and on what basis, where "stimulation" ends and dislocation of competition and industrial programs begins?

What Solomon decides what an industry segment is, and which segments as well as firms are to be allowed to put their hand in the public till?

What crystal ball is available to determine whether this segment or that firm has a broad enough spectrum of products?

CHOOSING THE BENEFICIARIES

On the question of a "selective program," who does the selecting, and on what basis?

If you are interested in the answer to that question, let me quote the Commerce Department itself:

The broad direction of the research program, such as the selection of particular industries in need of technological stimulation, and the criteria for eligibility of research institutions for contract awards, will be determined in the Department of Commerce, guided by advice from industry leaders, educators, and others.

How much guidance do you think the Assistant Secretary would seek from private industry when, as we have seen, industry's opinion not only was not sought in the program's creation, but was scrupulously avoided?

The mention of advice being sought from educators is also of interest, since the Commerce Department now proposes to enter the educational field and further compound the confusion in this area already created by the overlappings of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor with its apprenticeship and other vocational programs.

UPSETTING THE COMPETITIVE BALANCE

When all is said and done, the Assistant Secretary and his staff would have an extraordinary amount of power over this country's largest domestic industry. Having so far failed to avail themselves of any of the practical knowledge that this industry has gained in its hundreds of years of activity, the authors of this program would begin dispensing grants and applying stimulation that could disrupt a basic industry and dislocate all its component architects, contractors, builders, building supply manufacturers, distributors, and workers. Not only would such action upset the delicate competitive balance of a highly competitive industry, it might cause structural

unemployment in areas of the country which are dependent upon competitive parts of the industry.

Of paramount importance, they would again and again have to determine with unerring precision where basic research in a given product ended and where applied research began. In the case of collaborative research, it is interesting to speculate on how the Government would avoid running afoul of its own antitrust laws.

PENALIZING THE EFFICIENT

In my conversations with members of the industry, a number of other interesting points have been raised.

They point out that this program would penalize the most efficient producer by expending research funds, to bring the laggards within a group closer to the most advanced technological practices of the leaders, and, stimulate research and innovation in those industrial groups that have been relatively inactive or stagnant technologically. In effect, these most efficient producers would be taxed to pay for the technological advancement of their most inefficient competitors. This comes about as close to destruction of the free-enterprise concept as anything can.

THE FOREIGN MARKET MISTAKE

Another interesting point that the industry has raised is how Common Market competition can be cited as a valid justification for stimulating construction industry research. They point out that, while textile products and machine tools move in national and international trade, the product of building construction is mostly nonmovable and remains in its one location for its economic lifetime. Since structures and highways do not ordinarily move, bricks are not shipped overseas, and the construction industry is overwhelmingly domestic in nature, how can such a program help the United States compete with the Common Market? This is pure fancy.

DESTRUCTION OF PRIVATE RESEARCH

Industry also points out that this program would enter into competition with private industry research efforts, with predictable results. Those now spending their own funds for these activities would discontinue their own efforts and seek Government funds. This would dry up moneys now being spent privately and eventually the appropriation needed to finance research for the clamoring construction industry would be enormous. This, it is obvious, would cause even greater difficulties in our efforts to balance the Federal budget, to say nothing of stifling private initiative.

THE AGRICULTURAL IMITATION

I would also like to point out that advocacy of an industrial extension service along the lines of the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service would leave a great deal to be desired. We are now having proposed for industry the same sort of stimulation that has produced the sorry mess that we have in agriculture, with a continuing surplus and subsidy and no solution in sight. Interestingly, the President in 1961 proposed compulsory action to solve agri-

culture's difficulties, but this year the other cheek was turned and voluntary controls were recommended. Carried to its ultimate conclusion, we might at some future date have an industrial soil bank in which textile, machine tool, and construction industry producers could be paid by the Federal Government for not making anything.

NEW SOURCES OF POLITICAL FAVORITISM

Finally, consider the strong political implications in creating a whole new source of patronage and favoritism to influence this vast industry. Even the BRAB report which I mentioned earlier recommended that any Federal research be carefully controlled within the Bureau of Standards because of the patronage dangers that were clearly foreseen.

These are just some of the major flaws in this visionary program.

It would transgress the traditional boundaries of private enterprise and attempt to bring this industry under central economic planning.

It would in fact dislocate one of the Nation's prime industries at a time when we can ill afford any industrial slump. This in turn, would affect the economic well-being of constituents in every congressional district.

In my opinion, this is the most ill conceived, amateurish, and dangerous legislative proposal that I have seen in many years.

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

(Mr. RIEHLMAN (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 45th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania was observed on February 16. It was a time of mixed feelings of pride and sorrow.

I am pleased to join those who saluted the Lithuanian people, for their courage and yearning for freedom remain as strong as ever.

My dedication to the cause of freedom in Lithuania and all captive European nations is as firm as ever. I am honored to be able to pay tribute to the examples of courage and determination which the Lithuanian people have set for the world.

At this time, though, I am also saddened that these people are prisoners, deprived of the most basic human freedoms, in their homeland. It is sad to know that there is still a substantial portion of this earth in which mankind is under the domination of a murderous, godless, totalitarian dictatorship.

Our hearts go out to the Lithuanian people the world over, in whom the flame of liberty still burns brightly. I know we all look forward to the day when oppressed peoples will be free.

Cuba file
CUBA IN 1933

(Mr. SHORT (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker—

The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on: nor all thy piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all thy tears wash out a word of it.
—From "The Rubaiyat" of Omar Khayyam.

Mr. Speaker, last week I promised a kind of sequel to my "Selected Chronologies on Castro and Cuba" inserted in the RECORD Appendix as parts 1 through 10, and covering events from March 10, 1952, through January 1, 1963. Today, I would like to first quote an excerpt from the President's press conference of Thursday, February 7, 1963, when he was asked the following question:

Question. Mr. President, what chances do you think or do you believe there are of eliminating communism in Cuba, within your term?

The PRESIDENT. I couldn't make any prediction about the elimination. I am quite obviously hopeful it can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens. There are a lot of unpleasant situations in the world today. China is one. "It is unfortunate that communism was permitted to come into Cuba. It has been a problem in the last 5 years." We don't know what is going to happen internally. There is no, obviously, easy solution as to how the Communist movement will be removed * * *.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the quoted portion of this excerpt, I believe we all can agree and sympathize with the President. This is indeed a knotty problem with no easy solution. However, in regard to the portion of his answer which stated:

It is unfortunate that communism was permitted to come into Cuba. It has been a problem for the last 5 years.

I would like to offer proof that this has been a real and continuing problem since 1933, and possibly further back than that.

In the course of my research into the Cuban issue, I obtained a copy of an article published in the National Republic in November 1933, and written by Walter L. Reynolds. The National Republic magazine was originally a National Republican Club publication, started by Walter Steele and a Mr. Lockwood, both of whom are now dead. These men later published the magazine as an independent publication since some Republicans felt it should not be published under sponsorship of the Republican Party. This magazine appears to have been published last in March of 1960. The theme of this magazine was exposing communism in the United States and 90 percent of the publication was devoted to this effort. Walter L. Reynolds was the former chief clerk of a congressional committee created in 1929, the 70th Congress, and called Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States. Mr. Reynolds later headed an American alliance of 219 organizations opposed to the recognition of Russia.

The article is entitled "Moscow's Hand in Cuba," and a subheading under the title states, "Concerted Action on Part of Moscow-Directed Agents of Revolution To Overthrow Regime After Regime Is Keeping Little American Republic in Turmoil and Strife as Moscow Drive to Set Up a Little Soviet of the West Continues."

This article impressed me a great deal because it was a prophetic outline of coming events which truly "cast their shadows before"—not 5 years ago—nor during the Eisenhower administration which so many seem to be fond of reminding us—but in 1933—during the early years of the Roosevelt administration.

Further, the article did not deal in just the bare bones of the Soviet efforts to establish a Communist dictatorship over the world, but went into the details of how this was to be accomplished—by means of labor problems—trade relationships—plans to utilize Cuba as the fulcrum from which the Communist ideology was to be catapulted in various directions throughout the Western Hemisphere—after failure of its efforts to use Germany as the fulcrum.

In the period of history around 1933 a group of 219 national organizations, including the American Legion, sparked by the efforts of its National Commander Hayes, William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, Mathew Wall—who held a series of 5 to 6 weeks' broadcasts over a national hookup—William Tyler Page, then Clerk of the House of Representatives, and Mark Hershey, a hero of World War I—joined in a nationwide nonpartisan effort, as an American alliance to oppose recognition of Soviet Russia. To quote a prophetic sentence from the article:

The recognition of Soviet Russia will furnish a new impetus to communism, not only in Cuba but throughout the world.

The article also prophetically states:

Sovietizing Cuba would permit the establishment of a perfect base on the Western Hemisphere for the dissemination of their revolutionary propaganda in the United States, Panama, and all Latin America, should the United States not extend recognition to Soviet Russia.

What were the rumors about the State Department at that time—under President Roosevelt? Let me quote further:

It is rumored in Washington that the officials of the State Department have reached an accord that the present regime in Cuba should be recognized at once to stabilize conditions there, but that Ambassador Welles reports from Cuba that the present regime cannot last because of certain Moscow international conspiracies and activities that have been discovered in Cuba. It is believed that State Department officials are guarding this information because of the public indignation it might create against U.S. recognition of Soviet Russia on the eve of the American-Russo conference to be held in Washington at the invitation of President Roosevelt.

Now let us refresh our memories again by reading a State Department release dated September 25, 1962, received in my office:

1. U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA

U.S. policy is to get rid of the Castro regime and Soviet Communist influence in Cuba. We will not permit the Cuban regime to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force. We will prevent the Cuban regime by whatever means may be necessary from taking action against any part of the hemisphere. The United States in conjunction with the other countries of the hemisphere will make sure that increased armaments which the Soviets have furnished to the regime, while a burden to

the Cuban people, will be nothing more than that.

There is, however, no evidence of any organized combat force in Cuba from any Soviet bloc country. Nor is there evidence of any significant offensive capability, including offensive ground-to-ground missiles, either in Cuban hands or under Soviet direction and guidance.

The recent Soviet aid to Cuba indicates a significant increase in Soviet involvement in Cuba. The Cuban regime is in trouble and it is not surprising that it has committed itself further to the Sino-Soviet bloc in the hope of preventing its own collapse. The regime has been increasingly isolated from the hemisphere, its economy is crumbling, and it has discarded its pledges for economic and political freedom.

ACTION AGAINST COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN THE HEMISPHERE

The meeting of foreign ministers of the American Republics, held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in January 1962, recognized that the Communist offensive in the Americas poses a danger to the democratic institutions of the hemisphere. The meeting took several steps to deal with this danger, including the exclusion of the present Government of Cuba from participation in the inter-America system. Another of its decisions called upon the Council of the Organization of American States to maintain vigilance regarding acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to the peace and security resulting from the intervention of Sino-Soviet powers in the hemisphere. In addition the foreign ministers provided for the establishment of the Special Consultative Committee on Security to assist governments in security matters. The Committee presented its initial general report on May 1. The embargo imposed by the United States on Cuban imports pursuant to the decisions of the foreign ministers has resulted in a loss of income to Cuba and hence in Cuba's capacity to engage in subversive activities in the hemisphere.

Less than 1 month later—October 21, 1962—we all know the President announced the setting up of our quarantine against shipments of arms and military equipment to Cuba.

Further, now we not only see that Cuba's economy has not crumbled—as of February 21, 1963—but the U.N. is going to gallop to the rescue to make sure this does not happen, all the while protesting that American funds will not be used, so everything is fine. I have never advocated that the United States withdraw from the U.N., but I would like to challenge the U.N. to consider not only the physical needs of the Cuban people, but also those Cubans who have been forced by one means or another to leave their beloved island home because their desire for freedom—call it "intellectual" or "spiritual"—either word fits. Further, I challenge the U.N. to call for a free and open election to be held in which all Cubans will be allowed to cast their vote under protection of the U.N. as to what regime they prefer—the Soviet-Castro regime, or a free republican government. And then they will find Cuba would not need the U.N. aid to restore its economy, for the people themselves would restore it and could—if given the opportunity. Castro's announcement of no elections was for the same purpose the Berlin wall was built, to keep people in a state of slavery.

It is a pity the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD cannot print cartoons because the ar-

ticle I am quoting from included one also prophetic—depicting a basket on the steps of the U.S. Capitol holding an infant—oddly enough resembling Khrushchev—who is holding a bomb with a lighted fuse. The basket is labeled "Cuba, Little Soviet"—and a Russian labeled "Moscow" is peering over a fence at the baby to see if anyone from the Capitol rushes out to pick it up.

Well, obviously we did pick the baby up. We also recognized Soviet Russia, thus loosing upon the world the dread Communist forces politically blessed by the United States of America, through President Franklin Delano Roosevelt but not through the wishes of many, many troubled American citizens of both political parties.

We thus were found wanting at a time when the real basic morality of the United States of America was put to the acid test, and we are reaping the results now of that decision.

We are being retested today. Where stand we as a nation? Where stand we as a people? Is Cuba to truly be allowed to develop from "Little Soviet" to "Big Soviet" in the Western Hemisphere? Do we revise our thinking from the President down to the State Department—to the Congress—and to the people—and face what we could not face in 1933?

I seem to see and hear signs that some are heeding this handwriting on the wall even though some do it by the utterly unrealistic method of declaring Cuba, armed by the Soviets, is a threat not to the United States, but instead to Latin America.

My colleague, Congressman PAUL ROGERS of Florida, whom I respect and admire, had some pretty potent things to say to the House of Representatives on February 7, of this year, in a speech entitled "Cuban Venom Continues To Trickle." I commend his speech to anyone who has not read or heard it.

In 1933 there was a bipartisan effort to prevent recognition of Soviet Russia by the United States.

In 1963, as in 1933, there is still a bipartisan effort—regardless of what Senator FULBRIGHT chooses to term it—to get at the facts regarding our Cuban crisis, and the Soviet arms buildup in Cuba, and the use of Cuba to export communism to the entire Western Hemisphere.

