

ton—telephone Oxford 6-2010. These men have issued an invitation which stipulates that microfilms of manufacturing drawings will be issued to a contractor only after the award of contract. This provision is on page 14 of IFB 600-481-63-S.

In other words, a manufacturer must make the equipment and have it approved by the Navy before he can even be considered in the bidding. However, the same man cannot get the necessary drawings until he has won the contract, and he cannot build the set until he gets the drawings.

It is very plain to see that the stage has been set for a contract award to a company which already has the drawings and the only firm that has them—the company that developed the set and produced it first on a sole-source basis.

In short, Mr. Speaker, you just cannot get from here to there, and all this is because of the capricious and irresponsible action of Mr. Usilton, Mr. Lear, and Captain Appleby. There is absolutely nothing fair about this sort of conduct, and as a representative of American taxpayers, I protest vigorously. I also want to remind the Secretary of Defense that this sort of conduct is in direct conflict with his freedom of information policy issued last December which was supposed to aid manufacturers in getting every paper they needed to do business with Uncle Sam.

What should be done right now is to make these manufacturing drawings available to anyone who wants them for the cost of reproduction. The requirement to build a set before you can bid on it should be removed and this procurement should be made 100 percent competitive. If this is done, we will get a truly competitive procurement, provided some other bureaucrat does not change the rules again. If Navy continues to hide the drawings, it will again demonstrate its inefficiency and incompetency in handling public moneys.

I say today that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy should put the drawings for this oscilloscope out on the counter, make this a truly competitive procurement, and let American industry go to work. I have great confidence in the results.

#### LEGALIZING 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, to those Members of Congress who react with shocked feelings at the mere thought of legalizing a national lottery, I would like to bring to their attention some interesting facts which prove that tens of millions of our American citizens enjoy the relaxation and pleasures of gambling.

The National Association of State Racing Commissioners has just released its 1962 report on horse racing in the United States. It shows that \$3,669,-463,825 was wagered in 24 States where gambling on horses is legal and proper—at least inside the gates. I might point out that this figure represents an in-

crease of over \$202 million from last year.

The interesting part of this report, Mr. Speaker, is the tax revenue to the 24 States—collected painlessly and voluntarily—amounted to almost \$288 million. This also is an increase of over \$23 million over last year.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of our sanctimonious attitude about gambling, our Federal Treasury was the recipient of additional millions of dollars in taxes collected on admission charges from 50,582,092 persons whose urge to gamble brought them through the turnstiles.

To those who look upon gambling as wicked and immoral, I would like to point out to them that gambling funds collected in all 24 States are comingled with other State revenues and used to build schools and teach our children. As a matter of fact, the State of Florida last year programed nine extra racing days which were allotted for scholarships and charities.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for the average American taxpayer to understand why all the resistance to a National Lottery when every day millions of dollars change hands at every stock exchange, at every race track, at just about every sporting event that is staged. Are these transactions any different than buying a lottery ticket? Are these activities any different than the lotteries conducted every month by thousands of civic and fraternal clubs, churches, and welfare organizations where automobiles, television sets and other prizes are raffled off to the lucky ticket holder?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for this Congress to stop pussyfooting. I think the time has come for this Congress to wipe out hypocrisy and recognize the indisputable fact that man, by his very nature, is a gambler and wants a chance to legally satisfy his gambling thirst.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for this Congress to realize that a national lottery is the only painless, sensible and voluntary way to raise over \$10 billion a year in additional revenue which can be used to reduce our national debt and cut the heavy tax burden carried by our American wage earners.

#### THE WASHINGTON POST AND THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Seeing Reds" once again reflects an illogical and unreasonable prejudice against the important work and objectives of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For a paper that repeatedly claims to pride itself on a claimed objectivity of approach to important national issues, it seems to me that the Post does the public a disservice in repeatedly so editorializing as to slant facts against this Committee.

For example, "Seeing Reds" finds the Post repeating the well-worn strawman that we do not need the House Un-American Activities Committee because we have an FBI. This is ridiculous as the Post well knows. Why? Because, first, while the FBI is a splendid, efficient, and effective organization, the limited number of FBI agents—approximately 6,000—are required to do a great deal in the way of criminal and security investigation entirely unrelated to subversion; only a very small number of agents are available at any one time for subversive detail; but, second, even if detailed to subversive investigation, or surveillance, the FBI is an investigating agency lacking, completely, the power to compel testimony under oath. In the investigation of subversion it is indispensable that the activities of Communists should be developed by a process that compels answers under oath to relevant questions that are subject to penalties of perjury and wherein refusal to answer is punishable by contempt; otherwise there just would be little reliable information; third, in the important mission of keeping abreast of subversion within the United States the work of the FBI, House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Internal Security Subcommittee of Senate Judiciary are complementary, not opposed. They can and do work toward the single desirable objective, the safety and security of the American people.

It is unfortunate that the Post should continue to minimize or misrepresent the fundamental importance of the House Un-American Activities Committee and its continuation because of occasional differences of opinion as to method or application in individual cases. The committee is composed of sincere and loyal men who do not conceive themselves as superior in loyalty to other Americans but who are deeply concerned that there can be some who call themselves Americans who either profess membership in the Communist Party or knowingly and intentionally give aid and comfort to Communist Party objectives in this country. When we consider that the No. 1 objective of communism is the destruction of this Nation, the killing of its Government, its judges, and its leadership, it becomes reasonably obvious that Communist activity in the United States demands continuing investigation.

The tremendous bipartisan endorsement of this House of the continuation of its Un-American Activities Committee reflects the overwhelming support of the American people in which I am glad to say I join.

#### U.N. AID TO CUBA

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in my first statement to this House last month concerning the workings of the United Nations Special Fund, I said that an

investigation was continuing into U.N. aid going to Cuba from sources other than the Special Fund.

Today, I will outline a number of U.N. aid projects being conducted in Communist Cuba with the subsidization of American taxpayers. These are over and beyond the \$1.2 million Special Fund project for Cuban agriculture, and the Special Fund project for nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia.

Cuba has been receiving U.N. assistance under the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance since the 1950's. In programs scheduled in the 1961 to 1964 period Cuba has continued to receive U.N. aid, and currently—1962 to 1963—some \$1,033,080 is being spent by the U.N. in its efforts of technical assistance designed to strengthen Cuba.

This aid is administered by five sub-organizations of the U.N.—International Labor Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, and World Health Organization.

All of these organizations have high, altruistic aims and goals in the service of mankind. We Americans, certainly, agree with their general work. But once again, in the case of Cuba, American taxpayers who keep the U.N. solvent are being put in the position of paying to strengthen a Communist, enemy nation.

It is my purpose here today to provide for the House additional details about these projects so that Americans can be made aware of what they are paying for under the U.N. Americans may wish to continue to support some of the humanitarian programs listed here. On the other hand, they might prefer to curtail our support of others.

I already have addressed the House about the International Civil Aviation Organization program for training Cubans in aircraft operations and maintenance—a \$17,280 project.

Here are the other U.N. aid projects for Cuba:

**1. INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION**

The ILO is conducting in Cuba a \$89,000 project concerning social security. This project has been underway since the pre-Castro days of 1955, but has been continued to the Communist dictator's benefit.

It is planned that in 1963 at least three ILO experts will be in Cuba to further this project. In previous years two experts have been provided.

The project is designed in the words of the United Nations to "overcome a situation which might cause serious economic and social repercussions." It involves a study and recommendations about actuarial difficulties involved in a number of pension funds operated in Cuba with a view to combining some of the funds.

The project includes a "review of the policy of social security in the country as a whole."

That leads one to wonder if social security benefits are being paid to the widows and orphans of the men murdered by Castro firing squads.

**2. FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION**

The FAO is conducting a continuing project in Cuba programed in the 1963 to 1964 financial year for \$160,000 and for increasing amounts until 1968. The project is entitled "Fisheries Development."

Main objectives of this project, the U.N. says, are to develop Cuba's fishery resources along the Continental Shelf and on the high seas. To do this the U.N. plans to help Cuba improve its fishing fleet, explore fisheries and study fish biology and inland water restocking possibilities.

The U.N. says that among its objectives is one to "facilitate the Government's shipbuilding and marine investment projects."

It may occur to some Americans that shipbuilding is a necessary adjunct for the conducting of guerrilla operations in Latin America.

Also the FAO, subsidized by American dollars, is helping Cuba in its "general economic development and food supply plans." FAO is providing experts to assist the Cuban Fishing Research Center of the Fishing Department of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform.

Castro's Communist agrarian reform movement is well known in this House of Representatives.

**3. UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

UNESCO is conducting two projects in Cuba at this time.

The first is entitled "Educational Services" and is costing the U.N. and its American supporters \$13,500. Under this program, the U.N. says, an expert will cooperate with the Cuban Higher Institute of Education in preparing curricula and textbooks, organizing courses, and planning research.

This work is being done in connection with Castro's educational reorganization program, which, if it is at all like his other reorganizations, is being reorganized to teach children to parrot the Red line.

The second UNESCO project in Cuba is entitled "Marine Biology" and provides for \$54,000 for work in close conjunction with the FAO fisheries project in Cuba discussed above. Why two U.N. organizations are conducting the same project with separate funds has not been explained by the U.N.

This UNESCO project also is planned for continuation through 1968.