And in 1963, as in 1933, there is an awareness on the part of the American people that something is seriously wrong with our morality as a nation when we speak strong words protesting the slavery and degradation of communism, but look the other way when means are suggested for us, as a nation, to protect our free civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask permission to include the article "Moscow's Hand in Cuba," by Walter L. Reynolds, with my remarks today:

MOSCOW'S HAND IN CUBA

(By Walter L. Reynolds)

A year ago the drive of the Communist International for world revolution was centered in Germany. Most of its best trained available revolutionary forces were then concentrated there in an effort to win Germany to communism and add that nation to the world union of Soviet Socialist Republics

under the control of Moscow. But for the patriotism of the vast majority of the German people, who finally became fully aroused to the situation with which they were confronted, it is possible the Reds would have succeeded. Communism, which had grown to a force of over 5 millions in Germany, was repulsed, however, and has since been stamped out or driven underground in considerable disorder, many of its agents taking refuge in France, Moscow and Great Britain.

A new front of the so-called proletarian revolution has now developed—in Cuba—where the Communists, organized and led chiefly by their Anti-Imperialist League, with headquarters in New York City, a branch of the Red International, have begun another desperate struggle to carry on in Cuba from where they were forced to leave off in Germany. The Communist revolutionary movement always thrives where conditions such as exist in Cuba permit them to stir up discontent, leading to strikes, riots and bloodshed. The Anti-Imperialist League has been preparing the way for the active revolutionary movement over the past 5 years, in accordance with instructions from Moscow, illustrated by the following extract from the program of the Communist International adopted at its Sixth World Congress:

"When the ruling classes are disorganized, the masses in a state of revolutionary ferment, when the middle classes incline to join the proletariat and the masses have shown themselves ready to fight and make sacrifices, it is the task of the proletarian party to lead the masses in a frontal attack against the bourgeois state. This will be attained by the propagation of gradually intensified slogans and by the organization of mass action.

"Such mass action includes strikes, strikes in connection with demonstrations, strikes in connection with armed demonstrations, and finally, the general strike combined with the armed rising against the government authority of the bourgeoisie. The highest form of the struggle follows the rules of warfare, and necessitates, as a preliminary plan of campaign, an offensive character in the fighting and unlimited devotion and heroism on the part of the proletariat."

In Cuba the unsettled conditions, unstable government and factional discontent have afforded a fertile ground for the fomentation of revolution, and the Communists have seized the opportunity afforded to ply their trade of murder, sabotage, and civil war. The strike stage was passed during the Machado regime, and the "highest form of the struggle" is ready to follow. Since their recent decisive defeat in Germany, the Communists cannot afford another such failure in Cuba. The workers of the world have been promised by the Soviets ever since the Russian revolution some definite accomplishments toward the establishment of a World Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Cuba, they believe, now offers the best immediate opportunity. Then, too, sovietizing Cuba would permit the establishment of a perfect base on the Western Hemisphere for the dissemination of their revolutionary propaganda in the United States, Panama, and all Latin America, should the United States not extend recognition to Soviet Russia.

It is rumored in Washington that the officials of the State Department have reached an accord that the present regime in Cuba should be recognized at once to stabilize conditions there, but that Ambassador Welles reports from Cuba that the present regime cannot last because of certain Moscow international conspiracies and activities that have been discovered in Cuba. It is believed that State Department officials are guarding this information because of the public indignation it might create against U.S. recognition of Soviet Russia on the eve

of the American-Russo Conference to be held in Washington at the invitation of President Roosevelt.

The recognition of Soviet Russia by the United States will furnish a new impetus to communism, not only in Cuba but throughout the world, and at the same time act as a sedative to the growing impatience of the starving and depressed millions in Russia. In order to attract our money lenders, Soviet Russia has dangled the bait of lucrative trade promises, which has in the past been gobbled up by our international-minded financiers and Government officials. The Soviets say that after recognition they will purchase American goods to the amount of a billion dollars, to rehabilitate world communism; the extent of such trade depends entirely on how much our gullible capitalists and the RFC are willing to loan—\$1 or \$5 billion—having absolutely no intention of ever making payment. Is it reasonable to expect the Soviets, the least responsible of all governments both financially and morally, to repay such loans when France, England, Italy, and other European nations have set a precedent of repudiation by refusing to pay their debts to the United States?

For sake of argument, even should the Bolsheviks reverse their announced policy of abrogation of all contracts when it is no longer to the interest of the Soviet Republics to live up to them, as enunciated by several of its prominent officials in the past, would it be possible for the already bankrupt U.S.S.R. to make such payments? It has already obligated itself to payments to others in the amount of \$350 million a year to 1935. Soviet spokesmen are frank in saying they can pay us in the event of a new loan only by reciprocal trade agreements; by selling their wheat, oil, lumber, and coal, of which we already have surpluses, on our own markets. Competition from such forced labor, low cost and no cost, products would be ruinous to our own industries and cause further unemployment of free American labor. Then there is the probability that the Soviets would resell our commodities, bought on long-term credits, to our regular customers at less than actual production cost, to further demoralize the world markets and to raise cash for the purchase of arms and munitions to build up the Red army and strengthen the world revolutionary movement in all countries, including Cuba and the United States. They are now buying huge quantities of arms and ammunition from Poland on credit.

We are dealing with an enemy state, according to the definition placed on Russia by the Woodrow Wilson administration, and the leopard has not changed its spots. The main obstacle to recognition of Soviet Russia still remains—the attacks of Soviet agents on our institutions and their attempts to overthrow our Government by force and violence. It is to be hoped that the present administration will not barter away any of our cherished principles in dealing with the Soviets.

President Roosevelt has a means at his disposal to determine, to a degree, whether the past activities of the officials of the Soviet Government who have been in this country as representatives of the Amtorg Trading Corp. have been confined strictly to business matters, or whether they have been participating in Communist conspiracies and attacks on our Government. In 1930 the Special Committee of the House of Representatives investigating communism seized, by subpoena, several hundred cablegrams transmitted between Moscow and Amtorg. These messages were sent in a private Moscow code, in direct violation of international law, so complex that no cipher expert in the world has ever been able to break it down and the Soviet officials in the United States refused to decipher them even in secret session. If the business of Amtorg was legiti-

mate, as they claimed, it would not appear necessary to entail such extraordinary precautions as to invoke a code that defies all cipher experts. The President should demand the key to this code from the Soviet officials, as an act of good faith to prove that its accredited officials have not been actively engaged in the revolutionary activities of the third international in this country. If this demand is refused, there can be only one interpretation as to the content of these messages, and it would indicate what we may expect from Soviet officials who are to be given diplomatic immunity through recognition. Such agents have been found active in revolutionary work in Great Britain, Mexico, China, Argentina, France, Germany, and elsewhere.

When and if the recognition question is settled in the United States in favor of Russia, the Cuban campaign will be renewed with every available means and Communist agents in the United States will continue to supply the necessary backing and leadership. The Cuban situation today has a remarkable resemblance to the Russian picture in 1917. The Reds have resorted to the original tools of the Bolsheviks in Russia, by adopting slogans and other phases of the Russian revolution, as directed by Moscow. They are driving to force the Cuban citizens and the rank and file of the Cuban army to join their cause under the Anti-Imperialist League slogan: "The Cuban masses are struggling for bread, land, and freedom." The same meaningless promise of the Russian Communist Party in 1917, almost word for word. The Anti-Imperialist League, supported by the Cuban National Confederation of Labor (CNOC) and the Cuban Communist Party, is constantly stirring up strikes and inciting riots, bombings, and killings throughout Cuba. Other Communist International groups, such as the Communist Parties of the United States, Mexico, Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, Honduras, Salvador, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, have issued manifestos calling for the support of all Communist groups and their sympathizers and ending with the salutation: "Long live the workers, peasants, and soldiers soviet government of Cuba."

Regardless of the fact that such action is the last thing the United States desires, for if the Communists were to overthrow the existing Cuban Government and gain control, intervention by the United States would be inevitable. Anticipating this, the Anti-Imperialist League has been flooding the United States with propaganda to keep hands off Cuba, seizing upon the act of the U.S. Government in sending battleships to Cuban waters to incite the Cubans against this country, and circulating thousands of petitions throughout the United States and Latin America addressed to President Roosevelt protesting against the United States participating in Cuban affairs. While the United States is merely undertaking to live up to its obligations under the Platt amendment, to insure the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, the Communist International is using every possible means to have the Cubans misinterpret such action and to convert them to their cause, asserting that the United States intends to annex Cuba for the benefit of Wall Street, and that only a revolutionary government of the workers and peasants, a Soviet government, can free Cuba from Imperialist domination and clear the way for a higher standard of life for the Cuban toilers. This propaganda has extended to varied efforts by the Communists to win over to their cause the U.S. marines and sailors who have been sent to Cuban waters. The Young Communist League has been particularly active in this phase of revolutionary activities, posting in all conspicuous places in the United States and in Havana, appeals to the marines to refuse to

fight the Cuban workers and to "turn your guns on the bosses."

President Grau San Martin has been accused by many of being definitely allied with the radical elements in Cuba, which he has admitted while denying any Communist affiliations. He has, however, abetted the Communist cause by being overlenient in his treatment of Communist agitators, and by berating the American capitalists who have been trying to exert influences in Cuba, helping thus to crystallize the resentment of the Cuban people against the United States. While there is little doubt but that some of his charges are based on good cause, and that certain of these capitalists have been guilty of meddling and misdealings, nevertheless it should have been the President's first duty, in the interest of Cuba, to cooperate with the United States and to help instill confidence and faith in the good will of American officials who have been sent there in the interest of his own country. While San Martin professes to be friendly to the United States and unquestionably fully realizes our intentions he has continued to play into the hands of the Communists by adopting tactics similar to their own, and is, according to reports considering the appointment of representatives of the radical or Communist element to official positions in the new government.

The Chicago Daily Tribune, commenting on a statement by Sergeant Batiste, San Martin's military leader, that "we will not relinquish control until a truly revolutionary government has been established in Cuba" has this to say editorially: "The question of intervention either from the viewpoint of legal right or of expediency will turn upon Sergeant Batiste's and his associates' notions of a truly revolutionary government. If, as may be suspected, it involves confiscation of property, the execution or imprisonment of dissenters, repudiation of debts and other measures adopted by other truly revolutionary regimes, it would seem that American intervention would come within the terms of the Platt amendment whether or not it is deemed desirable by our Government. * * * If the new regime has communistic intentions it will soon confront our Government with the duty of intervention, reluctant as it and the American people are to resort to forceful interference in Cuban events."

Should Grau San Martin permit the Communists a foothold by appointment to office, then their next step would be to gain complete control of that government, with the consequent establishment of a Communist dictatorship, infinitely more disastrous to the welfare of the Cuban people than was the Machado military dictatorship. In that event, since the United States felt compelled to mediate in the first instance, it would be essential, if the United States is to uphold its world prestige and self-respect, to intervene under the Platt amendment. A Communist dictatorship would, as in Russia, abolish any semblance of human rights, and the murders under the Machado regime would fade into insignificance as compared to the slaughter of Cuban nationals under a Communist dictatorship. Wholesale murder would be legalized, to permit the liquidation of all those who oppose any of its actions, as "counter-revolutionists."

The Daily Worker, official Communist organ of the Communist Party of the United States and semi-official mouthpiece of the Anti-Imperialist League, in its issue of August 14th, condoned the murders of Jose Magrinat and Balmaseda by Communist mobs, stating that "They dragged him (Magrinat) out to the streets where he was beaten to death with bats and clubs," and that "the police stood by and did not dare to interfere." They also promised that other so-called "hangmen and assassins of Machado are

meeting the fate of Magrinat and Balmaseda at the hands of the enraged workers." This is a direct agitation for murder. Magrinat was accused by the Communists of murdering Julio Mella, one of the founders of the Communist Party of Cuba, and this is cited as an example of what might be expected if the Communists gain control of Cuba.

The Upsurge, official organ of the Anti-Imperialist League of the United States, makes the following report in its September issue, regarding the progress of the strike movement in Cuba, leading to the revolutionary crisis—civil war:

"Even within the ranks of the armed forces, the mass movement—communism—has taken root. The officers have been ousted, the noncommissioned officers elected by rank and file soldiers. The latter are fraternizing with the workers, and in many cases have refused to fire on them in the course of strikes. * * * While the Communist Party of Cuba and the CNOC lent the spark that set off the successful general strike, the mass movement that is now gaining in strength is getting more and more under the leadership of these organizations. This is a guarantee that in the shops and in the fields the revolution will not be betrayed. With a clear-cut program of economic demands and an uncompromising stand against imperialism, the revolutionary forces are drawing toward the anti-imperialist agrarian revolution."

The propaganda campaign in the United States keeps apace. A recent letter sent out from the New York office of the Anti-Imperialist League stated in part:

"The dispatch of 30 warships and thousands of marines is the answer of Roosevelt to the struggles of the Cuban masses for liberation. The entire Atlantic fleet surrounds the island ready to crush the Cuban workers and peasants as they rise to carry through the agrarian anti-imperialist revolution. * * * In the face of these imperialist schemes it is imperative that the American workers, farmers, and intellectuals be rallied at once to the support of the colonial masses who are struggling for liberation from the grip of U.S. imperialism."

Before recognition is extended to the Grau San Martin government, the United States should make sure that his regime is free from Communist influences, and that it will take aggressive action against the revolutionary movement sponsored by an alien power. Guarantees must be had that the promise of a direct franchise to the people will be kept, and that the constituent assembly scheduled for next April is held, otherwise no lasting peace is assured the Cuban people nor can the U.S. Government reconcile its past actions to such recognition until these conditions are met.

Should a Communist dictatorship (a Soviet) be established in Cuba, the Third International will have established an important base at our very door, and thereby control the Atlantic entrance to the Panama Canal from where they could carry on their program of sabotage and revolution in the United States, Latin and South America. It would, of course, be more desirable to Russia to have us give their agents diplomatic immunity here in the United States under official recognition, to better carry on this program, but with a newborn Soviet established in Cuba, it would be a simple matter to smuggle her agents into the United States to carry on these revolutionary activities. With both sources made available, we would be faced with a crisis which might prove to be the worst series of blunders ever perpetrated upon any nation by its governing officials.

On the other hand, with the recognition of Soviet Russia being proposed by the United States, President Roosevelt should realize that the Cuban situation must be

given consideration. Representative Hamilton Fish, Jr., of New York, recently stated: "If President Roosevelt recognizes Soviet Russia as indicated by the public press, all hell won't stop the Communists in Cuba from Sovietizing that country at our very doorsteps." Would it be a friendly act on the part of the United States, should Cuba be able to work out of its present difficulties, to have this country welcome Communist agitators to our shores from whence they can proceed to Cuba to continue to organize a revolutionary force sufficient to overthrow the existing Government of Cuba and undo all the progress the Cuban people may have made? It would be very easy for these revolutionary agents, who are accorded diplomatic immunity by this country, to go out from consulates established at Miami and other cities in Florida, for instance, to lead such a revolutionary movement for the establishment of a Communist dictatorship in Cuba.