**4. WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION**

The WHO, U.N. organization with which I am well acquainted as a doctor and as a Member of Congress who at-

tended as an adviser of this House the WHO meeting in Geneva last year, has a number of projects underway in Cuba. The chief one is entitled "Public Health Administration" and is programed for a current cost of \$152,000.

Essentially, it is designed to investigate the human resources and physical health facilities of Cuba and to train technical and auxiliary staffs in the fields of public health. It is proposed, the U.N. says, that the program will "progressively cover the whole territory of the Republic of Cuba, in a network of protection, promotion and rehabilitation of the health of inhabitants." The plan will last for 10 years or more.

There are several other WHO projects in Cuba, all designed to improve the health of the unfortunate people enslaved on that Red Island—a goal with which few Americans will find fault. These projects include:

First. A drive to eradicate the yellow fever mosquito from the Havana area at a 1963-64 cost of \$143,000. It is planned that the area involved will be expanded in later years. Staffers include a medical officer and two sanitarians.

Second. A project in nursing education features a school of nursing adapted to Cuba's needs and opened in October, 1960, with 94 students. By 1962 the school had 100 students and trained them at 400-bed National Hospital. In addition a special 6-month course for preparation of nursing instructors is given in Cuba.

Third. A malaria eradication project under the WHO general budget lists expenses for 1963 to 1964 of \$170,000. It involves a survey of the malarious area of Cuba, including Oriente and Camaguey Provinces, and the area around the U.S. base at Guantanamo. Provision is made for a malariologist, a sanitary engineer, two sanitarians and an entomologist.

Fourth. A program for fellowships in public health training under the WHO and the Pan American Health Organization is slated to cost \$254,300 for the 1963 to 1964 period. These fellows are to collaborate with the government in training staff for improvement and expansion of its public health services.

Fifth. A final Cuban project undertaken by the United Nations World Health Organization is entitled "Refuse Disposal" and provides for a consultant to advise Cuba in establishing facilities for proper disposal of refuse from Havana and adjacent areas. Fellowships were provided under this plan in 1962.

*Supplemental United Nations aid projects in Cuba, 1963-64 financial year*

Project title	Supervisory agency	Cost estimate
Social security.....	International Labor Organization.....	\$89,000
Fisheries development.....	Food and Agriculture Organization.....	160,000
Educational services.....	UNESCO.....	13,500
Marine biology.....	UNESCO.....	54,000
Public health administration.....	World Health Organization.....	152,000
Yellow fever eradication.....	do.....	143,000
Nursing education.....	do.....	(1)
Malaria eradication.....	do.....	170,000
Public health training fellowship.....	do.....	254,300
Havana refuse disposal.....	do.....	(1)
Air operations training.....	International Civil Aviation Organization.....	17,280
Total costs available.....		1,033,080

<sup>1</sup> Unavailable

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately I was at a meeting and did not get in on the start of this discussion. Are you discussing the ICA poll throughout the world that nobody seems to know anything about, and that the administration has under wraps?

Mr. BOGGS. No, I wish they would release them if they do have them under wraps.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows they do. We have not been able to get this report.

Mr. BOGGS. No, we were not discussing that; but if time permits and the gentleman wants to discuss it, I will be very glad to discuss it to the best of my ability.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to commend the gentleman for calling this subject to our attention today. I am particularly interested in one question that was asked in this survey: "Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?"

It would appear to me that if the U.S. News & World Report will look at the most recent Gallup poll, they can find their answer there from an awful lot of people in America because, if my memory serves me correctly, the Gallup poll sustains the President in refusing to be stampeded into an invasion of Cuba. The President certainly has tried very hard to resolve this problem and 63 percent of the people of America said the other day through a Gallup poll that they are opposed and are against any invasion of Cuba at this time. So it would appear to me that the President is certainly reading the mood of the people of this country a lot better than those who have been making big speeches here trying to goad him into some sort of military action in Cuba.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if time permits, I would like to go along for just a few minutes to discuss what I consider the damaging effect of this sort of approach. I do not think it is the function of the Congress to have to pass a dozen laws every day. Some people have pointed out, and I think quite wisely, that oftentimes it is better not to legislate than it is to legislate.

Congress has a wide variety of functions. We have been able to move into these difficult days in which we live, I believe, quite ably and quite well.

Just think of the fact that 10 years ago there was not even such a thing as a space program. I saw the distinguished chairman of that committee walk on this floor a minute ago. We had to go out and hire experts who were able to advise us and consult with us and give us information about such a program as the space program. The distinguished Speaker of this House of Representatives had much to do with the creation of that committee.

This has nothing to do with partisanship. We have had to move into this period of fantastic weaponry such as

the hydrogen bomb and nuclear energy and all of these other aspects, and I think the Congress by and large is entirely adequate.

I remember at this time last year that we had all this business about the 87th Congress being described as a "do nothing" Congress. Yet, I noticed there was inserted in the Record a few days ago by the gentleman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE] an article which appeared in one of the local newspapers on Sunday last entitled "Congress Has Been Maligned."

I am not going to read that article to you, but I commend it to your attention regardless of what position you may take. Incidentally, the gentleman from New York, I suppose, as a member of the Republican Party, did not vote for many of these programs which are set out in this article, but I will read you just a word or two. It says:

The daily reports of the 87th Congress made it appear to many as a catastrophe.

That is true. I remember reading those reports just as you remember reading them.

It reads:

Yet with a hindsight view of its accomplishments, we can judge it a smashing success. In the area of foreign and security affairs, Congress approved the defense buildup, the Peace Corps, the Disarmament Agency, the Alliance for Progress, an expansion of the food for peace program and the important Trade Act.

In the domestic area, it passed among others, the most comprehensive housing program in our history; the area redevelopment, manpower retraining; and emergency public works programs; an increase in the minimum wage to \$1.25; expansion of the social security system, including lowering the male retirement age to 62; complete revision of the public assistance programs; an increase in postal rates; revision of civil service and other Federal salary systems—

And so forth. I could add the drug bill and the satellite program and countless other programs.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. Did the gentleman ask the gentleman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE] or did he tell her that he was going to use her name this afternoon?

Mr. BOGGS. No, I did not; but I did not use her name unfavorably. The gentleman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE] is a very good friend of mine and has been for a long time. I did not want to imply that she had voted for or against some of these things.

Mr. STINSON. The gentleman said that she voted against some of these programs.

Mr. BOGGS. I said that I presumed she voted against them. I repeat that the gentleman from New York is one of my very close friends and I admire her very much.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. I commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his brilliant discussion here today, and I would

like to say with reference to these questions that I agree with him that it does not become a national magazine to get into this kind of interrogation in any way.

I would like to remind the gentleman from Louisiana and the Members of this Congress that this is the only body I know of on earth in which if a vacancy occurs it cannot be filled either by appointment or succession, for we are responsible only to the residents of our districts. We are not responsible to the President of the United States. Our first responsibility is to the people of our districts to do what they want us to do. If we were responsible to the President, we would just be rubber-stamps and the people would not need us here to represent them.

I am not always in favor of everything the President suggests, but I always will support the principles of my party. I may vote against some of his propositions, but I will stand by the principles of my party.

This President of ours has inherited more problems than any President in the history of America or any man in the long span of history, and I think that he has acted with vision, sometimes ahead of most of the Members of this Congress here in the House of Representatives and in the other body. I believe that history will put him in the place that he has earned, that of a great leader not only of America but of the free world. I believe that when history is written he will go down as one of the great Presidents of these United States. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BOGGS. Some of us here have traveled about and seen some other parliamentary bodies, even the alleged sedate House of Commons in London; and I have had opportunity to compare whatever you will, the efficiency, the dedication, the ability of the average Member of the House of Representatives, yes, and the ethics—and I do not care whether he be Republican or Democrat—with other members of parliamentary bodies, and I think that in every category we would compare favorably.

You have heard the uproars in some of these legislative bodies. I have sat in the gallery of the Chamber of Deputies in Paris and watched what I considered sheer disorder, something that would appall a Member of this body. I have seen things happen which no American Representative would dream of doing.

So in many ways what this really in effect constitutes is an attack upon the free institution of Congress itself which is the ultimate safeguard of the liberties of the people of the United States of America.

As some persons have so well said and what all of us at times have said, the President of the United States does not need anyone to defend him; he does very well himself.

I remember our late Speaker Rayburn saying in times of stress—and in this case he was referring to a Republican President, President Eisenhower—but I have heard him refer oftentimes to that President and other Presidents and say:

"Either he is my leader and the leader of the United States of America or we have no leader."

This does not mean you have to acquiesce in everything the President is for, not by any stretch of the imagination, but there is a difference between total obstruction and opposition just because it comes from a person of an opposite party, and constructive loyal opposition, as the expression is used elsewhere in the world.

One of the proudest documents I have is a letter written by President Eisenhower in which he gave me some credit for the enactment of the trade agreements program of his administration. I am proud of that letter, and I am happy that I was able to make some small contribution to the passage of that bill which he considered vital to his administration.

The President of the United States cannot be right about everything; but, on the contrary, he cannot be wrong about everything either. I must say that I get a little bit annoyed at people who are able to find that De Gaulle is right about everything; that Diefenbaker is right about everything; and even Mr. Tshombe is right about everything, but the President of the United States is wrong about everything.