Cuba and the United States have a common enemy, against whom they should form an ironclad alliance, and this country should realize its responsibilities in Cuba in time to avoid extending recognition to Russia and thus align itself against our neighbor, who should mean more to us than the outlaw Russian nation. Events of the past few months indicate, however, that many of our officials are unaware of the true situation. The first act of the Secretary of Labor on taking office was to practically destroy our immigration service; she discharged most of the efficient investigators who were engaged in running down aliens who were in this country illegally and deporting them.

So well has she pleased the radicals in the United States that they mention the fact that they are making progress "through support by departments of the Government." Then, shortly before the President's proposal of recognition to Soviet Russia, Representative Dickstein, according to Moscow's official organ in New York City, became suddenly alarmed over a report which appeared in that organ, the Daily Worker, that some kind of "Hitler International" was being formed in the United States for the purpose of Hitlerizing the United States. Mr. Dickstein "promised us," the Red organ contended, that "an investigation would be made at once," since which the Congressman has rather perplexed the Reds by properly adding that "all aliens who are guilty of spreading propaganda to overthrow our Government" will be investigated and if possible "be deported." This newly proposed action on the part of Representative Dickstein will be heartening to many of our patriotic organizations and to millions of American voters who have worked so hard to secure favorable action on the Dies bill, providing for the exclusion and expulsion of alien Communists (now pending in Congress for 3 years) if they can be assured by Mr. Dickstein that such an investigation will include "all alien and alien-directed propagandists and saboteurs from an unprejudiced angle, irrespective of any beliefs involved. There can be no question as to the intent and avowed purpose of the alien agents of the Communist international, abetted by Soviet Russia, to overthrow our form of government.

Furthermore, if the Communists are recognized, the U.S. Government owes it to the people of the United States to also see that the Jeffers bill, making it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence is enacted into law. This bill would enable the Department of Justice to keep in contact with the activities of the Communist movement and permit the Government to be in some measure prepared to protect our institutions against riots and sabotage movement sponsored by the Communist agents who are evidently to be welcomed to this country. With the enactment

of such laws, at least some measure of protection would be afforded our own citizens, and the United States will be prepared at least to some extent to help Cuba meet the crisis there which is certain to follow such recognition.

Recognition of Soviet Russia will increase our responsibilities in Cuba, and if the revolutionary movement there forces intervention, in justice to the Cuban people and under our responsibilities as laid down by the Platt amendment, we will have destroyed any progress we may have already made in building up good will and amicable trade relations in Latin-America, thus trading many good cash-paying customers for a bankrupt and begging one. It is to be hoped that such ill-advised action on the part of our Government will not have serious repercussions across the Pacific, involving the United States as a catspaw to pull Soviet chestnuts out of the Far East fire, and thereby stimulate the Third International's drive to communize the remainder of China. Such a display of foolhardy international policies by the present administration on the Russian recognition question could give no hope or comfort to those of our citizens who are desirous that the United States should exert its efforts toward world peace, and would easily result in an unholy alliance with the Soviets which might lose for us the respect and good will of Japan and China.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. MONTONA), for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FISHER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BOW, for 30 minutes, today and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. BRUCE), for 30 minutes, on February 25.

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. BRUCE), for 1 hour, on February 25.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. BRUCE), for 1 hour, on February 26.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWARDS and to include extraneous matter, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$240.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MONTONA in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN of New York in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. FISHER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVERETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NYGAARD and Mr. BERRY (at the request of Mrs. MAY) to extend their remarks following the remarks of Mr. STINSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

Mr. CAHILL.

Mr. DEROUNIAN in 12 instances.

Mr. WYDLER in two instances.

Mr. BECKER in two instances.

Mr. QUIE in five instances.

Mr. ROBISON in five instances.

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. DEVINE in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina.

Mr. SNYDER in five instances.

Mr. BROMWELL.

Mrs. DWYER in five instances.

Mr. POFF.

Mr. LAIRD in three instances.

Mr. NELSEN in four instances.

Mr. HOFFMAN.

Mr. ALGER in six instances.

Mr. SPRINGER in two instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in four instances.

Mr. OSMERS in five instances.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. CURTIS in six instances.

Mr. AVERY.

Mr. QUIE in five instances.

Mr. BOW in five instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. MEADER in five instances.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. ANDERSON in five instances.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana in five instances.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. CURTIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GALLAGHER in two instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. WALTER.

Mr. LANKFORD in five instances.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. ELLIOTT in two instances.

Mr. COHELAN in six instances.

Mr. BRADEMAS in eight instances.

Mr. FINNEGAN in two instances.

Mr. HEMPHILL in two instances.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DADDARIO in five instances.

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. KEOGH.

Mrs. KELLY in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. RODINO in three instances.

Mr. ST. ONGE in four instances.

Mr. STRATTON in three instances.

Mr. HANNA in three instances.

Mr. GARY in two instances.

Mrs. HANSEN in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon.

Mr. DORN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin in five instances.

Mr. MEADER in five instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in four instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

437. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting the U.S. Air Force flying pay report relating to the number receiving flight pay as of August 31, 1962, pursuant to section 301(g), title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

438. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

439. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report relating to paying special pay to certain officers during the calendar year 1962, pursuant to section 306, title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

440. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend and clarify the re-employment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

441. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting the December 1962 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

442. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report containing the results of our continuing review of the outstanding voluntary agreements and programs established, pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

443. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 18, 1960, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

444. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a re-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2599

region were being driven out of business because of destructive discriminatory pricing policies then being applied by some of the giant dairy organizations. During the course of these hearings Congressman STEED uncovered facts disclosing that Sealtest and other large dairies were selling a half gallon of milk to retailers in Mexico, Mo., for 6 cents. A third generation family-owned hometown small business dairy was forced to close its doors. Copies of the transcript of the testimony developed by the subcommittee were made available to the Department of Justice and one of the counts in the Sealtest indictment covered Sealtest's practices in Mexico, Mo.

The House Small Business Subcommittee, again under the chairmanship of our colleague, TOM STEED, developed additional testimony regarding the sale of milk at unreasonably low prices in other markets, including, for instance, Topeka, Kans., where a half gallon of milk was sold for a price of 14 cents. Other testimony received by the subcommittee was to the effect that Sealtest was absorbing losses incurred by its distributor in offering milk at below-cost prices in certain other markets. Prior to the Sealtest indictment, all of this and other evidence also was transmitted to the Department of Justice for consideration and action.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to tell the House that this decision of the Supreme Court is merely one of the many developments that attest to the constructive work carried on by the House Small Business Committee in behalf of small business enterprise.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Supreme Court's opinion in the Sealtest case be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 18.—OCTOBER TERM, 1962

(*United States, Appellant, v. National Dairy Products Corp., et al.*)

(On appeal from the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Feb. 18, 1963)

Mr. Justice Clark delivered the opinion of the Court:

This case involves the question of whether section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C. section 13a, making it a crime to sell goods at "unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor," is unconstitutionally vague and indefinite as applied to sales made below cost with such purpose. National Dairy and Raymond J. Wise, a vice president and director, upon being charged, inter alia, with violating section 3 by making sales below cost for the purpose of destroying competition, moved for dismissal of the Robinson-Patman Act counts of the indictment on the grounds that the statute is unconstitutionally vague and indefinite. The District Court granted the motion and ordered dismissal. On direct appeal under the Criminal Appeals Act, 18 U.S.C. section 3731, we noted probable jurisdiction, 369 U.S. 833, because of the importance of the issue in the administration of the Robinson-Patman Act. We have concluded that the order of dismissal was error and therefore remand the case for trial.

I

National Dairy is engaged in the business of purchasing, processing, distributing, and selling milk and other dairy products

throughout the United States. Through its processing plant in Kansas City, Mo., National Dairy has for the past several years been in competition with national concerns and various local dairies in the Greater Kansas City area and the surrounding areas of Kansas and Missouri. In the Greater Kansas City market National Dairy distributes its products directly, but cities and towns in the surrounding Kansas and Missouri areas outside this market are served by independent distributors who purchase milk from National Dairy and resell on their own account.

The indictment charged violations of both the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1, and the Robinson-Patman Act in Kansas City and in six local markets and in the adjacent area.¹ The Robinson-Patman counts charged National Dairy and Wise with selling milk in those markets "at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition." Further specifying the acts complained of, the indictment charged National Dairy with having "utilized the advantages it possesses by reason of the fact that it operates in a great many different geographical localities in order to finance and subsidize a price war against small dairies selling milk in competition with it, by intentionally selling milk, directly or to a distributor, at prices below National's cost." In five of the markets National Dairy's pricing practice was alleged to have resulted in "severe financial losses to small dairies," and in two others the effect was claimed to have been to "eliminate competition" and "drive small dairies from" the market.

National Dairy and Wise moved to dismiss all of the Robinson-Patman counts on the grounds that the statutory provision, "unreasonably low prices," is so vague and indefinite as to violate the due process requirement of the fifth amendment and an indictment based on this provision is violative of the sixth amendment in that it does not adequately apprise them of the charges. The district court, after rendering an oral opinion holding that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is unconstitutionally vague and indefinite, granted the motion and ordered dismissal of the section 3 counts. The case came here on direct appeal from the order of dismissal.

II

National Dairy and Wise urge that section 3 is to be tested solely "on its face" rather than as applied to the conduct charged in the indictment, i.e., sales below cost for the purpose of destroying competition. The Government, on the other hand, places greater emphasis on the latter, contending that whether or not there is doubt as to the validity of the statute in all of its possible applications, section 3 is plainly constitutional in its application to the conduct alleged in the indictment.

It is true that a statute attacked as vague must initially be examined "on its face" but it does not follow that a readily discernible dividing line can always be drawn, with statutes falling neatly into one of the two categories of "valid" or "invalid" solely on the basis of such an examination.

¹ Seven counts of the 15-count indictment charged violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. The Sherman Act and Robinson-Patman Act counts relate to the same course of conduct.

One Robinson-Patman count, number XIII, charges Raymond J. Wise, a vice president and director of National, with authorizing National's pricing practice and ordering its effectuation in the Kansas City market. *United States v. Wise*, 370 U.S. 405 (1962), involves two Sherman Act counts of the indictment which named Wise as a defendant.

We do not evaluate section 3 in the abstract.

"The delicate power of pronouncing an act of Congress unconstitutional is not to be exercised with reference to hypothetical cases * * * (a) limiting construction could be given to the statute by the court responsible for its construction if an application of doubtful constitutionality were * * * presented. We might add that application of this rule frees the Court not only from unnecessary pronouncement on constitutional issues, but also from premature interpretations of statutes in areas where their constitutional application might be cloudy." *United States v. Raines*, 362 U.S. 17, 22 (1960).

The strong presumptive validity that attaches to an act of Congress has led this Court to hold many times that statutes are not automatically invalidated as vague simply because difficulty is found in determining whether certain marginal offenses fall within their language. E.g., *Jordan v. DeGeorge*, 341 U.S. 223, 231 (1951), and *United States v. Petrillo*, 332 U.S. 1, 7 (1947). Indeed, we have consistently sought an interpretation which supports the constitutionality of legislation. E.g., *United States v. Rumely*, 345 U.S. 41, 47 (1953); *Crowell v. Benson*, 285 U.S. 22, 62 (1932); see *Screws v. United States*, 325 U.S. 91 (1945).

Void for vagueness simply means that criminal responsibility should not attach where one could not reasonably understand that his contemplated conduct is proscribed. *United States v. Harris*, 347 U.S. 612, 617 (1954). In determining the sufficiency of the notice a statute must of necessity be examined in the light of the conduct with which a defendant is charged. *Robinson v. United States*, 324 U.S. 282 (1945). In view of these principles we must conclude that if section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act gave National Dairy and Wise sufficient warning that selling below cost for the purpose of destroying competition is unlawful, the statute is constitutional as applied to them.² This is not to say that a head-sight indictment can correct a blunderbuss statute, for the latter itself must be sufficiently focused to forewarn of both its reach and coverage. We therefore consider the vagueness attack solely in relation to whether the statute sufficiently warned National Dairy and Wise that selling "below cost" with predatory intent was within its prohibition of "unreasonably low prices."

III

The history of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act indicates that selling below cost, unless mitigated by some acceptable business exigency, was intended to be prohibited by the words "unreasonably low prices." That sales below cost without a justifying business reason may come within the proscriptions of the Sherman Act has long been established. See e.g., *Standard Oil Co. v. United States*, 221 U.S. 1 (1911). Further, when the Clayton Act was enacted in 1914 to strengthen the Sherman Act, Congress passed section 2 to cover price discrimination by large companies which compete by lowering prices, oftentimes below the cost of production * * * with the intent to destroy and make unprofitable the business of their competitors. H.R. Rep. No. 627, 63d Cong., 2d sess. 8. The 1936 enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act was for the purpose of strengthening the Clayton Act provisions, *Federal Trade Commission v. Anheuser-Busch, Inc.* 363 U.S. 538, 544 (1960); and the act was aimed at a specific weapon of the monopolist—predatory pricing. Moreover,

² It should be noted that, in reviewing a case in which a motion to dismiss was granted, we are required to accept well-pleaded allegations of the indictment as the hypothesis for decision. *Boyce Motor Lines v. United States*, 342 U.S. 337, 343 (1952).

section 3 was described by Representative Ufferback, a House manager of the Joint Conference Committee, as attaching criminal penalties in addition to the civil liabilities and remedies already provided by the Clayton Act. (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8419.)

The Court, in *Moore v. Mead's Pine Bread Co.*, 348 U.S. 115 (1954), a case based in part on section 3, recognized the applicability of the Robinson-Patman Act to conduct quite similar to that with which National Dairy and Wise are charged here. The Court said, "Congress by the Clayton Act and Robinson-Patman Act barred the use of interstate business to destroy local business" through programs in which "profits made in interstate activities would underwrite the losses of local price-cutting campaigns" (Id. at 120, 119).

In proscribing sales at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor we believe that Congress condemned sales made below cost for such purpose. And we believe that National Dairy and Wise could reasonably understand from the statutory language that the conduct described in the indictment was proscribed by the act. They say, however, that this is but the same horse with a different bridle because the phrase "below cost" is itself a vague and indefinite expression in business.

Whether "below cost" refers to "direct" or "fully distributed" cost or some other level of cost computation cannot be decided in the abstract. There is nothing in the record on this point, and it may well be that the issue will be rendered academic by a showing that National Dairy sold below any of these cost levels. Therefore, we do not reach this issue here. As we said in *Automatic Canteen Co. v. Federal Trade Commission* (346 U.S. 81, 85, (1953)): "Since precision of expression is not an outstanding characteristic of the Robinson-Patman Act, exact formulation of the issue before us is necessary to avoid inadvertent pronouncement on statutory language in one context when the same language may require separate consideration in other settings."

Finally, we think the additional element of predatory intent alleged in the indictment and required by the act provides further definition of the prohibited conduct. We believe the notice here is more specific than that which was held adequate in *Screws v. United States*, 325 U.S. 91 (1945), in which a requirement of intent served to "relieve the statute of the objection that it punishes without warning an offense of which the accused was unaware." Id., at 102; see id., at 101-107. Proscribed by the statute in *Screws* was the intentional achievement of a result, i.e., the willful deprivation of certain rights. The act here, however, in prohibiting sales at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition, listed as elements of the illegal conduct not only the intent to achieve a result—destruction of competition—but also the act—selling at unreasonably low prices—done in furtherance of that design or purpose. It seems clear that the necessary specificity of warning is afforded when, as here, separate, though related, statutory elements of prohibited activity come to focus on one course of conduct.

United States v. Cohen Grocery Co., 255 U.S. 81 (1921), on which much reliance is placed, is inapposite here. In *Cohen* the act proscribed "any unjust or unreasonable rate or charge." The charge in the indictment was in the exact language of the statute, and, in specifying the conduct covered by the charge, the indictment did nothing more than state the price the defendant was alleged to have collected. Hence, the Court held that a "specific or definite" act was neither proscribed by the act nor alleged in

the indictment. Id., at 89. Moreover, the standard held too vague in *Cohen* was without a meaningful referent in business practice or usage. [T]here was no accepted and fairly stable commercial standard which could be regarded as impliedly taken up and adopted by the statute " * * *." *Small Co. v. American Sugar Rfg. Co.*, 287 U.S. 233, 240-241 (1925). In view of the business practices against which section 3 was unmistakably directed and the specificity of the violations charged in the indictment here, both absent in *Cohen*, the proffered analogy to that case must be rejected.

In this connection we also note that the approach to "vagueness" governing a case like this is different from that followed in cases arising under the first amendment. There we are concerned with the vagueness of the statute "on its face" because such vagueness may in itself deter constitutionally protected and socially desirable conduct. See *Thornhill v. Alabama*, 310 U.S. 88, 98 (1940); *NAACP v. Button*, decided January 14, 1963, —U.S. —. No such factor is present here where the statute is directed only at conduct designed to destroy competition, activity which is neither constitutionally protected nor socially desirable. We are thus permitted to consider the warning provided by section 3 not only in terms of the statute "on its face" but also in the light of the conduct to which it is applied. The reliance of National Dairy and Wise on first amendment cases is, therefore, misplaced.

IV

This opinion is not to be construed, however, as holding that every sale below cost constitutes a violation of section 3. Such sales are not condemned when made in furtherance of a legitimate commercial objective, such as the liquidation of excess, obsolete or perishable merchandise, or the need to meet a lawful, equally low price of a competitor (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 8332, 8334; see *Ben Hur Coal Co. v. Wells*, 242 F. 2d 481 (C.A. 10th Cir. 1957)). Sales below cost in these instances would neither be "unreasonably low" nor made with predatory intent. But sales made below cost without legitimate commercial objective and with specific intent to destroy competition would clearly fall within the prohibitions of section 3.

Since the indictment charges the latter conduct and, as noted, supra, we are bound by the well-pleaded allegations of the indictment, we must conclude that National Dairy and Wise were adequately forewarned of the illegal conduct charged against them and remand the case for trial. Our holding, of course, does not foreclose proof on the merits as to the reasonableness of the alleged pricing conduct or, for that matter, the absence of the predatory intent necessary to conviction.

Reversed and remanded.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 18.—OCTOBER TERM, 1962.

(*United States*, appellant, v. *National Dairy Products Corp.*, et al.)

(On appeal from the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri, February 18, 1963.)

Mr. Justice Black, with whom Mr. Justice Stewart and Mr. Justice Goldberg join, dissenting.

The statute here involved makes it a crime to sell goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor. 15 U.S.C. section 13a. In *United States v. Cohen Grocery Co.*, 255 U.S. 81 (1921), this Court held unconstitutional and void for vagueness a statute which made it a crime "for any person willfully * * * to make any unjust or unreasonable rate or charge" in dealing in or with any necessities. The rule established by that case has been often

followed,¹ is in my judgment sound, and should control this case. Accordingly, I would affirm the district court's judgment holding the statute invalid. The Court here attempts by interpretation to substitute unambiguous standards for the vague standard of "unreasonably low prices" used by Congress in the statute. It seems to me that if this criminal statute is to be so drastically reconstructed it should be done by Congress, not by us. Moreover, I agree with the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, which concluded:

"Doubts besetting section 3's constitutionality seem well founded; no gloss imparted by history or adjudication has settled the vague contours of this harsh criminal law."²

DANGER SIGNALS FLY—PRESSURES MOUNT IN CUBAN REFUGEE SITUATION

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the tragic and dangerous situation which has arisen in Miami, Fla., in which exiled Cubans have today engaged in street rioting accompanied by threats and imprecations against local police authority and the American way of life. In so doing they have disrupted the peace of a friendly community and fallen prey to those who would add fuel to the Communist propaganda line.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to reports from Miami advising:

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21.—At 10 a.m. this morning four pacifists carrying picket signs began to picket the Cuban Revolutionary Council at 17th and Biscayne Boulevard, Miami. A riot began. One of the revolutionary council officials, with a loudspeaker, asked all to be calm. Thereupon, some 200 or more Cubans entered the fray with bottles, eggs, stones, and other items.

The police were called. The riot squad of police and dogs tried to break up the gathering. Six policemen were seen fighting with one Cuban in an effort to get him under control. Thirteen Cubans were picked up by the Miami police, four of whom are reportedly members of the 2506 Brigade. Fire trucks were called to the scene ready to use water hoses to disperse the crowd. Attempts by members of the Cuban Revolutionary Council to quell the violence were responded to by jeers and catcalls by their fellow Cubans. During the riot, Cubans were heard screaming:

"Even Castro does not permit this," followed by denunciatory statements to the effect that they did not like nor did they want "this kind of democracy," the kind that would let this type of people run around loose. The rioters fighting the police screamed and denounced them as "Communists."

The following was today carried on the United Press wires:

Violence erupted today when a group of pacifists attempted to picket the headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Council.

¹ E.g., *Cline v. Frink Dairy Co.*, 274 U.S. 445 (1927); *Lanzetta v. New Jersey*, 308 U.S. 451 (1939); cf. *United States v. Cardiff*, 344 U.S. 174 (1952).

² Atty. Gen. Nat. Comm. Antitrust Rep. 201 (1955) (recommending repeal of sec. 3).

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2601

Club-wielding police quickly broke up the demonstration when 200 angry Cubans clashed with the pickets. About half a dozen exiles were arrested by police, who entered the headquarters of the council, prepared for what looked like the beginning of a street riot. The police were denounced violently by the Cubans, many of them members of the Cuban invasion brigade, who shouted, "Communists—even Castro doesn't do this in Cuba." Three fire trucks moved into a side street and prepared to douse the area with water if necessary. Police, under command of Miami Safety Director Col. Don Pomerleau, broke up the disorders within 10 minutes. Trouble started even before the arrival of the pickets when Spanish-speaking police, using a portable loud-speaker, requested the Cubans to remain inside the property limits of the council grounds.

Jose A. Hernandez, a spokesman for the council's labor organization, speaking to the Cubans through a microphone from the headquarters porch, urged them to go home peacefully and "not play into the hands of the Communists who want to cause disorder here."

The exiles reacted violently against the request and denounced Hernandez and shouted epithets at him. Another council representative, Raul Mendez, then appealed over the microphone for the crowd to go home.

His petition was greeted with loud boos and angry shouts. For a few minutes, it looked like some members of the crowd were going to attack the two council representatives. At this point, the police, who originally posted about 15 men, summoned reinforcements including about 15 motorcycle officers.

A few minutes later, the pickets, men and women—apparently Americans—arrived carrying signs bearing pacifist slogans such as "War will end man or man will end war" and "We oppose military service."

The pickets massed on a grassy mall directly in front of the council headquarters entrance and then suddenly violence erupted when one Cuban darted across the street and ripped a sign out of a picket's hands. Stones and bottles were hurled at the police by the Cuban exiles.

Police roped off the property of the council and refused to let anyone in or out.

Later, a group of about 100 Cubans, most of them members of invasion brigade 2506, set out on a protest march to police headquarters.

The citizenry of Miami, Fla., has long borne with patience the burden of an onslaught of dispossessed Cubans—a burden which should long ago have been shared by the entire United States.

Vallant efforts have been made by our Presidents, the Federal and State agencies, our churches, business institutions, and individual citizens, to assist in every way possible.

Arriving in Miami penniless and with just the clothes they were wearing, almost all of these Cuban refugees has been forced to give up their homes, their businesses, their life savings, and all their personal property.

To help them meet the basic needs of existence, the Federal Government has made financial and other assistance available to them until they can become self-supporting.

Employment opportunity in Miami is limited. There simply are not enough jobs to accommodate both local residents and refugees. There arose open competition and economic conflict between the permanent citizenry and the incoming refugees. The ballroom had to burst.

I have noted the ever-increasing frustrations, stresses, strains, and economic ills imposed on the people of my area. For this reason, I have for over 2 years fought for a

more realistic approach to this long-festering situation.

I have repeatedly advocated—to two Presidents and Government officials—that Dade County and Florida had reached a saturation point on the receipt of Cuban refugees.

Long ago I urged, and have continued fighting for, the establishment of an additional port of entry and reception center.

Long ago, and many times since, I urged extension and amplification of the resettlement program under which the Government—through January 25, 1963, has resettled 53,974 Cubans, not quite one-third of the 157,525 persons entering and registering from Cuba. Again I reiterate, no community the size of metropolitan Dade County could conceivably be expected to absorb such a shock.

Time and time again, I have met with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other top echelon governmental officials concerned with the Cuban refugee programs, to discuss the need to reevaluate the overall program. Long ago, it was obvious that this was no longer a temporary situation; the facts demanded that priority attention be devoted to resettlement—to opening a reception center elsewhere.

Admirable efforts have been made by this administration and the agencies of the Federal Government in their attempts to alleviate this situation. While the programs instituted have been highly successful, we have got to do more.

On February 5 of this year, I addressed myself to reports that a so-called Cuban GI bill was being considered. At that time, I publicly stated my opposition before top echelon officials of executive agencies having jurisdiction of the Cuban refugee program. I told all that I felt that the present programs are more than adequate and that I am opposed to any new or additional benefits. I am grateful that no more has been heard of this proposition.

I again respectfully submit that Cuban exiles must be allocated to communities all over the United States and not concentrated in one already greatly overburdened area, and no further flow should come to the Miami area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spread on the record a letter which as recently as February 15 I directed to Mr. John Frederick Thomas, director of the Cuban refugee program:

I am quite concerned over the Cuban refugee program in my district. The residents of Dade County have been extremely patient and understanding of the problems of these refugees and have cooperated to the fullest. However, as I have emphasized many times before, Dade County has long ago reached the saturation point.

I have been deluged with mail from my constituents indicating their dissatisfaction with the rate of resettlement of these refugees the latest official figures indicate a severe drop in resettlements and their strong opposition to any additional benefits to the Cuban refugees. I am in full agreement with these views

and I might add that I believe the present programs to be more than adequate and I am opposed to the establishment of broad new programs for any Cuban refugees. I fully support the previously granted authorization for qualified Cuban refugees to serve and be trained in the U.S. Armed Forces, but not to be granted any special benefits or privileges for this service.

I would respectfully request:

First. That if any additional Cuban refugees are to be permitted to enter the United States in the future, they be assigned to a port of entry and processed through a reception center other than Dade County or the State of Florida.

Second. That additional emphasis be placed on the resettlement program and that it be accelerated and implemented to the fullest degree.

Third. That I be notified at the earliest practicable moment if any new programs or broadening of present programs are being contemplated.

I respectfully go on record, Mr. Speaker, urging the immediate attention of the House to this most urgent request. The situation in the Miami area is dangerous and explosive. It is made for those who would deliberately attempt to set citizen against refugee—yes, even refugee against refugee—and to utilize the pentup emotions of American and Cuban alike to supply the fuel of the Communist propagandist.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time for us to act on some conclusive solution for this problem which will relieve all possibilities of a further attempt to exploit the frustrations and stresses of residents of the Miami area. The need is not yesterday, nor tomorrow, but right now.

It is imperative that action be taken to permanently alleviate the economic and psychological ills that have beset the long-suffering Miami community. We must expeditiously implement the humanitarian and intelligent programs which will relocate large numbers of Cuban exiles immediately—until such day as they can be returned to a free, democratic Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise that, partially in response to my letter to Mr. Thomas, a meeting was held yesterday between officials of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and four national voluntary agencies which have major responsibility for carrying out the Cuban resettlement program. Dr. Ellen Winston, Commissioner of HEW's new Welfare Administration, told the group that the resettlement program has her full support of the Department and the Federal Government. She said:

We want to secure the best possible resettlement of the refugees in the last possible time so that the fathers and mothers and children in Miami, who so urgently need new homes and new jobs, can begin new lives. In the case of the refugees, the path to independence and self-support can follow only one major route, resettlement.

It is a source of deep satisfaction to me to note that the good work of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be continued—that relocation is to be immediately accelerated and diligently pur-

sued. This is one constructive step toward the ultimate solution.

CUBA PLANES FIRE ON U.S. SHRIMP BOAT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, along with the rest of America, I was incensed to learn of the report that two Mig fighter planes apparently based in Cuba had fired rockets at Florida shrimp boats on the high seas.

The protection of Americans and the right of freedom of the high seas must be guaranteed by our Government.

Planes and vessels should be ordered to shoot to kill on any interference by hostile aircraft or vessels out of Communist Cuba.

Since this attack by Cuban fighters may be a preliminary probe, we should make clear by our immediate response that the United States will use whatever force is necessary or required to stop or prevent these attacks—or the likelihood of further attacks—even if it means pursuing the attackers to Cuban soil.