They talk about people whom we work with who come from the White House. There is a certain implication in this. I have known Larry O'Brien for a long time. He, too, does not need anybody to defend him. I invite any member of the opposition to indicate to me any time where he has been unfair, where the thing he did was not right and what a man in his position was required to do and should do, if there is to be comity between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

As far as I am personally concerned, all that Americans require of a public official, regardless of party, and from those instruments which go to make public policy—namely, the press, newspapers, radio, editorialists—is that all of us act responsibly.

I do not know of a single Member of this body who does not know how to act responsibly. It is so easy to do. I do not know of anyone who does not know how to join in the public clamor, whatever it may be.

The only monument on the Capitol Grounds is erected to a former Republican Member of the Congress of the United States, the other body. I refer to the distinguished former Senator from Ohio, Senator Taft.

One of the things for which that monument ultimately came to him was the fact he stood alone in the other body and said he would be against drafting workers into the Army to run the railroads, despite the fact that this body had voted for it, with only a few dissenting votes.

The point I make is: it is difficult to act responsibly at times, but it is important to act responsibly. We have the greatest nation on earth and the freest nation on earth. The way to lose it is to be irresponsible, and it is just as bad for a journalistic enterprise to be irresponsible as it is for you, me, or any

other person who is charged with some responsibility.

### CUBAN REFUGEE AGITATION AND RIOTING SHOULD NOT HAPPEN AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1963, and again on February 26, 1963, I addressed the Members of this body with reference to the problems that have arisen in Miami and south Florida with the Cuban refugees.

At that time I called the Members' attention to a riot between the Cuban refugees and local police authority at about 10 a.m. February 21.

At the session of February 21, I spread on the Record the stories of this uncalled for outburst as they were carried on the wires of the Associated Press and United Press.

At the session of February 26, I re-spread on the Record these same wire stories and included for the Record a story written by Milt Sosin, a reporter of the Cox newspapers for the Miami News, wherein he ably presented the story of this tragic and untimely incident. There was also spread on the Record an editorial from a Knight newspaper, the Miami Herald, dated February 26, titled "No Right To Riot."

The day before the appearance of the four or five picketing members of the Committee for Nonviolent Action in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters in Miami, and the ensuing riotous action of the Cuban refugees, the editorial staff of the Miami News, in the evening edition of February 20, 1963, carried the following editorial comment:

**REFUGEES SHOULD IGNORE PEACE AGITATORS**  
The Committee for Nonviolent Action seems determined to keep busy until it stirs up a little violent action.

What these extreme pacifists hope to accomplish by announcing—2 days in advance—that pickets will parade tomorrow in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters is not too hard to understand. The refugee would only be playing into their hands by marching against the pickets in force.

The Cuban radio announcer who urged the demonstration against the pickets showed poor judgment. A riot on Biscayne Boulevard would end a 4-year record of peaceful assimilation by the Cubans into the community, a record remarkably free of violence.

There is no disposition here to come out against peace, nor against the right of people to assemble or picket for special causes, no matter how unpopular or extreme the causes.

But we think the Committee for Nonviolent Action has tipped its hand in electing to taunt a refugee population that is understandably edgy and which has no vote in the political matters that interest the committee.

This committee is out to make propaganda for a program which, if followed along its unlikely course, would leave the United States

unarmed and defenseless against communism. Their exploitation of the Cuban refugees is calloused and cruel, and the refugees would be smart to ignore them.

On February 20, 1963, the day prior to the pacifist picketing of the Cuban Refugee Council headquarters, Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news at WTVJ, channel 4, Miami, issued the following TV editorial:

The National Committee for Nonviolent Action has been provoking violent action by staging demonstrations in Miami Shores, Coral Gables, and Homestead Air Force Base. Tomorrow the committee members intend to set up shop outside the headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. It should be said that these people claim they hate nobody. They just want the United States to disarm and disband our military services. The theory is we can trust the Communists to do the same and therefore peace will reign forevermore. This would be great except the Communists have openly demonstrated and stated their intention to take over this little world of ours by whatever means necessary, including deceit and lies. The only thing they can be trusted to do is be untrustworthy.

These pickets are irritating—but the best thing to do is to do nothing; just ignore them. To do otherwise would play into their hands.

On February 21, 1963, Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news, WTVJ channel 4, Miami, and their Latin news editor, Manolo Reyes, issued the following TV editorial comment:

### CUBAN RIOTS: WHY IT SHOULDN'T HAVE HAPPENED

What happened at Biscayne Boulevard and 17th Street this morning is deplorable. Riot action of any kind can only give a city a black eye and considering the tense state of Caribbean affairs at the moment, a riot in Miami is bound to create undue fear elsewhere that it is somehow unsafe to visit here.

We should like to note that channel 4 in its twice-daily Spanish language news program pleaded for all Cuban exiles to stay clear of the revolutionary council headquarters where the pacifist picketing was to take place.

Last night and this morning, Mayor High appeared on the program, speaking in Spanish, telling Cuban residents to ignore the picketing.

There are probably 150,000 Cubans here—149,700 heeded this advice. The 300 that didn't are guilty of giving all of their fellow exiles a black eye along with the city.

What happened should never have happened. Miami police and firemen are to be commended for efficiently handling a volatile situation. It should be said that the revolutionary council and its leader, Dr. Jose Miro Cardona, did little to prevent the gathering of the mob nor to quell the action which followed at its headquarters.

Channel 4 Latin News Editor Manolo Reyes, on WTVJ's program "News En Espanol," later tonight and tomorrow morning, will carry an editorial addressed to the Cubans saying "the law comes before the will of men and no one is authorized to take justice by his own hand. The law is to be respected above all personal prejudice or emotion or justified anger."

Reyes deprecates the fact that a minority group of Cubans fell into the trap made by a group of pacifists. He called upon the Cubans to "think with their head and not their heart."

It is time for Miami's Cuban colony to develop a form of leadership which can exert self-discipline. To do otherwise will gravitate this community to an explosive state of human relations which will hurt the

1963

exiles, the town and its permanent population.

These timely and well-stated words of warning, unfortunately, went unheeded. Nonetheless they bear repeating lest some other persons with misguided, or possibly purposeful intentions, again attempt to rile the emotions of persons who have been angered and oppressed by the Communist tyranny within their homeland, Cuba.

In our great country, within the framework of our democracy, we provide that each citizen shall have the basic right to agree or disagree, or present his views, publicly or otherwise, by peaceful means.

These are the rights which the Communist would have us destroy.

The Cuban refugee would do well to remember that had he, and other persons oppressed by tyrannical governments ruled from extremes of either the right or the left, been permitted the right to think, speak, and act peacefully, without fear of governmental reprisal, he might not have found himself today, nor during prior governmental regimes, the victim of oppression.

They would do well to remember that in our democracy, we settle our differences through judicial, peaceful means rather than with emotional and riotous outbursts.

Those who demonstrate for peace would similarly do well to remember that they may well be aiding the cause of communism and those who would overthrow the Government—that peace cannot be found through public actions that tend to incite riot—nor those actions that prey upon the emotions of refugees from oppression.

The incident of February 21 should not have occurred and should not happen again.

**CUBAN REFUGEES RESPONSIBILITY OF ENTIRE NATION—NOT JUST SOUTH FLORIDA**

Mr. Speaker, through January 25, 1963, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports they have resettled 53,974 Cuban refugees from Miami, Dade County, Fla., to other parts of the United States. This is not quite one-third of the 157,525 persons who had entered the United States and registered at Miami from Cuba.

Untold numbers of Cuban refugees who entered the Miami area did not register. Therefore, the 157,525 Cuban refugees figure is not entirely accurate. Reliable sources estimate the actual number of Cuban refugees entering the south Florida area at 200,000 or more.

Whether the figure is 105,000 or 155,000 Cuban refugees still remaining in Miami is immaterial.

The point is that there are well over 100,000, in fact maybe as many as 200,000 Cuban refugees, still in the Greater Miami, Fla., community; an area which had a population of only 1 million.

No community, no matter how large, could withstand the almost immediate impact of a 10- to 20-percent increase in population; the number of persons bringing about this increase being penniless and destitute without homes,

clothing, food, in many cases without friends, with little or no knowledge of the English language, and all unemployed.

The situation is worsened by the fact that there already existed in Dade County, Fla., a serious unemployment problem—so much so that the U.S. Department of Labor and the Area Redevelopment Administration had long ago found that there were a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens so as to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area.

The result: The American citizens of south Florida were thrown into open competition with the Cuban refugees for the very limited number of jobs available.

The Cuban refugee, in desperate straits, was willing to work for ridiculously low wages. Employers in a distressed State, seeking to keep their economic heads above water, engaged the refugee at a lesser wage, and an American thereby became unemployed. Approximately 30,000 Cuban refugees are employed in the Miami area.

The laboring classes—and the Negro particularly—suffered from the influx of the refugees who entered in large numbers in the field of domestic work, light manufacturing, and the many other areas of nonskilled as well as professional labor. They had no Cuban refugee center to turn to when their jobs were gone and their funds expired. Often, he became the refugee—pulling up stakes before his funds ran completely out; some left Florida and went to areas foreign to them in search of work.

We are all well aware of the tremendous sum of money that the Federal Government has pumped into the Dade County area to assist with the Cuban refugee situation. Without this Federal financial assistance, the community might well have been substantially more economically distressed.

The Greater Miami-Dade County area has opened its arms and its pocketbooks to these refugees and has done and will continue to do everything humanly possible to assist them to maintain their livelihood and their honor.