For many years under two administrations, I have urged repeatedly that the United States must take whatever action, military or economic, as necessary in its self interest with regard to the problem of a Communist Government in Cuba. We need to take every collective action, economic or military, which needs to be taken.

The removal of the offensive weaponry by the Communists was certainly a significant turn of events for the free world and the United States. The recent announcement that several thousand troops will be withdrawn is certainly a step in the right direction.

But, Mr. Speaker, as our President has so wisely and properly said, the great danger emanating from Cuba is not whether there are 5,000 or 50,000 Russian troops there, but the fact that it is used as a base for subversion. Our Government has pointed out to all Latin countries that the Communist Government of Cuba has declared war on Latin America; that every Latin government is in peril.

The point is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the great danger to the United States and to the Western Hemisphere is simply the existence of a Communist government in Cuba.

Our President has stated clearly that the existence of the Communist government in Cuba is incompatible with the inter-American system and that all of the U.S. policies shall be directed towards the eradication of communism in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, the American people solidly support the President of the United States in any action which he may take.

It is evident to me and I have predicted many times over the years that the new arena for the world struggle would be in Latin America. It is obvious today that this prediction is more than borne out. There is obviously a full-scale hemispheric effort on the part of the Communists in Latin America. This has all been stimulated and will continue to be stimulated by the very existence of a Communist base of operation

in Cuba. Therefore, this base must be exterminated.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the Communists' phase 2, use of the popular front in Latin America, has moved into phase 3, which is the use of violence and terrorism for the weakening and overthrow of democratic institutions in Latin America.

Under these circumstances, as I have repeatedly said, long-range programs designed to treat the economic and social ills of a people who are in an epochal revolution is desirable, but not sufficient. The United States and the Latin American republics must have short-range programs to deal with the immediate threats to political stability.

In this regard, this administration has taken masterful steps long needed to meet this threat. We must continue to pursue these, and in addition, engage in the greatest concentrated ideological offensive the United States has ever undertaken.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, not only must the Communist challenge be met head on at the military, economic and ideological level, but we must pursue those courses which will make national and international events follow an offensive pattern determined by the United States.

UNITED NATIONS

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1963, I introduced a bill, a resolution (H.J. Res. 253), that will provide an avenue for U.S. citizens to express their endorsement of the United Nations not only by words but also in a very tangible and meaningful way.

My measure will permit American taxpayers to deduct from their individual income taxes any contributions to the United Nations and its specialized agencies such as UNESCO.

The measure will enable supporters of the U.N. to wish the organization well at a time when crucial financial and moral supports are needed. And it will provide Americans an opportunity to express the view, shared by President Kennedy, that it takes more than arms to keep the peace.

Too long, Mr. Speaker, have the supporters of the U.N. in this country been silent in the face of unreasonable criticisms directed against it by opponents whose views have been given unrepresentative prominence. Some of the critics of the U.N. have narrow, selfish economic interests. And it has been well publicized that a well-financed, lavish campaign against the U.N. on behalf of the so-called Katanga government has been operating in freewheeling style in the United States. And it appears that some of this criticism may be coming from organizations that enjoy tax-exempt status or claim to.

I do not have swollen expectations for the U.N., Mr. Speaker. I do not believe it is an infallible organization. But I insist that the U.N. has richly earned

the support of the peoples of the world in its efforts to provide a forum for conciliation of international tensions and conflicts and to assist developing countries with their medical, education, and social problems. Our membership in the United Nations, beginning with the San Francisco Conference in 1945, has been endorsed by a broad range of bipartisan support from the leaders of our two great major political parties. I hope they will join with me in another move to reaffirm our support in an organization that is one of our best hopes for a just peace.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1963, I introduced a bill, H.R. 3861, to provide equal pay for equal work.

This bill is designed to remove a serious injustice to both men and women workers in our Nation. In my view, State equal pay laws have not proved effective.

It is shocking and unjust that with some 24.5 million full- and part-time women workers in our labor force, there should be discriminatory wage rates. These women neither work for "pin money" nor are they casual workers. They are workers in their own right. They are entitled to the same privileges and rights as male workers. These women support themselves or contribute in whole or substantially in part to the income of their families. I think it is high time that in all instances women workers are treated with full and equal employment rights. Studies have shown that a permissive situation in which employers are permitted to pay lower wages to women than to men for work demanding comparable skills leads to situations in which the wages of men themselves are depressed.

My bill represents a policy of President Kennedy. It is an integral part of his legislative program. President Kennedy since his election has taken several steps to insure full and equal promotion and employment right without regard to race, creed, color, or sex. These actions are to be applauded. I look forward to a full measure of support from a majority of our Members of Congress for what in my view is legislative action long overdue.

MOTOR VEHICLES EQUIPPED WITH SAFETY BELTS

(Mr. RYAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a measure which would require all motor vehicles sold or shipped in commerce to be equipped with safety belts and to meet other safety standards.

This bill would make it illegal to manufacture for sale in interstate commerce any vehicle which is not equipped with

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2591

tion or any other area where such entity conducts operations unless the Secretary has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of an existing business entity in the area of original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations, and (C) is reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area in which it is, or will be, located.

(b) In cases of demonstrated need, to be determined by the Secretary, a lending institution from whom the Secretary purchases evidences of indebtedness under Section 3 of this Act, may invest not more than 25 per centum of the proceeds from such purchase in ways other than those authorized by this section.

USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

Sec. 5. (a) To the fullest extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, but only with their consent and on a reimbursable basis. The foregoing requirement shall be implemented by the Secretary in such a manner as to avoid the duplication of existing staffs and facilities in any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government. The Secretary is authorized to delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government any of the Secretary's functions, powers, and duties under this Act as he may deem appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers, and duties by the heads of such departments and agencies.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions so as to assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority, and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, or functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

(c) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be transferred between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

POWERS OF THE SECRETARY

Sec. 6. In performing his duties under this Act, the Secretary is, among other things, authorized to—

(1) assign, sell, or otherwise dispose of for cash, credit, or such consideration as he shall deem reasonable, at public or private sale and without recourse to him any evidence of indebtedness, debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him as a result of, or in connection with an evidence of indebtedness purchased under this Act and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with such evidence of indebtedness until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(2) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash, credit, or such consideration as he shall deem reasonable, at public or private sale and without recourse to him, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by him, in connection with the evidence of indebtedness purchased under this Act; and

(3) to establish such rules and regulations as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 7. This Act shall, to the fullest extent practicable, be administered so as to be consistent with the objectives, purposes, and

polices of the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87-27, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, May 1, 1961.)

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 8. (a) "Secretary"—Unless otherwise indicated, when used in this Act, "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) "Redevelopment area"—When used in this Act, "redevelopment area" shall mean an area designated as a redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87-27, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, May 1, 1961).

(c) "Evidence of indebtedness"—When used in this Act, "evidence of indebtedness" shall mean a bond, debenture, note, or other contract for the payment of money, or a participation therein, which, among other things, (1) evidences a loan to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the acquisition or development of land or facilities (including, as the case may be, machinery and equipment), or both, for industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings, the rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, and the alteration, conversion or enlargement of existing buildings; (2) is secured by a mortgage, deed of trust, or similar instrument, covering land or facilities (including, as the case may be, machinery and equipment), or both acquired or developed for industrial or commercial usage; and (3) is so secured as reasonably to assure repayment.

REVOLVING FUND

Sec. 9. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury a revolving fund (hereinafter called "the fund") which shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for use in carrying out the provisions of this Act. All repayments of loans, and interest, and other receipts from transactions under this Act shall be paid into the fund.

(b) To carry out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, appropriations not to exceed \$50,000,000 are authorized to be made to the fund from time to time and without fiscal year limitation. The Secretary shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the net amount of cash disbursements from the fund, at a rate to be determined annually by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current average market yields on outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities.

CAREER COMPENSATION ACT

(Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress occasionally passes a law designed to achieve a desirable purpose but which in operation fails to bring about the results desired by the Congress. Whenever it is apparent to the Congress that a measure we have passed is failing to achieve the purpose for which it was enacted and is causing hardship, it is the duty of the Congress to take remedial action.

In July of 1962 the 87th Congress enacted Public Law 531. The bill amended certain sections of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950. The changes became effective January 1, 1963.

Under the law certain senior noncommissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines were relieved of

the mandatory responsibility or providing allotments for the support of their dependents. Since January 1, 1963, allotments for the support of their dependents have been voluntary on the part of these noncommissioned officers.

In the enactment of Public Law 531 the Congress was endeavoring to achieve a worthwhile purpose. The quarters allowance for certain members of the Armed Forces was to be raised and senior noncommissioned officers were given the opportunity of providing for the support of their dependents without arbitrary action on the part of the Federal Government.

I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, it seems that Public Law 531 with respect to voluntary allotments on the part of senior noncommissioned officers has failed to justify the optimism of Congress when the law was enacted. Many members of the Armed Forces have taken advantage of the law to terminate all assistance to their dependents, bringing about extreme hardship to the families of many servicemen.

I have received numerous complaints from the dependents of servicemen advising that their allotments have not been forthcoming since the effective date of Public Law 531. The Red Cross representative in one city in my congressional district informs me that she has been deluged with inquiries from the dependents of service personnel who have suddenly been deprived of their means of support.

In addition to creating unusual hardship conditions for thousands of dependents of military personnel by the enactment of Public Law 531, we have brought about an administrative problem which is beyond the power of the various military services to handle. While the Armed Forces will make every effort to impress upon persons in the military service the necessity for providing for their dependents, the military services have been left without an effective remedy to apply in the matter.

In a letter dated February 13, 1963, the Commandant of the Marine Corps pointed out to me the difficulty with which the Corps is confronted in this matter.

I might point out—

General Shoup said—

the following difficulty which will be encountered in resolving nonsupport problems under the new legislation. In accordance with the Marine Corps policy, a member who fails to provide support for his dependents may become subject to disciplinary action. Such action will not, however, serve to force the member to provide support for dependents against his wishes. This can only be accomplished by a civil court of competent jurisdiction.

The other military services are faced with a problem similar to the one described by General Shoup.

Mr. Speaker, unless the Congress takes quick action to restore the requirement for mandatory allotments for the support of dependents of military personnel, the problem I have described will continue to grow. Congress should act promptly to see that the dependents of military personnel continue to receive adequate support.

Under existing circumstances in the Armed Forces this responsibility can be fulfilled only by the enactment of legislation restoring the requirement for mandatory allotments on the part of enlisted military personnel. The bill I have introduced will alleviate the unfortunate situation of many families of service personnel that has arisen through the enactment of Public Law 531 of the 87th Congress.

I know that my colleagues in the House must have had numerous inquiries in the past several weeks from constituents who have had their subsistence funds terminated. In the light of their experience in this matter I hope that they will join with me in working for the enactment of my bill.

Cuba in Perspective
CUBA IN PERSPECTIVE

(Mr. STRATTON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I had the honor to address the annual convention of the New York Press Association, an organization comprising the editors and publishers of virtually all of the weekly newspapers in New York State.

I took advantage of that occasion, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this distinguished body of community leaders and opinionmakers in our great Empire State, to try to present my own views, as one Member of the House as well as a member of the great Committee on Armed Services, of just what the current situation in Cuba really is. I tried to do it without any of the narrow political partisanship that has clouded so many of the comments on this crisis in recent weeks.

In the thought that perhaps some Members may find some of these remarks of interest in connection with their own discussion of this vital subject in their home districts, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of these remarks be included at this point in the RECORD.

The address referred to follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN SAMUEL S. STRATTON, BEFORE THE NEW YORK PRESS ASSOCIATION CONVENTION BANQUET, HOTEL SYRACUSE, SYRACUSE, N.Y., FEBRUARY 15, 1963.

CUBA IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. President, members of the New York Press Association, ladies and gentlemen: I welcome this opportunity, as one member of the political fraternity, to pay my formal tribute to the ladies and gentlemen of the press for the vital and important role you play in making our American democracy work. Nobody knows better than a practicing politician the power of the press in the operation of our free and open American society. Without the means of communication between those in office and the people whom they represent which a free press supplies; and without an alert press, as a kind of fourth branch of government overseeing and riding herd on the actions and the antics of the other three, democracy could not long survive. Just how long might be a matter of some speculation, but I am sure that at least as far as the people of New York City are concerned, 2 long

months is just about as far as they would care to push the experiment.

I'm also glad to have this chance to salute you who comprise that special portion of the fourth estate, the weekly newspapers of New York State. All of us in Washington respect the press. But as the New York Member of Congress who has more counties in his district than any other Member, and who therefore has, or so I am reliably informed, more weekly newspapers delivered to his office than any other Member from New York, I stand in particular awe of this distinguished audience and welcome this unique chance to try to penetrate your influential columns.

One of our occasional problems in a democratic society has been to reconcile the freedom of speech and of the press which is so vital to the preservation of our liberties with the special exigencies of war. Yet, even though we have never liked it, we Americans have always willingly accepted the temporary restraints which war, on the fortunately few occasions when we have been engaged in it, has imposed on these basic freedoms. Censorship has been accepted with the outbreak of hostilities, and has been speedily removed when those hostilities came to an end. We have been willing to forego some of our own right to know so as to make sure the enemy isn't reading any of our important military secrets over our shoulder. And I dare say our democracy has not suffered as a result of this exercise in self-discipline.

I mention all this because of course today—in February 1963—we find ourselves in a situation that is really neither war nor peace as we have known them in the past. No shooting—or almost no shooting—by American forces anywhere in the world; yet our House Committee on Armed Services is currently studying—and doubtless will approve—the fourth largest defense budget—\$54 billion—in the Nation's entire history.

What we are in today is what we have come to know as cold war—a somewhat inexact term, for a continuous and unrelenting struggle between communism and freedom which, for many at least, is just as deadly as hot war and whose outcome for the ultimate course of history could be even more crucial.

Just as the distinction between war and peace becomes blurred in an era of cold war, so too do some of the other distinctions. Last October, for example, this Nation stood on the brink of nuclear war in a situation more perilous than any we have faced since Pearl Harbor. Fortunately boldness and determination prevailed without the need for any outright hostilities. During this brief period, while the outcome was still in balance, our military leaders revived a modified form of wartime censorship and restricted their announcements to the press to those items which would not alert our enemies in advance to the course of action we intended to follow. When the crisis subsided this limited censorship came off.