However, the situation in Miami obviously did not result from foreign policy actions of the Floridians. The responsibility is that of the entire Nation. Uttering nice words about the wonderful way in which the Miamians have reacted to the situation was, and is, no substitute for more equitable actions—actions of other cities and States and the Federal Government to share in greater proportion a burden which is theirs as well.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to commend the gentleman on the forceful and fair manner in which he is bringing this problem to the House and to commend his city on the tremendous job it has done in dealing with these people who are refugees from a tyranny that seeks to

threaten the United States. I think the job has national implications, and I think the gentleman in pointing up its national implications is doing a service to this country as well as to his own constituents.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman. This is one purpose of my remarks as I have made them from time to time on this subject on the floor of this House; also I seek the continued assistance of our House Democratic leadership, which has assisted us so generously as it has other areas which have a similar unemployment problem.

Along with the majority of Congress, I have strongly supported some administration policies dealing with the economic plight of our American citizens whether in West Virginia, Florida, Pennsylvania, Detroit, or some other State. I want to advise any Member of Congress if he wants to listen to me that all it takes is for serious economic distress to happen to you one time, to your district and your people, and as you see other economically distressed areas around the country, you will decide quickly that your problem is not one for the community to take care of by itself.

Every day here in Congress we have to draw a line regarding each issue we confront. Sure, it is easy to be in political opposition to anything. We all know that. That is no trick. But blind political opposition is also the height of irresponsibility. But in the stand we individually take on every issue there is a right place to draw a line based on our own criteria and responsible judgment, whether our decision is based on what we responsibly believe is the national interest, the national security, the desires of our constituents, or the principles of our party.

That is why I was very much interested in the remarks previously made here today by our distinguished majority whip on this question of blind political opposition and irresponsibility. It does not make any difference whether the Republicans are in power or the Democrats are in power, we have to recognize the problems in this country and then attempt to do the best within our ability and judgment to meet and solve those problems. There we are going to have arguments. There we are going to make political capital out of the differences which exist, as to how the country's needs should be met. That is part of the American political system. This is what we love, this is what we fight for.

But as was so ably stated by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, our majority leader, Hon. CARL ALBERT, and also in the forceful remarks of the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. HALE BOGGS, the pattern of irresponsible political attack that seems to be emerging I call frightening, discouraging, I call disheartening, and I call downright dangerous. The pattern of irresponsibility is to attack blindly; attack the democratic institution of the Congress of the United States; attack it; weaken the confidence of the American people in the greatest

democratic assemblage the world has ever known; destroy it; attack the Chief Executive of the United States; attack the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; attack, destroy, and weaken the confidence of the American people in the ability of a democratic government to hold off the tyranny of Communism; attack the Defense Department; weaken and destroy the confidence of the American people in the ability of our military people to exercise the proper judgment and to meet the challenges that we have to face; attack and destroy the State Department; weaken the confidence of the American people in those who are responsible for carrying out the foreign policy decisions of the United States; attack the Supreme Court, abolish it, modify it, change its powers, weaken the confidence of the American people in the democratic institution of divided powers and authority.

Do all this—for political purposes? God forbid—but the dangerous pattern faintly but clearly emerges out of the cloud of irresponsible political venom filling the air.

Do all this—to accomplish what?

Win the Congress? Win the White House? Throw out the "ins"?

Let us have our political opposition. Let us have our political fights. Let us draw the lines on the issues. Let us call them very clearly to the attention of the American people. But let us be responsible and preserve, not attack, our democratic institutions. Let us be responsible and then go to our own people and let them decide who should carry on.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this context that I bring to this body today the problems that exist in my area with respect to the Cuban refugees who are fleeing the tyranny of communism in Cuba.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to associate myself very strongly with the sentiments expressed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and to ask him whether in that part of his remarks which I did not hear he called attention to the fact that the gentleman and I have planned to hold hearings within a few days in Miami and to have all the agencies of the Federal Government that have to do with the relocation program of the Cuban refugees present with us and to let them, in our presence, hear the sentiment of the people of our country as to the impact, economic and otherwise, of the Cuban refugees upon our economy. Did my distinguished colleague cover that in his very able remarks?

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the distinguished gentleman, who is my able colleague from my former district. I did not include that in my remarks and I am very happy that the gentleman made mention of it. I want to take this opportunity, by the way, since I have not had the opportunity before, to say I am delighted that my district has been split in half and that you now so ably represent the other half. I also want to say

here on the record that from the day you have been here you have interested yourself ably in this problem and have exercised great leadership and knowledge with respect to it. I know that we can solve this problem. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my colleague.

#### MINNESOTA TACONITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. MACGREGOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this body are concerned, as are our colleagues in the other body, with the problems of our country's depressed areas. All of us are disturbed by the continuing problem of serious unemployment in this country. We are concerned with proper solutions to the problems of these economically unfortunate areas, and many of us recognize that the best solutions lie in the efforts of private citizens, private associations, and companies, and the efforts of local and State governments.

In this connection, there is about to be written in the State of Minnesota a successful conclusion to an effort to properly bring to northeastern Minnesota the economic health which that area of the State and of the country deserves to enjoy. That success story is not the result of action by the Federal Government, but rather it stems from concerted activity by municipal and local government officials, by the executive and legislative branches of the Minnesota State government, and by officials of the United States Steel Corp. and the United Steelworkers.

Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman from the State of Minnesota I desire to inform the House of Representatives of an issue of vital importance to the people of economically depressed northeastern Minnesota, indeed to the entire State of Minnesota, and to the Nation. That issue is taconite, and the related attempt to add a taconite tax amendment to the Minnesota State constitution. The argument for the amendment had been arrived at only after careful study and analysis. I should like to present some of the background of this proposal.

For more than three-quarters of a century, Minnesota and iron ore have been linked together. Since 1884, when the Soudan Mine was opened on the Vermilion Range, iron mining has played a major role in Minnesota's economy.

Vermilion Range iron mining operations were much like those of Michigan and other areas—underground mining for the most part. But when the great Mesabi Range began to sprout mining camps, a revolution was about to begin in the American iron and steel business. Never before had iron ore of such rich quality been attainable so easily from open pits.

The Mesabi Range began to produce ore shortly after 1890 when iron ore was discovered near Iron Mountain, Minn. Further discoveries near Biwabik led to the construction of the Duluth, Mesabi, and Northern Railroad line in 1892, when the first Mesabi ore was shipped to dockside in Duluth.

The Mesabi Range proved to be far larger than any of its discoverers had ever dreamed. Within a few years after 1892, the ore—chiefly soft hematite—was discovered all the way from Babbitt on the east to Grand Rapids, 110 miles to the southwest. Then when ore shipments from the Cuyuna Range began to flow down the Great Lakes in 1911, Minnesota's position as the world's foremost iron ore producer was assumed.

As mining methods improved, and with the demands of World War I and the economic growth that followed it in the 1920's, Minnesota's importance as a source of iron ore steadily grew. By 1940, Minnesota had produced more than 1.2 billion tons of iron ore. Indeed, Minnesota had the lion's share of the iron ore market.

World War II brought an even greater demand for Minnesota ore, and during the 5 war years, Minnesota's mining industry produced over 338 million tons of ore—ore for all but a minute percentage of our war armaments. And the next 5 years saw only a slight lessening of the need for Minnesota-produced ore, with 295 million tons being shipped.

Then came the Korean war and the prosperity of the 1950's—a time during which Minnesota had its biggest ore-producing years—79 million tons in 1951, a Korean war year, and 81 million tons in 1953. These were good years for Minnesota and its iron mining industry, good years for iron miners and their communities.

Today, however, conditions are much different. Minnesota no longer has a monopoly on iron ore sources. In fact, our largest fields of rich, pure ore are close to being depleted. Ore today is being produced in dozens of different places, all of which compete with our Minnesota ore. While Minnesota's share of the iron ore market has declined, the State has been unable to keep pace with other areas in attracting investments for iron ore products.

#### PROBLEMS FOR MINNESOTA ORE PRODUCERS

Actually, Minnesota's iron ore problem can be traced to a number of different causes—all of which have contributed to the overall problem. The problem, basically, is that Minnesota no longer dominates the market for iron ore as it previously has. The reason for this loss of hold on the market is that other areas can produce ore of equal or better quality at an equal or lower cost. If iron ore cannot compete on the quality-cost front, then it cannot sell, and if it does not sell, there are no opportunities for jobs. This is the current problem—demand for high-quality ore at a reasonable and competitive cost.

It would seem reasonable to assume that iron ore produced in Minnesota should cost approximately the same as iron ore produced elsewhere in the Na-

# Appendix

## U.N. Conference—Linowitz' Role

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished resident of the district I am privileged to represent, Sol M. Linowitz, of Rochester, N.Y., was a member of this country's delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas held recently in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. Linowitz, an attorney, is chairman of the board of Xerox Corp., a trustee of the University of Rochester, New York State president of the American Association for the United Nations and an officer in many civic organizations.

In a recent edition of the Rochester Times-Union, Mr. Linowitz wrote a report on the U.N. Conference, as a guest columnist for Paul Miller, editor and publisher. We can learn much from Mr. Linowitz's observations. I take pleasure in offering them for the attention of my colleagues:

#### How U.N. CONFERENCE ATTACKED WORLD POVERTY

(By Sol M. Linowitz)

"The simple fact is that we have learned a great deal more from them than they have learned from us."