This, of course, is what we now hear referred to as a policy of "managed news." I find it hard to believe that any reasonable man—or newspaper editor—would suggest for a moment that our Government had any more obligation to telegraph its punches to the enemy during the October Cuban crisis than we did in the months following Pearl Harbor. Yet this simple and to me perfectly unexceptionable principle still tends sometimes to be overlooked just because it is harder today than it was a generation ago to draw a clear line between war and peace.

The handling of our Government's relations with the press is not the only thing that we sometimes find hard to keep in perspective in the light of the realities of today's unique cold war situation. We've been witnessing another example in Washington

these past couple of weeks of the ease with which our consideration of vital military and political issues can slip out of perspective and end up in confusion and hopeless exaggeration.

I'm not interested now in trying to assess either praise or blame. But as one Member of Congress with some responsibility for the successful operation of our overall Defense Establishment I do welcome the opportunity, before this distinguished audience, to make an effort to review the current situation in Cuba in the kind of perspective to which I believe it is entitled.

Here, as I see it, are the essential points about Cuba as of this Friday evening, February 15, 1963:

1. The Soviet long-range nuclear missiles have left Cuba, and the missile bases—whether they be concrete, gravel, concrete-with-gravel, or gravel-with-concrete—have in fact been dismantled and destroyed. Nothing is ever absolutely certain in this imperfect and uncertain world of ours, but I say that Secretary McNamara proved this point beyond a reasonable doubt to all fair-minded and reasonable men last week on television.

2. We Americans can take pride in a top-notch military intelligence system. No one could have watched that television report without marveling at the precision and detail of our knowledge of what goes on in Cuba. I might add that when Secretary McNamara presented essentially the same briefing to our committee 2 weeks earlier, every member of the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, spontaneously applauded him and his young briefer when they had concluded for a really virtuoso performance. While it is of course theoretically possible for the Soviets to be hiding missiles in caves or under trees, they could not get them out and get them set up against us as things now stand without our detecting them in the process.

3. No intelligence system can ever be perfect. Trying to find out what goes on in a closed society cannot, obviously, be a completely exact science. Some stories we get are fact; others are only rumors. I know from my own wartime experience as an intelligence officer that any military commander learns to live with the inexact and the unprecise and tries as best he can to increase the area of hard knowledge and reduce the area of sheer guesswork before he decides upon a course of action.

4. If we propose to take this country to the brink of nuclear war, then it makes sense to try to do it on the basis of the facts we know and not just on the rumors we may merely suspect.

May I digress here to add just one comment in connection with that observation. A good deal has been said in recent days about those who, so we are told, "rightly called the turn" on Soviet missiles in Cuba last September, and "forced the administration" to confirm their charges in October. This is a bit misleading. The rumors about Soviet mistakes in Cuba, peddled by refugees, had been going the rounds in Washington for some weeks last fall. Our intelligence services were as well aware of these rumors as anyone else. But it is one thing to have a rumor and it is an entirely different thing to confirm that rumor as a proven fact. You can't very well go to the brink of war, as I say, over a mere rumor. Nobody in Washington had proved those missile rumors until the photographic evidence came in on that fateful October 14. Then, as you know, the administration acted swiftly, courageously, and effectively. But they could not—and indeed they should not—have acted until the proof—which those who had been peddling the rumors had never been able to supply—was in.

1963

5. The Cuban crisis isn't over by a long shot. Certainly the threat to our own continent has subsided with the departure of the long-range missiles. Those missiles were offensive because they could be directed effectively against American cities and could have been part of a rational overall attack on the United States which successfully bypassed our missile early warning network to the north. That's why their presence was intolerable and why they had to be removed, even at the risk of war.

The Soviet infantry and antiaircraft troops and equipment which remain are not at all offensive in this sense, as Governor Rockefeller acknowledged last weekend. But this does not mean that they do not have some unpleasant capabilities for mischief in this hemisphere or do not, in fact, constitute a matter of grave concern to us. They do, and Secretary of State Rusk himself has told us that the United States cannot permanently accept this Soviet military presence in Cuba.

6. Finally, we are not only opposed to Russian troops being stationed in Cuba; we're also against Castro himself and want to see him out too. This, I submit, is also basic American policy.

Now if we can agree generally that these six points summarize things as they currently stand in Cuba, the next question is, What do we do about it? There's been a lot of criticism these past 2 weeks about Cuba, a lot of second guessing, and a lot of sanctimonious viewing with alarm. But except for Republican Senator JOHN S. COOPER, of Kentucky, there's been darn little in the way of constructive recommendations for action. And it isn't hard to understand why, because any course of action in today's polarized world can have highly explosive consequences. Talk is cheap; action never is.

The simple fact is that action over Cuba, now just as well as last October, could always involve us in all-out nuclear war with the Soviet Union. These are the stakes we are really playing for, let's not make any mistake about it. This doesn't mean we have to back away automatically from the possibility of nuclear war. Far from it. In fact we've already faced up to this possibility before without flinching—eyeball to eyeball with the Russians as someone expressed it—in October. We are ready to do it again if need be; let's make no mistake about that either. But surely we would be criminally negligent to move ourselves into this posture without first undergoing the most careful, cautious, and sober consideration of all that such a decision entails.

Frankly, most of the semantic games that have been played over this Cuban issue in recent days hardly measure up to this exacting requirement.

So far we have won one essential victory in Cuba without firing a shot. Perhaps we may succeed in winning more. But before anyone gets the idea that our military planners have gone to sleep over Cuba, let's just spell out some of the highly explosive possibilities of the situation we are already facing, each of which we must be prepared to deal with right now, not 2 months from now, and each of which could conceivably escalate into the all-out nuclear war with the Soviet Union, to which we faced up last October and successfully avoided. Here they are:

1. If one of our reconnaissance aircraft were shot down over Cuba. In the absence of on-site inspection, our present aerial surveillance is absolutely essential to continuing the present arrangement with Cuba. Yet the Soviets do have the capability to shoot these planes down at any time.

2. If Soviet long-range missiles were ever reintroduced into Cuba. President Kennedy made this perfectly clear in his press conference last week.

3. If the Soviets were to undertake any substantial increase in their present ground

capability in Cuba. We have taken steps to get the Soviets to reduce their troops in Cuba. Perhaps we may not succeed. In any case I do not believe we could ever accept any substantial increase in these troops.

4. Any export of arms or subversion from Cuba to other Latin American countries. President Kennedy made this pledge, too, last October. I am sure its still stands.

5. Any attack on our naval base at Guantanamo, or any interference with our present position there.

6. Any use of Soviet forces, including tanks, to put down any anti-Castro rebellion by the Cuban people themselves. I do not believe we ever could or ever should sit by passively and let Soviet tanks crush any Cuban freedom revolt as they crushed the uprisings in Hungary.

Perhaps there other other possibilities which I have overlooked. But I have said enough, I think, to make it clear that even if we were to do nothing more in Cuba, we still could find ourselves confronted overnight with the threat of all-out war. And since most of us feel that we cannot long tolerate even the present situation, there comes the further question of just how we should proceed to correct it if our present diplomatic efforts fail. But whatever we decide to do—and we may well have to decide to do something—it won't come cheap.

So, wouldn't it seem obvious that viewed in this perspective the details of our Cuban policy become more than just a passing game of political checkers?

No one, surely, would want to foreclose public discussion, in the press or from the platform, about Cuba any more than about any other aspect of our foreign policy. But surely it is not too much to hope, is it, that in this great national debate, carried out in this shadowy era of half-war and half-peace, there should be at least some simple ground rules of responsibility which could help to keep this debate one that clarifies rather than confuses, and one that encourages rather than sublimates the rational processes of thought and reflection on which sound and effective American policy must be built?

No matter what the requirements of partisan politics may be, there is certainly no right to undermine the national security by anybody, anywhere, at any time.

Can we not, for example, agree that regardless of what past mistakes may have been made, from here out every criticism should carry at least the suggestion of some alternative course of action? And can we not also agree that since we have, after all, only one executive branch of government charged with maintaining our defense, those who profess to have available to them special sources of information on conditions abroad should make them available to our Defense Establishment at least as soon as they do to the press galleries?

Some may say, no this can't be done, because already we are in the process of a great American presidential campaign and the present President and his administration are fair game. Fair game yes, as individuals and as a party. But not fair game as the only duly constituted Government of the United States of America in a period of high international peril.

Once before we in America have seen that it is possible to conduct a political campaign under the shadow of war without undermining our national security. That was back in 1944 when a former Governor of New York State and a great American, Thomas E. Dewey, was running for President of the United States. During the course of his campaign the Governor, as you will recall, learned that our American intelligence officials had broken the Japanese diplomatic code and were regularly reading the Japanese dispatches prior to Pearl Harbor. Yet

at the request of Gen. George Catlett Marshall, the Army's wartime Chief of Staff, Governor Dewey voluntarily refrained from using that information as a campaign issue—though it could have been a highly explosive one—because to do so would have gravely impeded the successful prosecution of the war.

The American people, I have always felt, owe a great debt of gratitude to Governor Dewey for his deep sense of responsibility and restraint in circumstances that must have been tempting in the very extreme.

As members of the press, you ladies and gentlemen are familiar with restraint of this sort and you are called upon to demonstrate it week after week in your papers. I am sure that we in public life, once the seriousness of the Cuban crisis is apparent, will follow the brave example of Governor Dewey and will exercise the responsibility and restraint which the times now require.

For after all, the things that divide our two great political parties are far less than the things that unite us as Americans. Politics still stops at the water's edge of national security and survival. And surely when it comes to the ultimate goal of eliminating communism—not just from Cuba, but from the face of the earth wherever it may be—this great country of ours, Democrats and Republicans alike, will continue to speak with a single firm and forceful voice of determination and of hope.

VFW SPEAKS UP FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

(Mr. STRATTON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House are well aware, the most important single element of our National Defense Establishment is its personnel. It is particularly necessary that, in spite of the great emphasis being placed upon scientific, mechanical, and technological advances in weaponry, we do not overlook the role of the officers and men who man these weapons. All of the tremendous national investment in resources, dollars, and time, which we have made and are making in improving our military equipment would be useless without the devotion, the hard work, and the skills of our military personnel into whose hands these weapons are entrusted.

Our military personnel are serving in remote and scattered places throughout the world. They are there because that is where their duty requires them to be. We should recognize their vitally important service overseas; we should not penalize them for it. It is, therefore, with profound concern that I bring to the attention of this House the recent proposal that the customs officials of our Government plan to terminate the \$10 tariff-free gift mailing privilege of our citizens. My purpose at this time is to urge that if such tariff-free mailing privilege from overseas is to be canceled, then our military personnel and their dependents should in all fairness be exempted from the new restrictions.

There are many good reasons why such arbitrary and unfair actions should not be imposed upon those who are so well serving in the defense of our Nation and the free world overseas.

The inequity of such a proposal from the standpoint of our military personnel and the reasons why they should be exempted from such restrictions are forcefully set forth in a recent letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Norman S. Paul. I am confident that Members of the House are well acquainted with the alert and effective manner in which the VFW has championed the interests of those who serve and have served in our Armed Forces.

I also invite attention to the reply of Assistant Secretary Paul to the letter addressed to him by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, VFW director of national security and foreign affairs, in behalf of Byron B. Gentry, the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Secretary Paul's letter is reassuring in that it associates itself with the position taken by the VFW in support of our servicemen. This is another example of the insight and understanding of personnel problems which we have come to expect from Secretary Paul. Parenthetically, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, I wish to compliment Secretary Paul for the sincerity, intelligence, and frankness with which he is performing his vitally important role as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include at this point the VFW letter in defense of the interests of military personnel overseas and the reply by Secretary Paul:

JANUARY 22, 1963.

HON. NORMAN S. PAUL,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower),
Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The purpose of this letter is to inform you, on behalf of Mr. Byron B. Gentry, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of our deep concern over the recent announcement of the impending cancellation of the current authority for individuals to send tariff-exempt gifts of \$10 or less, from overseas to individuals in the United States.

The VFW urges that every effort be made by the Department of Defense to permit military personnel and their dependents to continue the \$10 tariff-free gift privilege. Unless overseas military personnel are exempted from the impending cancellation, an undue and unnecessary burden will be imposed on them.

It is difficult, indeed, for the VFW to believe that the withdrawal of this small privilege of sending a tariff-free \$10 gift, is, in fact, a necessity. With tourists able to bring in \$100 in tax-exempt purchases as often as once a month from foreign countries, with U.S. corporations able to purchase foreign companies in amounts of hundreds of millions, and in view of the tremendous economic assistance by this Nation, even to Communist regimes, the continuation of the authority for our military personnel to send home \$10 tariff-free gifts, does not seem unreasonable.

While such gifts may not appear to be an important factor in morale, I believe that even a cursory survey of the opinion of U.S. officers and enlisted personnel overseas will disclose a widespread and intense resentment over the impending cancellation. I have recently returned from Europe. In

the course of my travel, representing the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Byron B. Gentry, I had the opportunity to meet with numerous officers and enlisted personnel of our armed services. This matter of the impending cancellation of gift mailing is deeply resented by them.

It was only a short time ago that military personnel had the privilege of mailing \$50 tariff-free gifts. That authority was allowed to lapse, leaving service personnel only the broad \$10 gift-mailing entitlement. If this, too, is taken away from them, they will then have only the dubious privilege, in accordance with pending plans, of mailing to their mothers, fathers, relatives, and sweethearts gifts of not more than \$1. This is at best a ridiculous entitlement.

It is generally recognized that one of the basic and acute problems in defense matters is the retention of experienced military personnel many of whom are overseas because of duty assignment, and not because of personal choice. To deprive them of this small privilege of sending a modest gift to a loved one in the United States is an insult to their intelligence and creates a continuing and unnecessary cause of resentment.

In the interest of service morale and just plain fair treatment for those who serve in our Armed Forces overseas, the VFW strongly urges that the Department of Defense take such action as is necessary to prevent the \$10 gift-mailing privilege from being taken away from military personnel.

Sincerely,

J. D. HITTLE.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1963.

Brig. Gen. J. D. HITTLE,
USMC, Retired, Director, National Security
and Foreign Affairs, Veterans of Foreign
Wars of the United States, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR GENERAL HITTLE: Thank you for your views expressed in your letter of January 22.

The Department of Defense shares your concern over the impact the Commissioner of Customs' proposal to reduce the value of articles which may be admitted free of duty would have on the morale of our personnel, and we have strongly recommended to the Secretary of the Treasury that Department of Defense personnel who are stationed overseas be exempt from this regulation.