That comment by one of the U.S. delegates to the U.N. Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas held in Geneva, Switzerland, between February 4 and 20 summarized for a number of us the most dramatic result of the Conference.

As a member of the U.S. delegation to UNCSAT (the ponderous formal title led to the even less pronounceable abbreviation), I participated in the sessions from February 9-16.

The Conference was set up by the U.N. as an unprecedented global effort to help mobilize the accumulated experience and resources of the more developed nations in launching a full-scale attack against the illiteracy, hunger, disease, and poverty of the less developed areas.

To Geneva came some 1,500 delegates from 80 countries. Among them were foremost governmental officials, scientists, technical experts, educational, medical, and other leaders.

The purpose of the Conference was not to make recommendations to governments or to come to decisions regarding policy. Rather, it was to focus attention on practical means for accelerating the development of the less developed areas through effective application of science, technology, and other advances of the more fully developed societies.

#### LITTLE GOBBLEDEGOOK

Frankly, I went to the Conference with some real questions. Would it be too large

to be manageable? Would there be too many academic dissertations and abstruse discussions in which experts would talk only to other experts in the unintelligible gobbledegook of their expertise? Could such a Conference involving Communist and non-Communist representatives—and held at precisely the same time as the Disarmament Conference a stone's throw away—submerge the cold war long enough to concentrate on programs to help the millions of human beings in need?

On just about every count, I found the Conference more successful and effective than I had anticipated.

The U.S. delegation—led with immense skill and judgment by Dr. Walsh McDermott, Cornell Medical School professor—included Jerome Wiesner, special assistant to the President for Science and Technology; Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations; Jonathan Bingham, Ambassador to the U.N. Economic and Social Council; Frank Coffin, Deputy Administrator of Agency for International Development (AID); Leona Baumgartner, Assistant Administrator for Human Resources of AID; Detlev Bronk, president of the Rockefeller Institute; Dr. I. Rabi, Nobel prize-winning physicist; Dr. Margaret Mead, associate curator of the American Museum of Natural History; Dr. Max Millikan, director of the Center of International Studies at M.I.T., and Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

The delegation worked hard and long and I believe it is fair to say that its impact on the Conference was greater than that of any other.

#### COLD WAR SQUELCHED

At the outset there were some on our delegation who plumped for playing one-upmanship with the Russians—meet every Russian parry, answer every Soviet point, counter every Russian maneuver. But it soon was recognized that this should not be our role. When at the opening plenary session, chief Russian delegate, Federov, launched into some cold war pyrotechnics, Wiesner, following him to the platform, won widespread laughter and applause with the simple introductory sentence:

"It is good to be here at this nonpolitical Conference to discuss true science."

As time went on, it became clear to all of us that the 400 delegates from the underdeveloped nations had their eyes on the United States in formulating their own objectives and aspirations.

Time and again their representatives would tell us in informal talks that their nations were trying to emulate the kind of progress we had achieved and would like to accomplish some of those things for themselves. But, they emphasized, they wanted to do so in their own way, in their own time, and in their own social and economic tradition.

And in understanding this, we all were learning a good deal of lasting significance:

1. We learned directly and personally about the real problems which confront these underdeveloped countries and how we must think about them in trying to arrive at solutions.

2. We learned that much of what we know and which is of real consequence to the rich areas of the earth is almost meaningless to the vast poor areas in which men still barely survive by tilling the soil with hoe and primitive plow (it makes little sense to talk

of harnessing sound and space to men whose lives are spent harnessing water buffalo).

3. We learned how little technology alone or money alone or aid programs alone could do to solve the problems or meet the needs, and that the challenge is one that can only be dealt with effectively in terms of the economies, the mores, the social customs, the ways of life of the countries we are trying to help to help themselves.

4. We learned in an unforgettable way that the best way to exchange knowledge is to wrap it up in a person, that the most effective method by which to transfer information and experience is on a person-to-person and people-to-people basis.

#### BUSINESS HELP

One area in which the Conference and especially our American participation might well have been bolstered, it seems to me, would have been in having more representatives of American business and industry.

A number of the delegates from other countries—including some from the Communist bloc—made the point that there were relatively few American business leaders in attendance and yet the implementation of many of the objectives would require precisely the techniques and experience developed by American industry.

Whenever and wherever I could, I tried to make clear that American business and industry were ready to help the advance of the less developed areas of the world with their science, technology, and accumulated skills, and that out of the Geneva Conference might come some real guidance as to ways in which American government, business, industry and labor might join together to help meet the needs of the less developed countries.

Before I left Geneva, I summed up my own observations for our American delegation. It seemed to me the whole theme could well lie in this sentence from Arnold Toynbee:

"Our age will be well remembered not for its horrifying crimes or its astonishing inventions, but because it is the first generation in history in which mankind dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

## Macauley's Warning

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, some 100 years ago the great British thinker and famed writer, Macauley, in one of his writings issued a stern forbidding warning to the Government and the people of the United States.

This warning is so realistic and timely today that, I think it is well worth repeating for the possible benefit of the House and the country.

It goes as follows:

Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when a society

A1155

A1156

has entered on this downward process, either civilization or liberty must perish.

Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of Government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century, as the Roman Empire was in the 5th; with this difference, that the Huns and vandals who ravished the Roman Empire came from without and that your Huns and vandals will have been engendered within your own country and by your own institutions.

While I do not agree that either the American Constitution or our political institutions are inadequate to cope with present conditions, I firmly believe that it is imperative for us to pause and take account of present conditions and trends in the Nation and then move with all practicable speed to strengthen and reinforce our institutions, where this is deemed necessary, so that they may resist the incessant clamors and impacts of subversive and softening ideas and destructive movements and be streamlined and modernized, where the need may be shown, to cope with and solve the challenging problems of our rapidly changing, growing country and the world.

To preserve intact our cherished freedoms, and at the same time adapt our Government and economic system to the needs of the present, should not be too difficult a task for our great democracy, experienced as it is in the affairs and techniques of Government.

But we must tackle this important task before our free institutions are overwhelmed by the whirlwind of radical thought and movements that literally besiege us, and before, by the sheer force of events, we succumb to the tides of moral, social, and political disintegration which godless materialism is sweeping across the world.

*Cuba*  
Insult Us at Will

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, although the President recently stated he had given instructions for our Armed Forces to shoot back, apparently he did not mean with live bullets.

A very disturbing and disgusting report of our apparent policy is given in the story by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, in yesterday's Long Island Daily Press. These directions, if true, hardly bring respect to this great Nation:

**SHRIMP BOAT NOT THE FIRST JET INCIDENT**  
(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—That shrimp boat attack is only one of a number of Mig incidents in the open waters between the United States and Communist-ruled Cuba.

Prior to that, on at least six occasions Migs buzzed U.S. naval patrol planes flying surveillance missions in this troubled area. The last of these deliberately provocative episodes occurred February 18—just 2 days before the gunfire assault on the unarmed and disabled shrimp-boat.

Full reports on each of the aggressive buzzing incidents were made to the President, State Department, and Pentagon. In each instance public disclosure was banned by direct White House edict.

The shrimp boat attack became known only because newsmen and Members of Congress were tipped off about it and began demanding the facts. Only after the White House, State, and Defense Departments were bombarded with questions did they admit what they had suppressed for more than 24 hours.

While the naval patrol planes are armed, they did not fire at the buzzing Migs. The U.S. pilots did that under stringent orders not to use their weapons unless fired upon.

Military authorities are convinced there is a direct relation between the buzzing incidents and the machinegunning of the shrimp boat.

This sequence is a characteristic Communist pattern. The Reds extend their provocative probes step by step to determine how far they can go before there is a reaction. Its nature and scope determines what they do next.

Contrary to certain press reports, there has been no change in the "don't fire" orders of U.S. pilots.

They are still strictly barred from using their weapons against the Cuban-based Migs unless fired upon. In other words, the Migs can continue to buzz and otherwise harass our planes with impunity.

Defense Secretary McNamara personally revealed this in his secret testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In response to a question on what the Kennedy administration proposed to do in the event of a recurrence of the shrimp boat attack, the Pentagon chief made this reply:

U.S. planes have orders to fire only if fired upon. They are free to fire on any plane or ship attacking an American vessel or plane in international waters, but hot pursuit is prohibited. McNamara stated that both he and the President are emphatically against that for the present.

Three Migs were involved in the February 18 buzzing of a Navy patrol plane—two Mig-17's and one supersonic Mig-21.

The U.S. plane was over international waters approximately 40 miles off the northeast coast of Cuba when the Migs swept in and made their first buzzing pass. They were preparing to make a second when two supersonic U.S. interceptors appeared on the scene.

They had hurriedly scrambled aloft from a Florida base in response to word from the naval plane.

The three provocative Migs broke off abruptly and hightailed for Cuba.

The two U.S. interceptors, closing in at supersonic speed, could have overtaken the Reds and unquestionably blasted the Mig-17's out of the sky. But beyond chasing the "buzzers" off, the American pilots did nothing—under orders.

Their orders flatly forbade them from using their weapons against the Communist planes.

Later, the crew of the patrol plane reported the Migs flew so close they could clearly see the pilots. Also that the pilot of the Mig-21 was apparently the commander of the trio and that, while he spoke Spanish, he had a pronounced guttural accent.