The continued support of your organization in these matters is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

NORMAN S. PAUL.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE FACES HEAVY WORKLOAD DURING 88TH CONGRESS

(Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the new chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I want to take this opportunity to invite the attention of the Members to the work and the accomplishments of the committee during the preceding 87th Congress. An examination of the hearings held by the committee, the reports covering those hearings, and the additional reports covering the staff's studies and the 60-odd field investigations, will serve to demonstrate that this committee has been on the job and working diligently in furtherance of the tasks and duties assigned to it by the House.

I want to mention also that, in addition to all of the foregoing, the committee handled more than 500 small business problems referred to the committee by various Members of the House.

Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, the House Small Business Committee, during the 87th Congress, much was accomplished.

As the newly appointed chairman of this committee, I want to assure the Members of the House that the committee will continue to work industriously and effectively. There will be no lessening of the workload intensity of the committee's work or of the determination and dedication of the committee to carry out effectively its assigned mission. There will be no lessening of the accomplishments of the committee.

A rather complete picture of the work of the committee during the 87th Congress can be obtained by referring to the various recommendations set forth in the committee's final report, which was distributed on January 3 of this year. This final report will show that the committee submitted to the House 37 individual recommendations covering small business problems in about a dozen different fields of economic activity. To be specific, the recommendations dealt with small business problems associated with antitrust, taxation, distribution, the Small Business Administration, Government procurement, foreign trade, television, urban renewal, area redevelopment, and the aluminum industry.

In order that the Members may have more detailed information about these recommendations, there is reprinted below that chapter of the committee's final report which describes and explains each of the committee's 37 conclusions and recommendations:

CHAPTER XIX. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

GENERAL

"The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through full and free competition can free markets, free entry into business, and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment be assured. The preservation and expansion of such competition is basic not only to the economic well-being but to the security of this Nation. . . . The Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise" (Small Business Act of 1958).

At the time of its establishment, during the opening days of the 87th Congress, the House Small Business Committee was charged with the duty to "conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business." Since that time, the committee has sought out and examined the problems of the small business sector of the national economy. Investigation has likewise been made of those situations and conditions appearing to be prejudicial or detrimental to small business.

Small business continues to suffer from a manifold complex of discriminations. Inequities in the Federal tax structure, although lessened to a degree by legislation adopted during the 87th Congress, continue

¹ H. Res. 46, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

STATE DEPARTMENT SELECTION?

(Mr. BATTIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the diligence of my colleague, Mr. E. Y. BERRY of South Dakota, we have an insight into the thinking of the policymakers at the State Department. In the RECORD for February 14, 1963, at page 2114, Congressman BERRY inserted in an official publication of the U.S. Department of State concerning the House members that were elected to fill the vacancies on the Foreign Affairs Committee. The heading on the release or story is as follows: "House GOP Names Five Conservatives To Fill Foreign Affairs Posts—Move Seen Increasing Opposition to Kennedy Foreign Aid Plans—Lone Internationalist Named." The official publication leaves the impression that the action of the Republican Party in the House through its committee on committees and the Republican conference is not in the best interests of the State Department.

At one point in the story the following language is found:

The administration's dealings with the Republican committee members may be especially difficult this year because of the November defeat of Representative Judd of Minnesota, the leading House Republican spokesman on foreign affairs and a moderate who often sided with the administration.

It is noteworthy, I believe, to point out at this time that while Representative Judd stayed on the job in Washington in the fall of 1962 fighting the cause for the President's foreign aid program, the President was in Minnesota campaigning in opposition to Representative Judd's reelection. The hearts and flowers thrown to Congressman Judd at this late date is a shoddy way of covering up the actions of the administration in the past campaign.

The report listed by name the eight new members of the committee, including two of our Democratic colleagues. The distinguished public careers of our colleagues need more adequate description than the slanted approach delivered in the State Department's official publication.

Try as I have to locate the statutory authority which directs the taking of a civil servant's time to research the background of Members of Congress to determine how they will react to a given bill, I have been unable to find any such provision in law. I would suggest, however, that if they would take the same time and use the same effort in analyzing the background and public statements made by some of the leaders of foreign nations and the representatives of these countries, they would have a better idea of the problems in the world and how they affect the United States. We might even find we could take the lead in many areas and not have to be continually on the defensive.

The members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, like all Members of Congress, have all been elected by the voters in their districts and try as I have, I have

been unable to find anyone in the State Department who presently has had the vote of confidence of any voter in the United States. The State Department publication, therefore, goes far beyond proper bounds.

I am sure that if some employees in the State Department had their way and could make the selections of members to serve on the committee, they would choose those who would never disagree with their proposals, but fortunately for the country this is not our system.

I noted with interest in the report that the State Department was concerned that "the five conservatives also are expected to oppose aid for Communist nations." So that the record may be straight and so that the researcher in the Department of State and the author of the official publication can sleep tonight, I want him to know that I do not believe that the taxpayers' money should go to the aid of communism or the support of communism any place in the world. I do not labor under the illusion that Marshal Tito will fight on the side of the West if Russia decides he should fight on the side of the Communist bloc countries, nor do I have delusions about what Mr. Khrushchev intends to do and I will never accept the fact that Castro is just a naughty boy or an eccentric who does not believe in the advertising of the Gillette Safety Razor Co.

The State Department could aid our battle in the world and the morale of the American people if they would adopt a philosophy compatible to the thinking of the American people. Should they disagree with the people or the Congress, all they need do is submit a simple resignation.

In January we heard a lot said about the packing of the Foreign Affairs Committee. People worried about losing the bipartisan approach to foreign policy. The newspaper accounts always attributed the statements to a "reliable source." From the recent official publication, I think the reliable source has now been identified. I suspect that the State Department would like to rewrite the definition of the word "bipartisan," which Webster defines as "representing, or composed of members of, two parties."

I for one am very happy to be able to serve my country as an elected Representative in Congress and a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The members of that committee are all hard-working people, devoted to the cause of the United States. I have had the opportunity of working with some of them in the 87th Congress and find them to be very intelligent, able, and dedicated people. I do not expect them to capitulate from their beliefs and principles and I am sure that they could have little respect for me if I capitulated. It is controversy that makes good legislation. It is the inquisitive mind and dedicated people who have made our country what it is today. As a parting thought, I do not believe that a person employed by the Department of State, because of his employment, automatically becomes an expert even though they sometimes leave this impression.

A NATIONAL LOTTERY

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years, I have urged Congress to wipe out hypocrisy and accept the indisputable fact that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in most human beings.

For 10 long years, I have repeatedly suggested that Congress recognize the fact that the desire to gamble is a universal human trait which should be regulated and controlled for the people's benefit and our Treasury's welfare.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, in spite of our great reluctance to recognize and accept the obvious, gambling in the United States has grown into a \$50 billion a year industry which continues to be the chief source of revenue for organized crime.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked Congress to tap this tremendous source of revenue only because it can produce over \$10 billion a year in new income which could help us cut our taxes and reduce our national debt. I have proposed a national lottery because it is the only way we can easily, painlessly and voluntarily raise a tremendous amount of money needed to give our sagging economy a fiscal "shot in the arm." This proposal is not a gambling bill but rather a revenue-raising measure—it will divert gambling revenue from the underworld into the coffers of our own Treasury. And what is wrong with that?

Mr. Speaker, I realize that some Members of Congress question the morality of gambling. To those who consider a national lottery conducive to sin, may I refer them to Thomas Jefferson, who once said:

If we consider games of chance immoral, then every pursuit of human endeavor is immoral; for there is not a single one that is not subject to chance, not one wherein you do not risk a loss for the chance of some gain.

More recently, the New York Times, in its November 23 issue, had this to say, editorially:

Consistency would require that, from a moral or ethical point of view, either all gambling should be outlawed or a carefully regulated extension should be allowed.

Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, February 12, brought us further evidence of hypocrisy. The New York State Legislature approved a bill to extend the racing season for an additional 26 days. Was this extension of the racing season granted because New York is interested in the "improvement of breeding horses?" Of course not. New York extended its racing season to improve its finances. The Governor asked for a longer racing season in order to increase State tax revenues by \$9 million a year and help balance his budget.

What occurred last week in New York is certain to happen in all of the other 23 States that have parimutuel betting. Why? Because collecting revenue from gambling at the racetracks is the most painless and voluntary method of raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come for us to stop pussyfooting and show some good horse sense by tying the gambling spirit of the American people together with our Government's desperate need for revenue.

A national lottery would be the most profitable, sensible, and satisfactory solution to our Government's need for more revenue and the people's cry for tax relief.

Cuba file
SPECIAL FUND OF UNITED NATIONS
TO HELP CASTRO—A PARADOX

(Mr. McINTIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, there were few of us in the Congress who were not shocked by the recent announcement that the special fund of the United Nations was going to provide Fidel Castro with a \$1.2 million agricultural aid project.

We have received assurance from several quarters that none of the funds used for this project would be represented by American money. However, this assurance loses substance in the face of the fact that the United States provides 40 percent of the total support of this fund.

To the extent that 1 American dollar serves as a catalytic agent in this disturbing exercise, in that degree is the American taxpayer being forced to subsidize an element alien to his best interests.

Gentlemen, I say to you that this is, indeed, a day of paradoxes. While on one hand wisdom calls out clearly for American containment of a Communist evil breeding 90 miles off the coast of Florida, other forces move forward to use the substance of America to nourish this evil and make it flourish.

If this is a sad and hard-to-understand story, sadder still is the fact that this development was conceived only through the flagrant flaunting of the will of the Congress.

I want to say here and now that elements of the Congress—both the Senate and the House of Representatives—established a legislative record which clearly condemns any program that harbors the potential of assistance to the followers of communism.

For the convenience of my colleagues, I have documented evidence in this respect, and I will, with proper permission, include it in the Record along with my remarks.

I want, thereby, to make it abundantly clear that this undesirable thing is upon us not because of the Congress, but in spite of it.

And I want to mention that I do not stand alone in my concern, for many of my colleagues have spoken out against this action of the United Nations.

And speak out we must, for if we let this matter go unattended, our silence might very easily be incorrectly interpreted as consent.

There is, of course, a principle involved in all of this, but even more than that there is the fundamental aspect of national security.

America has never turned her back on the deserving and the needy, but she has always drawn back from those who place the mantle of dignity on evil.

Gentlemen, I denounce this form of assistance to Communist Castro as being injurious to the best interests of our citizens and our country.

If this thing comes to pass—as against the spelled-out opposition of the Congress—then we, as Americans, will be placed in that peculiar and precarious position where we are feeding the very same parasite that seeks to feed on us.

Beyond the question of a doubt, the severity of this circumstance demands an immediate and penetrating investigation by a committee of this Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I include along with my remarks the article appearing February 25, 1963, in U.S. News & World Report and an article appearing in the Washington Star on September 5, 1962.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 25, 1963]

ANTIAMERICANISM UNITED STATES PAYS FOR
Now it appears that U.S. dollars, contributed to the U.N.—

Have been used to published pro-Soviet propaganda;

Have been spent to improve Congo's image in United States.

Reaction: an angry outburst in the U.S. Congress.

American taxpayers suddenly find that they are scheduled to begin helping Fidel Castro's Cuba, through the U.N.

Taxpayers are discovering, too, that they already have helped finance a booklet, prepared by the United Nations, that attacks capitalist countries and strongly praises the Soviet Union.

These developments created an angry reaction in Congress and brought at least one demand that the United States consider withdrawing from the United Nations.

What happened was this:

1. The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) announced it would spend \$1,150,000 in various currencies to help Fidel Castro solve Cuba's agricultural problems.

The program is to be financed by the U.N. Special Fund, for which the United States puts up 40 percent of the cash.

President Kennedy told his February 14 news conference that no U.S. money will go into the Cuba project, but Members of Congress promptly disagreed.

Said Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, Democrat, of Alabama: "It does come out of our money. We provide 40 percent of the funds . . . and the money loses its identity when it goes in."

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, a Connecticut Democrat, said: "This country will be making an indirect contribution to this project."

Representative T. A. THOMPSON, Democrat, of Louisiana, said the United States had been "gratuitously insulted," and Senator MINWARD SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming, declared: "It is time for the United States to seriously reconsider its membership in the world body."

The FAO project is regarded as a test of U.S. reaction to such projects. The worry in Congress was that U.S. acceptance of the FAO's Cuba deal would lead to other and larger investments.

Managing director of the U.N. Special Fund, which is to hire FAO to aid Red Cuba, is an American former industrialist, Paul G. Hoffman. The go-ahead for the Cuban project was announced by Mr. Hoffman, who said that it has his permission.

2. A report praising Communist Russia in connection with colonialism was issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO.

American taxpayers put up 31.5 percent of the money to support that organization. Russia, which ducks many of the heavy assessments levied by the U.N., contributes about 15 percent of the funds of UNESCO.

The report on colonialism was prepared by two Russian citizens. It lauds Russia as the great friend and benefactor of onetime colonial areas. The booklet is printed in English and French, distributed free to many organizations, and sells for \$1.50 at U.N. bookstores.

The pamphlet, entitled "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," is by I. P. Tsamerian and S. L. Ronin, and has been published by UNESCO in the Netherlands.

The UNESCO document, among other things, says this:

"The unequal treatment of nationalities, colonialist oppression and discrimination on grounds of race or nationality, which still characterize a number of capitalist countries today, are to be explained by the political and social system prevailing in those countries."

The report adds that "the successful establishment of full equality of rights between races and nationalities in the U.S.S.R." was "one of the major social triumphs of our day."

Then the Russian writers tell how "in 1940 the Soviet regime was restored in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which voluntarily joined the Soviet Union."

The U.S. Department of State, which puts up the money for this U.N. body on behalf of American taxpayers, issued a statement on February 13, in which it said that it had officially opposed the move to aid Castro and had protested the UNESCO action in publishing Communist propaganda.

But State Department officials then expressed themselves as being unable to resist successfully the actions approved by other countries in these groups.

CONGRESSMEN ANNOYED

In Congress, there were prompt protests by important Members, both Democrats and Republicans. The point was made that there is no requirement that the United States put up money to finance projects of this type.

The result—a dual Communist victory, still not halted, financed through the United Nations—and involving American dollars.

3. Taxpayers in the United States, meanwhile, were able to learn of another use to which their money, donated to the United Nations, actually is being put.