## More Teachers Abandoning Field

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this is a time when improved education for all students is on the mind of all our citizens. Yet, at the very time when, for a variety of reasons, we must constantly seek improvement, there is the very real danger of a decline in one of the most important factors of education: the quality of the teaching available to our children. This decline stems not from a lack of preparation of teachers for their jobs, but rather from the accelerated pace at which skilled, well-trained teachers are changing their careers from the academic to the world of business, industry and Government.

Yesterday, the nationally known educator-columnist, Dr. Benjamin Fine, wrote of this current danger to our educational system. His article, which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger, deserves the thoughtful consideration of all here in this body. And, for this reason, I insert it in the RECORD:

## MORE TEACHERS ABANDONING FIELD

(By Dr. Benjamin Fine)

Lured by higher salaries in business, industry and Government, more men than ever before are leaving the teaching profession. Angry, frustrated, and insecure in their teaching posts, they say frankly if other jobs become available, they will leave the classroom.

Men in public school work average \$5,500 from their teaching. About half or them work at a second job during the school year, while 60 percent hold another job during the summer months which brings them an average \$1,200 a year more.

Eighty percent of the men teaching in public schools are married with an average of two children. More than 40 percent have master's degrees, compared to 15 percent for women teachers.

Despite their greater amount of education, their teaching careers are shorter. As a group, men are 10 years younger than their women colleagues, and have only half as much teaching experience.

These statistics have been compiled by Dr. Sam M. Lambert, National Education Association research director. Reporting in the February NEA Journal, Dr. Lambert notes that a large proportion of men teachers have serious financial problems.

Most want to continue teaching but thousands resign each year because of financial difficulties. Their salaries provide basic necessities but little else. A wife facing major surgery, a son needing braces on his teeth, means trouble.

To make ends meet, the men pick up almost any kind of job available in the community as house painters, filling station attendants, selling life insurance, or cemetery lots. Many tutor in the evenings while others work in department stores, serve as part-time busdrivers or run sanitation trucks.

"I don't know whether I'm a full-time teacher and part-time bulldozer operator, or

over the Pentagon. The power to raise and maintain armies and navies, conveyed to the legislative branch by the Constitution, has been watered down as a result of the sheer immensity and size of the Defense Department, the tremendous increase in Executive power, and the weaknesses and mistakes of Congress itself. In the Senate and the House, intercommittee jealousies and the small size of the staffs of these committees—which have not matched, in any way, the growth in size of the armed services—have hampered examinations and control. And Congress, by loose legislation, conferred upon the President and the Secretary of Defense such immense power to reorganize the Pentagon that it has, in the view of some Legislators, virtually abandoned its former power to check, control, and approve every detail of defense policy and organization.

The process of centralization in the Pentagon has gone so far there is very considerable doubt that the service departments can remain separate at all.

Both Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, now NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, have publicly opposed a single chief-of-staff system, and have endorsed the separate service "techniques of land warfare, naval warfare, and air warfare." Former Secretary of the Navy, later Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates has warned against centralization and has said that to "submerge \* \* \* honest differences of [service] opinion and free expression \* \* \* in any monolithic system would be a fatal mistake."

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U.S. Army (retired), spoke in 1960 against reduction of everything to its lowest denominator, one service, one uniform \* \* \* to the dead level of mediocrity, jack of all trades, masters of none, a group of "Yes" men always in unanimous agreement—what an insidiously dangerous philosophy.

If the Pentagon ever does speak with one voice, if the Nation's Armed Forces do come, as the trend now indicates, to represent a monolithic military-political point of view, both freedom and security will be in jeopardy through the slow erosion of democracy into a garrison state and the stagnant conformity that leads to combat ineffectiveness.

### Lewis Deschler Resolution

SPEECH  
OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution tendering the thanks and appreciation of the House of Representatives to Lewis Deschler for his faithful service as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives for the past 35 years is a very fitting tribute to a great American.

Lewis Deschler is not only the greatest Parliamentarian of our times, but he has endeared himself to all Members of the House. In addition to his many splendid qualifications as Parliamentarian, he has those personal attributes which make people admire and respect him.

It has been a real privilege for me to

have been associated with Lewis Deschler throughout my service in the Congress, and I wish him the best of everything in the years that lie ahead.

### Timely Editorials

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News and two from the Richmond, Ind., Palladium-Item, in the Appendix of the Record:

[From the Shelbyville (Ind.) News, Mar. 3, 1963]

#### How To GET A Tax Cut

Most Capitol Hill news observers are of the opinion right now that Congress will cut taxes this year—which is the major domestic issue of the current session—but they hasten to inject a number of important reservations with that opinion.

First of all, they agree that President Kennedy won't get the tax program that he has called for. That program has been termed just about everything from "unrealistic to irresponsible"—and among those who have given it these and other names are some members of both political parties in Congress, plus business and labor.

Business groups formerly were cast in the role of proponents of a tax bill, while now they're said to be opponents. From what we have been able to gather, the latter is not true. Most business groups still favor tax cuts, but they also support a corresponding cut in spending by Government.

Labor unions and liberals recently have also been sounding like opponents, too, but they're not. They just want Congress to vote for tax cuts effective at once, instead of in stages as Mr. Kennedy has proposed.

We think, as most other observers have expressed themselves, that there'll be a tax cut before the summer is over. But we believe it will have to be along the lines urged earlier this week in Washington by a committee of businessmen representing 30 State and regional chambers of commerce. Submitted for consideration was a program of feasible reductions totaling \$9.8 billion of appropriations in the Federal budget for 1964 with a resultant cut in spending of \$5.8 billion.

The economies were advocated as removing "the only real roadblock to tax reduction this year." The roadblock was seen as congressional reluctance to participate in "sheer fiscal irresponsibility" in reducing taxes with the budget already far out of balance.

Once the budget roadblock is removed, the businessmen see the way open to tax reform. They envision this as tax legislation "effectively reducing existing tax barriers to capital formation, individual incentives, and risk-taking, job-creating investments."

The committee identified areas in the 1964 budget where appropriations and expenditures could be cut without disrupting essential Government services. At the outset it called for the rejection of seven new non-defense spending programs proposed for fiscal 1964. The seven new spending measures include the omnibus Federal aid to education program, urban mass transportation, youth employment and training, and four lesser programs. Elimination of these would

reduce appropriations \$1.5 billion and spending \$245 million.

The committee cited a number of Federal loan programs which could be curtailed at a saving to taxpayers of \$840 million in appropriations and \$659 million in expenditures in 1964. These included REA electrification, area redevelopment fund, Farmers Home Administration direct loans, FNMA special assistance fund, VA direct home loans, and the Small Business Administration revolving fund.

By reducing the outlays for certain Federal grant-in-aid programs the businessmen proposed to save \$868 million in appropriations and \$762 million in spending. These were in public assistance, grants to schools in federally impacted areas and the school lunch program.

The committee recommended a cutback in civil public works spending in 19 categories of public works including the accelerated public works program enacted last year. If these were held merely to 1962 levels, the committee pointed out, budgeted appropriations and expenditures would be reduced \$851 million and \$776 million, respectively.

The committee attacked three large-scale civilian research activities as "growing at too fast a pace for efficient utilization of available resources of money and personnel." By slowing down the space program and those for the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation the business group declared \$2.5 billion can be saved in appropriations and \$1.4 billion in expenditures.

Recommendations for foreign aid were offered as a solution to current problems relating to the balance of international payments, the flight of gold, and budget deficits. These would cut in half the \$5.4 billion foreign aid appropriation and limit expenditures to the \$2.7 billion appropriation figure—which would be \$1.5 billion less than budgeted expenditures.

By reducing the number of Federal employees to 1961 levels, with certain exceptions, largely through attrition by not refilling positions left vacant by resignation, retirement, and death, the committee anticipated savings of \$513 million in both appropriations and expenditures.

The business organization supported economy programs in logistical activities that Secretary of Defense McNamara is undertaking. It urged "vigorous prosecution of these and other economy measures with the objective of about 10-percent savings in the annual defense budgets ahead."

There is almost unanimous agreement among economists and politicians, businessmen and labor leaders, and conservatives and liberals that our income tax rates are too high and should be reduced for the good of the economy. The administration has indicated strong concurrence with this view and has proposed a course of tax-cutting action for Congress to undertake. At the same time, however, the administration has set up a roadblock to desirable tax action which is likely to be insurmountable unless it is materially reduced in size. This roadblock is the proposed \$98.8 billion 1964 fiscal year expenditure budget with its \$11.9 billion deficit.

Remove this roadblock, and we can have our tax cut.

[From the Palladium-Item, Richmond, Ind.]

#### KENNEDY WON'T LIKE THIS

Thanks to our form of government, those in position of leadership and responsibility are not immune to criticism, either from members of their own political party, from the opposition party, or from the press.

The situation in Cuba, where Communist Russia actually has established a military foothold within 90 miles of our shores, is one in which freedom of expression and the

right of constructive criticism are vitally important.

The administration of President Kennedy has said that it now is high time that its opponents quiet down on the Cuban situation.

Fortunately, the Republican Party has no intention of letting up on its close scrutiny of the Kennedy administration's handling of the Cuban situation. As leaders of the Republicans have pointed out, the Soviets now are rather firmly entrenched in the Western Hemisphere and it may take some doing to get them out.

President Kennedy and his circle of advisers would like to see a bipartisan front regarding our position in Cuba.

By bipartisan, he means no voice of criticism, no opposition, no needling of any kind. But that is not the kind of bipartisanship which will best serve the public.

Republican leaders in the Congress feel that there is deep unrest throughout the country concerning the Cuban situation. They feel, and rightly so, that it is their duty and their responsibility to continue to let the Kennedy administration know that they are watching his progress, or lack of progress, carefully. They will make themselves heard when they feel it is necessary.

This is not the time for shutting our eyes and blindly following Kennedy and his advisers or refraining from any criticism or suggestion whatsoever.

The voice of opposition, of constructive criticism, must continue to be heard, now more than ever before. There is too much at stake for any other course to be followed.

[From the Palladium-Item, Richmond, Ind.]  
HOW CAN WE BELIEVE THEM?

How can President Kennedy expect us to have full trust and unshaking confidence in his administration if he, his advisers, and his spokesmen engage in half-truths, evasive answers, sly suppression of facts, or even in outspoken denials.

Take the 1961 invasion attempt on Cuba and Senator DIRKSEN's recent disclosure that four American fliers were killed.

President Kennedy's Defense Department at first declined to comment on the report of the Senate Republican leader.

The Department was unwilling to confirm or deny the statement of Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, who is making a one-man inquiry into the Bay of Pigs disaster in April 1961.

Later, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate Democratic leader, confirmed the report. The four airmen, he said, were employed to train Cuban pilots and navigators. The Americans volunteered to fly combat missions and were killed.

All the details of this ill-fated invasion attempts are in the hands of the Defense Department. If Senator DIRKSEN, alone and singlehanded, succeeded in getting this information, undoubtedly the Defense Department could have published it long since.

The suppression, the alteration, and the withholding of information about public affairs are usurpations of the rights of the people.

The monopoly on information, which a bureaucratic officialdom believes it has on information, destroys the faith, reliability, and confidence which the people should have in their public officials.

Neither is the deft and nimble weapon of social flattery and patronage which the President is employing to control and color news destined to encourage or solidify public trust and reliance in his words and actions.

Arthur Krock of the New York Times, for 50 years a Washington correspondent and a longtime friend of President Kennedy and his family, in a magazine article, says he has seen nothing to match the Kennedy pol-

icy of news management, especially in the Cuban situation.

Krock said the weapon of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error in the aftermath of half-won showdowns, such as President Kennedy's with respect of the Soviet rearmament of Cuba.

No wonder Republican leaders and even some Democratic leaders are insisting on a complete disclosure of the Cuban fiasco and are carrying on investigations of their own to get it.

### Even Though Heller Jeers We Need More Puritanical Principles in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Rock County Star-Herald of Luverne, Minn., has an editor, Alan C. McIntosh, who does not think much of the theories currently being expounded in Washington, as he demonstrates in an editorial in a recent issue. Thinking my colleagues would be interested, I request that the editorial be published in the RECORD:

EVEN THOUGH HELLER JEERS WE NEED MORE PURITANICAL PRINCIPLES IN WASHINGTON

Dr. Walter Heller, who left the banks of the Mississippi River where he was an instructor at the University of Minnesota, is now the economic adviser to the President.

Sometimes Dr. Heller's theories are so far out in front that you think you are looking at the 1982 model of economic theory.

He alluringly referred to the old belief that living within your income, as an individual or as a government, as being old hat . . . that trying to spend less than you take in is an outmoded puritanical belief.

We think Dr. Heller may be a most brilliant man but we think he needs a reorientation course in America—what made America great—and what made America "tick."

We think he could well apologize to the Puritans—what we need more of in Washington today is principles of the Puritans as to honesty, morals, thrift, and decency and less of what we have.

The curse of too many administrations has been the number of college theorists—and Harvard doesn't hold the monopoly—who have never earned a dollar in their lives by risking a dollar—who haven't even managed a peanut stand but who would remake America, and what made America great, individual enterprise and initiative.

The administration claque jeers at those who do not swallow sight unseen the "reforms" in the tax measure. They say spending is necessary to get "America moving"—that was what they said in the 1960 campaign before they put sand on the ralls when they got their hands on the throttle.

Somehow we have the idea that an advance alibi is being prepared for a "Kennedy depression" which will result if policies are not reversed.

What Dr. Heller fails to see, through the miasmic fog of his esthetic economic theories that debt is a virtue, is this:

Private investment which is the only thing that creates jobs has been lagging. It will never pick up unless investors see a hope of profit.

Union demands, which the administration aids and abets as in the settlement of the

dockworkers strike, have driven employers to automate at a fantastic pace.

Until profits increase no employer is going to add marginal labor to his payroll.

He just isn't going to risk. It takes an average of \$15,000 to \$17,000 in machinery and plant investment to create a single job.

Who will risk \$450,000 to create 30 jobs when he can make more return just "sitting" on his money.

When bonds bring a higher yield than stocks, as in today's market it is a clear signal of what is wrong.

If Dr. Heller wants to know why America isn't moving forward faster just let him look at the mirror—this man who sees no danger in staggering debt.

### Danger of More Cubas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a very fine editorial which appeared in the Lawrence, Mass., Eagle-Tribune on February 27, 1963. The editors have pointed out the very important truth that the security of Latin America depends to a large degree on attacking the prevailing social and economic injustice.

DANGER OF MORE CUBAS

President Betancourt uttered the obvious when he told President Kennedy that the United States and Latin America must control air and sea traffic between Cuba and Latin American nations to stamp out Communist subversion.

He uttered the obvious too when he said that economic and social reforms must be accomplished in Latin America or Cuban communism will have numerous national comrades in this hemisphere.

Kennedy did not say yes or no to Betancourt's proposals. He merely pledged full support of Venezuela's resistance of communism. But he could not have failed to see the sense in Betancourt's words, nor could he have failed to discern the enormity of the obligation Betancourt defined.

Obvious, we think, is the fact that the kind of control Betancourt called for would have to be applied almost wholly by the United States. Latin American nations through the Organization of American States never, since the rise of communism in Cuba, have been able to agree on effective action against the Castro regime. The fact that Brazil did not promptly return to Venezuela the hijackers of a Venezuelan ship signifies the unwillingness or inability of Latin America to deal vigorously with the danger of communism.

But effective control of air and sea traffic from Cuba to other Latin American nations would not prevent the establishment of Communist regimes in Central and South America. As long as unrest caused by social and economic injustice prevails, the soil to nourish communism exists, and someone will appear to seed it. Communist Cuba, free to export subversion, makes the seeding process easier.

The President, as he examines this truth, must bitterly rue what his brother Robert calls the mistake he made when Cuban exiles nearly 2 years ago tried to overthrow Castro and failed because the administration refused to shake the dust of neglect from the Monroe Doctrine.

"Tax incentive to attract new industries to the State; change election law by doing away with names on petitions, and allow candidates to run in their party primary by paying a filing fee and bond for character, to increase participation in party primaries; expand rehabilitation program for young people in correctional institutions; primary election for all State offices; State legislative reapportionment based upon citizen population; permanent primary day in June; increase State aid for education as to fair share of the taxes by the residues; free tuition at city colleges; right to vote at 18 years.

"State build upstate rehabilitation camps for dope victims; fair sabbath law in New York City; off-track betting by a referendum; research study to curtail the pollution of air and water; raise drinking age to 21 years; more stringent penalties to dispensers of narcotics; State bonus of Korean veterans; racial discriminations be extended to all multiple dwellings and one- or two-family houses throughout State.

"More State aid for public health centers; repeal law creating East Hudson Parkway; examinations be given every 10 years for all motor vehicle operators; change election law to live in county 30 days and not 4 months; establish State commission of recreation; mandatory sentence of 20 years for nonaddict pushers in illegal sale of narcotics for profit; mandatory 5-year sentence for carrying knife for improper purposes; mandatory 10-year sentence using knife in any crime of violence; better nursing home care for aged, with more help given to the handicapped and retarded in State; more State scholarships with more assistance to the gifted students.

"Domestic Peace Corps; toughening first and second degree rape laws; recodification of the criminal statutes to curb juvenile delinquency; study laws to unify the Federal and State laws with less entanglement; install device in automobiles to control auto exhaust gas; amend State election law to provide for part-time off for voting; urge State legislature to ratify the 15th amendment, and advocate a printed record be published and made available to the public of full proceedings of State legislature."

The above legislation will be introduced in the State Legislature in January 1963 by our 14 members in the State senate and 29 in State assembly, with Aileen B. Ryan, of the Bronx, chairman in the assembly, and Samuel L. Greenberg, of Brooklyn, chairman in the senate.

Harold R. Moskovit, State President of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York presided.

### Behind the Hikes

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Charles W. Bailey, Washington staff correspondent for the Minneapolis Tribune, in a recent article drew an interesting appraisal of the 50-mile hikes encouraged by the present administration. Mr. Bailey, it will be remembered, is coauthor of the book "Seven Days in May," which has found popularity in this country. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the Bailey article which appeared in the February 18 issue of the Tribune, and ask that it be reprinted in today's RECORD:

#### ALL THIS HIKING IS THE RESULT OF FIVE CAPITAL BLUNDERS

(By Charles W. Bailey)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Serious students of history probably will overlook it, but the brief crisis over the 50-mile hike tells a lot about the Kennedy administration.