Reports revealed by the Department of Justice show that American taxpayers helped to put up \$200,000 or more—through the U.N.—which was spent in the United States to "improve the image" of the central Government of the Congo.

U.S. PEOPLE SHELL OUT

The Congo operation of the United Nations has cost Americans, over all, about \$200 million, the lion's share of a major military move.

The \$200,000 was for propaganda purposes, directed at the American people. It took on importance from the fact that the U.S. Department of State had moved to deport a man who spent half as much—or \$100,000—to tell the opposition story, that of Katanga Province.

High officials, it developed, had objected to the viewpoints expressed in favor of Ka-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2547

tanga when its dispute with the central government was active.

The "image" that is suffering in the United States, as a consequence of all this, is that of the United Nations—where some outlays of U.S. dollars, coming to light now, are bringing congressional tempers to a boil.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 5, 1962]
FREEMAN PLEDGES \$50 MILLION TO U.N. FOOD PLAN

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Agriculture Secretary Freeman pledged \$50 million today in American food and cash toward a \$100 million United Nations world food program.

Mr. Freeman made the offer at a conference at which other nations also offered pledges of assistance to the program being developed by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. The food would be used to help feed the world's hungry.

The Secretary told the conference that U.S. participation in this program would supplement and not replace American help to the hungry through this country's food-peace program.

The U.S. pledge included \$40 million worth of food, \$10 million in cash, and ocean transportation service on U.S. vessels.

Mr. Freeman said the types and amounts of U.S. foods to be donated to the world program will be determined later.

KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION NOT FOLLOWING CONGRESSIONAL INTENT ON FAO AID TO CUBA

Mr. Speaker, this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report contains a very timely and appropriate article entitled "Anti-Americanism United States Pays For."

One of the most glaring and flagrant examples of this anti-American aid, which is being paid for by the U.S. taxpayer is seen in the recent action taken in Cuba by the Food and Agricultural Organization—FAO—of the United Nations. As pointed out by U.S. News & World Report, FAO announced it would spend \$1,150,000 in various currencies to help Fidel Castro solve Cuba's agricultural problems. This result, Mr. Speaker, is completely and entirely inconsistent with the legislative intent of Congress as manifested in last year's farm bill, the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962, and it never should have happened.

In November, 1961, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, appearing at the FAO Conference in Rome, Italy, pledged the U.S. Government's support in both food and funds for a multinational program to aid underdeveloped nations.

At that time Mr. Freeman did not have an endorsement by nor a directive from Congress, which for many years has refused to commit the United States to a World Food Bank program.

In order to fulfill his promise at the Rome meeting, Secretary Freeman recommended to Congress—in H.R. 10010 and S. 2786—a new title V to Public Law 480. This title of the administration's 1962 farm bill would have given the Secretary specific authority to participate in the Rome agreement.

In his appearance before the House Committee on Agriculture on February 7, 1962, Mr. Freeman said at page 48 of the printed hearing, serial AA, part 1:

May I deviate from my prepared statement to say that I think an encouraging beginning can be seen in the pilot program that we considered with FAO in Rome last fall. * * *

If we are going to make use of agriculture and food abundance and bring some rationale to agriculture, I think the experience learned in trying to have a kind of international of multinational food for peace operation can be extremely useful through this medium, because we will be able to get other nations to share with us the burden that we have happily shouldered in seeking to help the developing nations.

The proposed language of H.R. 10010 is as follows:

SEC. 203. A new title V is added at the end of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, as follows:

"TITLE V—MULTILATERAL FOOD PROGRAMS

"SEC. 501. The purpose of this title is to utilize surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States in programs of economic development, emergency assistance, and special feeding carried out through the United Nations system or other inter-governmental organizations.

"SEC. 502. In furtherance of the foregoing purpose, the President is authorized to negotiate and carry out agreements with such intergovernmental organizations to provide for the transfer on a grant basis of surplus agricultural commodities from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation or from private stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation or from private stocks procured by the Corporation for the purposes of this title, to such organizations for use in programs of economic development, emergency assistance, and special feeding.

"SEC. 503. In entering into such agreements the President shall secure commitments from such international organizations that reasonable precautions will be taken to assure that agricultural commodities utilized in the program shall not displace or interfere with sales of agricultural commodities produced in the United States.

"SEC. 504. For the purpose of carrying out agreements entered into by the President under this title, Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to make available surplus agricultural commodities either from its stocks or by procurement from private stocks, and to pay with respect to commodities made available hereunder, in addition to the cost of procurement of commodities from private stocks, the cost of processing, packaging, transportation, handling, and other charges up to the time of their delivery free alongside ship or free on board export carrier at point of export: *Provided*, That after June 30, 1963, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not incur any costs in carrying out this title unless the Corporation has received funds to cover such costs from appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this title.

"SEC. 505. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, and such amounts as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for all costs incurred by it hereunder including Corporation's investment in commodities made available from its stocks."

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture considered this proposal very carefully and debated its merits thoroughly. During the course of the hearings, I had the opportunity to question representatives of the Foreign Agricultural Service of USDA on the intent and purpose of this particular provision.

Many of us on the committee feared that if the United States surrendered the control of our funds and food to an international body that was responsive to neutral and Communist bloc sentiments,

U.S. resources might be channeled into Communist hands.

I, therefore, questioned the departmental witnesses to develop clearly the legislative intent that the Rome commitment was contingent on congressional approval, as a first consideration, and that secondly, no Communist countries would benefit under any such arrangement.

At pages 382 and 383 of the printed hearings, serial AA, part 2, I developed these points as follows:

Mr. McINTIRE. The other point is in title 5, and what you are proposing here, as you tell us in your statement, is that we have already engaged in a conversation, and we are now in the process of committing ourselves to this proposition, at least in memorandums, without the authority resting in law to fulfill that commitment unless this amendment is offered, is that right?

The USDA witness replied:

I would say this that what we have done is to develop a tentative program, which in the case of each country would be subject to authorization by the appropriate legislative body of that country, so that in this case it's been made clear that the United States offer to participate is subject to authorization by the Congress.

I continued my question, as follows:

Yes, but we are actually negotiating?

The Department witness replied:

Hoping that Congress will authorize.

I continued by asking:

Approve a memorandum agreement which is not now a commitment, because without statutory authority at the present time there can be no fulfillment of that memorandum agreement?

The Department witness answered:

I would have to put it this way: what we are doing is to explore, we are engaged in exploration and in the development of a draft program and making known explicitly that any arrangement that is developed is an ad hoc arrangement which could not become effective until congressional authorization.

I concluded this part of the questioning with this comment:

Now, then, we are in this situation to the extent that these agreements or understandings, ad hoc, or anything you want to call them, to the extent that they are participating in them, the burden rests on the Congress to either deny the authority under which these could be promulgated or fulfill the obligation by granting the authority.

The departmental witness then said:

I think that is right, sir.

Mr. Speaker, it should be abundantly clear what the understanding of the committee was in regard to the new title V.

The committee did understand the situation and the committee did reject completely the whole proposal. So did the Senate committee and, as a result, there was not one word of authority in Public Law 703 of the 87th Congress—the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962—or in any of the committee reports or debate to indicate in any way the approval of Congress for this international commitment.

As to the second point concerning the ultimate destination of commodities and

2548

funds into Communist hands, I asked these questions:

But, certainly we are all aware of the strong recommendations of many in international affairs for Red China to be in the U.N. If this came about, there would be nothing to prevent, as far as we are concerned as a separate member of the U.N., our funding up to whatever the statute permits for a program of feeding into Communist countries. And just from the standpoint of the real provisions in the law, I hope you could answer whether or not this is legally possible?

The USDA witness replied:

Well, there is no provision in this law that indicates to which destination commodities could go . . . but I think I can assure you without question today that there would be no intention of permitting any of the food under a program of this kind to go to Red China.

I then made this comment:

Well, let me just make a further observation. Do you think your intentions or mine would be controlling?

The USDA witness then said:

Well, I certainly think that if this program were in operation today, assuming the bill was passed and the authorization was made available, I am certain that in the international agreement that is finally written that the United States would reserve the right to restrict shipments to certain destinations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, this raises some very important questions. For instance, what about Cuba, should not shipments to Cuba be stopped? Why did not the Kennedy administration restrict shipments to Cuba when it went ahead and joined the FAO pact without congressional approval? These are vital questions which must be answered.

On September 5, 1962, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced that the United States would participate in the FAO project by pledging \$40 million worth of food and \$10 million in cash to a \$100 million U.N. world food program.

The senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] protested this action at the time, but the administration contended that it had now found residual authority in the law to enter into this agreement, and that specific authority as requested in the farm bill was not really needed.

Senator HICKENLOOPER's comment was most appropriate when he said at page 17668 of the RECORD of September 6, 1962:

I think this is the first step in relinquishing U.S. control of our agricultural commodities. In my estimation, this is the first step toward giving the Communists under the domination of the Soviet Union an equal share as to the operation of our so-called food-for-peace program. I raise the question again—If the Secretary had the authority under Public Law 480, then why did he ask the Congress to give it to him in 1962?

The utter disregard of the intent of Congress in this grant of aid to Communist Cuba should not be tolerated, Mr. Speaker. I most sincerely and emphatically urge that the Foreign Agricultural Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture give this matter its immediate attention and

that the Secretary of Agriculture explain fully to the Congress and the American people how U.S. funds and food can be used, even indirectly, to benefit the likes of Fidel Castro.

BETANCOURT REVISITED

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair that we hear both sides of the story regarding the erstwhile Venezuelan leader, Betancourt. Mr. Harold Lord Varney, president of the Committee On Pan-American Policy delivered an address at a seminar conducted by the conservative coalition here in Washington on January 31 of this year. It represents a strong statement of opinion and fact on the other side of the Betancourt coin. The address follows:

I want to start out by saying a few words about the latest Cuba events. The Cuba debate has deteriorated into a "who said it?" contest. Attorney General Kennedy says that the United States didn't promise air coverage to the Bay of Pigs invaders. President Kennedy backs him up in his press conference. One thousand and one hundred Bay of Pigs invaders, minus one man who sustains the Kennedy position, say that they were promised air coverage.

I don't intend to engage in a veracity contest with the President of the United States. If he says he didn't promise it, his word is good enough for me. But if such air coverage was not promised, where does that leave us? President Kennedy does not better his own image because, by all the rules of war and humanity, he should have promised such coverage, and delivered it. What kind of a picture of the great United States does that imprint? We induce 1,300 brave men to invade Cuba at risk of their lives in an operation which we should have done ourselves, and then, after dumping them on the beaches in the firm belief that they will be supported, we do a Pontius Pilate act and leave them to their fate. Let's be honest and stop making excuses for ourselves. We walked out on the Cuban invaders, when they could have won. We flinched before Fidel Castro when we could have destroyed him. This is a record of shame which every American citizen must carry into the future. It is a record which will not soon be forgotten by the Latin Americans who want to be our friends, but who also want to respect us.

But I am not going to consume my time this morning with postmortems about the Bay of Pigs. I think we will learn nothing from our Cuba experience if we do not recognize that Cuba is only one sector in a hemispheric life-and-death struggle which we are now waging with communism. It is a vital sector, but it has meaning only if we see it against the livid background of an all-America struggle which we are losing in Brazil, in Venezuela, in Bolivia, in the Dominican Republic, in British Guiana and in Ecuador—just as we are losing it in Cuba. And the cause of our loss, I attribute to the almost incredible ignorance on the part of most of the American people, of the very nature of the fight which communism is waging against us in the Western Hemisphere.

The great paradox of our struggle against communism is that the overwhelming majority of Americans don't even recognize or suspect the Communist enemy unless he comes to us bedizened with all the regalia

and the proofs of signed-up Communist Party membership. World communism is winning stupendous victories in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America, and we don't even recognize them because the winners are not openly labeled "Communist Party." This blindness is not restricted to the laymen. It is a blindness which exists appallingly in the press, on the air waves, in the security organizations of the Government, and even in the sacred precincts of the National Security Council which advises the President on his foreign decisions. No wonder we have been wrong on Castro. For over a year after his triumph, the wise men in Washington and in the radio and TV commentator's booths were so busy trying to prove that they were right in declaring that Castro was not a Communist, that Nikita Khrushchev had already been installed immovable in Cuba before our "experts" had come out of their trance.

Some of us who have been fighting this evil thing for three decades or more have finally learned to recognize a Commie, no matter what kind of a beard or a mustache he may be wearing. But the Johnnie-comelates in the anti-Communist movement are almost invariably slaves to labels, and disguises. They are fearfully conscious of the peril of the communism which emanates from the Kremlin or from vocal organs of Nikita Khrushchev. But beyond this open and perceptible communism which conspicuously rears the Communist name, most of them are naively unaware of the great surging tide of communism which is mounting triumphantly in all world areas and which masks itself under the names of "social democracy," "socialism," "peace," "liberalism," and similar cognomens. Today, probably two-thirds of the important Communist work is being done by such Trojan-horse movements. Probably two-thirds of the people who are consciously working for communism have dropped the identifying Communist name and are operating under some unsuspected label. And it is a commentary on the wisdom of the Rostows, the Schlesingers, the Bundys and Hubert Humphreys, who are showering their advice about communism upon the President, that they wouldn't recognize most of these Trojan horses as Communists if they met them walking down the street. They would be most likely to hail them cordially and heartily as brother anti-Communists.

Let me elaborate on this point a little further. The policy of the Trojan horse, the policy of planting Communist infiltrators in nonparty organizations and working behind unsuspected liberal fronts, was inaugurated by Misvow on a grand scale in the 1930's. It had a striking success in the United States during the Hiss era and after World War II. It was employed brilliantly in Latin America under such leaders as Cardenas, Lombardo Toledano, Haya de la Torre, Betancourt, and Arevalo.

What the Schlesingers, the Rostows and the Berles don't seem to grasp is that the Trojan horse technique has never been liquidated in Latin America. It is a weapon which is rated by Khrushchev as high as outright Castroism. Today, although the spotlight is on Castro and his out-in-the-open communism, the main show in Latin America is the nonparty communism which, under "Liberal" and "Democratic" labels is sweeping on from victory to victory in one country after another.

This is a communism which you won't read about in the self-styled anti-Communist books of R. J. Alexander, Daniel James, or Jules Dubois. Its existence remains a dark, deep mystery to Ted Szulc, Jack Kofeod, or Herbert Matthews—our leading newspaper Latin American specialists. But it is the deadliest Communist threat in the hemisphere today. It is working on a timetable of bold plans to confront the United