It flashed across the wintry landscape of Washington like a comet last week, dazzling but short lived, leaving blistered feet, bruised egos, and a shower of bad jokes in its wake.

In many respects, the hiking crisis parallels the Canadian crisis. Both began with administration statements being issued without full checking and clearance. Both produced results beyond the wildest nightmares of those who made the statements. Both wound up embarrassing the officials involved.

It is true that one of these crises brought about the fall of a government, while the other brought down nothing more than a few arches. But the basic elements—ill-considered statements, misunderstandings, hastily designed policy expedients, chain reaction repercussions—were markedly similar.

Perhaps the most serious failure of governmental machinery came at the very start. The commandant of the Marine Corps, cleaning out his old files, came across a half-century-old order from President Theodore Roosevelt directing Marine officers to become proficient in long-distance walking.

His mistake was in sending it on to President Kennedy as a curiosity. Everyone in town ought to know by now that it is dangerous to send historical curiosities to Mr. Kennedy.

Mistake No. 2 was made by the Chief Executive, who obviously read the old order hastily and acted without proper background briefing or policy staffing.

He fired it right back to the commandant, saying it was a fine thing and wondering if Marines could do as well today. It is always a mistake to suggest to a Marine that he may not be one of the old breed, especially when the Marine you tell it to can order out the whole corps to prove you wrong.

Mr. Kennedy's second mistake was in bringing Pierre Salinger, his press secretary, into the inner circle of policymakers who had knowledge of the matter.

The President, obviously failing to realize that Salinger is almost as eager to get himself into the public eye as he is to publicize his boss, told his press secretary the whole story.

Salinger proceeded to commit a fourth error. He not only leaked the whole thing to the papers, but went on impetuously in an obviously ill-considered statement to say he'd try walking, too.

Salinger's error, in fact, was a double one. Not only did he let himself in for an inevitable loss of face—those who know him best never allowed themselves to think he would actually walk anywhere—but he also got Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy into the act.

Bobby, who is congenitally incapable of admitting that he cannot do anything that anyone else can do and then some, leaped into his high shoes, called in his own flacks and took off.

In so doing, Bobby made another mistake—and one that is typical of this administration. When a Kennedy does something, he really does it. It mattered not to him that the original order was aimed at producing marines who could carry heavy loads and live off the country while covering ground at a reasonable pace for several days.

All that Bobby saw was the part about walking 50 miles. To a Kennedy, that means do it now, at high speed, and all at once, and never mind the fine print. That's the way he did it, leaving his reluctant comrades scattered along the way to Camp David, Md.

This series of blunders produced utter chaos. Men, women, and children, heedless of their physical conditions, jumped out of their TV lounges and took to the hills. It will be months, perhaps years, before the full extent of the damage to the Nation's health and welfare can be accurately measured.

The end result, of course, was public humiliation for Salinger. He had to be sacrificed, much as Nikita Khrushchev had to sacrifice the prestige of Fidel Castro last October.

Backing down when he stood toe-to-toe with challenge would have been bad enough, but events conspired to make Pierre look even worse. Seven congressional secretaries, all female, had announced they would match him stride for stride—and they went walking anyway.

One of them even went so far as to cut her foot at the start of the hike, and then stick it out to the end, 32 miles away, regardless of pain, suffering, and band-aids.

It is surely to be hoped that out of the debacle some hard lessons may be learned by the administration. Certainly its prestige is not enhanced by this sort of thing. Furthermore, Nelson Rockefeller looks like a pretty good long-haul hiker himself.

### How To Deal With Soviet Cuba Short of War

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting an editorial from the March 8, 1963, Life magazine which discusses the problem of Cuba and places special emphasis on the dangers of communism spreading from Cuba to South America.

The editorial states that President Kennedy's negotiations could seem more serious if "he took steps to put more pressure on the already chaotic Cuban economy, make its support more expensive to the Russians, and ultimately make that support impossible."

In this connection I refer the Members of the House to my remarks on Monday, March 4 when I introduced House Resolution 277, urging a study, by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of the advisability of denying the use of the Panama Canal to all vessels trading with Cuba.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:  
HOW TO DEAL WITH SOVIET CUBA SHORT OF WAR

The recent freak attack by Cuban Migs on a flagless American shrimp boat elicited a prompt order from President Kennedy; next time our jet fighters will shoot back. But this is no answer to the question that Senators KEATING, COOPER, STENNIS, RUSSELL, and other critics and doubters of the administration's Cuban policy keep asking: Why should there be any Migs in Cuba at all, not to mention some 17,000 Russian troops, more than 500 antiaircraft missiles, and huge quantities of other Soviet armaments? They want to know why the administration continues to downgrade the importance of these Soviet arms and whether

A1180

it really has an adequate plan to get rid of them.

More and more of our Latin allies are asking the same question and, in marked contrast to their ambivalence toward Castro a year ago, they are now actually ahead of Washington in wanting action on Cuba. Before the Organization of American States, the Guatemalan Foreign Minister last week demanded a stronger application of the Monroe Doctrine. President Betancourt of Venezuela, in his recent visit said the OAS "should tighten the ring around Cuba, isolating her completely," and also "stimulate democratic resistance within Cuba." OAS Council Chairman Facio of Costa Rica echoes him. An OAS committee has just issued a blunt report on Castro's methods of exporting communism, urging members to take much stronger defensive measures. The Peruvian Ambassador predicts OAS unanimity behind any U.S.-led action against Cuba—specifically a blockade.

In his private exchanges with Khrushchev, Kennedy may be assumed to be prodding for removal of the Russian troops, and he has Ambassador Dobrynin's promise that "several thousand" will withdraw by March 15. But Kennedy still postpones action. He continues to insist on an unreal distinction between offensive and defensive Soviet weapons and he asks his critics not to rock the boat or, as Ambassador Stevenson put it, "make it too embarrassing for him [Khrushchev] to back down again." Why should we be so tender about Khrushchev's face? Sometimes critics are asked how they would handle Cuba; but when Senator KEATING came up with a long list of steps, none of them military, the President asked him not to make these public.

Meanwhile the Russians, for all we know in the absence of on-site inspection, may be (as Senators Cooper and STENNIS suspect) increasing instead of reducing their military strength in Cuba. They are certainly adding to Castro's strength. One does not have to be a warmonger to demand more action. Kennedy's negotiations do not exhaust our peaceful remedies for the outrageous Russian presence in Cuba. Indeed the negotiations would seem much more serious on Kennedy's part, not only to his critics but to Khrushchev, if he took steps to put more pressure on the already chaotic Cuban economy, make its support (already at least \$1 million a day) more expensive to the Russians, and ultimately make that support impossible.

For example: U.S. vessels have long been forbidden to carry strategic goods to Cuba, and U.S. Government-financed cargoes are now refused to foreign ships that continue trading with Cuba. That is not enough. The United States could strengthen its partial quarantine by forbidding our ports entirely to these foreign vessels. A further step would be to revive and extend the October quarantine against Soviet vessels bearing arms to Cuba. This might involve us in boarding and inspection. A later step would be to expand the quarantine to any and all tankers, including Soviet tankers. Without Soviet oil, the Castro economy would grind to a halt in a few weeks.

Other measures may have to be taken against Castro. But the first task is to get the Russians and their massive armaments out of Cuba. In a speech in Houston last week Secretary Rusk said: "Fortunately, there is unanimity in the hemisphere on the most crucial matters . . . a Soviet military presence on that island cannot be accepted." It is time for deeds as well as negotiations to prove that we mean that.

## Practical Physical Protection of Electrical Systems

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, from the day the nuclear age was ushered in nearly 18 years ago there have been many plans and panaceas, little hope, and much defeatism, and much too little cool, calm, and realistic judgment about how man must adapt himself to the nuclear environment of the 20th century. An occasional breath of fresh air clears the atmosphere. This was the case on January 30 of this year when Mr. Robert L. Corsbie, A.I.A., addressed the winter general meeting of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers in New York. His topic was "Practical Physical Protection of Electrical Systems"—used for industrial and commercial power—a subject of great interest to me and of the utmost importance to all of us, as the remarks have application far beyond the field of electrical power. Mr. Corsbie, one of the world's foremost experts in the field of the effects of nuclear explosion on man and structures, is a member of the New York firm of Rose, Beaton, & Corsbie and a consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission. He was formerly Director of Civil Effects Tests and Operations and Chief of the Civil Effects Branch of the Division of Biology and Medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission where he was author or participant in the preparation of more than 200 weapons effects reports during the firing of more than 100 nuclear devices.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his address, as follows:

#### PRACTICAL PHYSICAL PROTECTION OF ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS

(By Robert L. Corsbie)

I am pleased to participate in this discussion of industrial and commercial power systems during and following a national or regional disaster, and to exchange thoughts on protection against the effects of nuclear reactions, with particular reference to the hazards accompanying and following the explosion of nuclear weapons.

The atomic bursts in 1945 over the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki greatly complicated the professional lives of those who influence and control man's physical environment. The instantaneous destruction of these cities, with populations of 200,000 and more, by airburst bombs of about 20-kiloton energy release, brought into sharp focus the interrelationship of the physical parts of cities, their buildings, and bridges, electrical generating and distributing systems, communications, water supply, sanitation, and transportation.

The unbelievable and unpredicted damage from the nuclear blast, thermal, and ionizing radiation, placed new demands upon architects and engineers. Since that day, they have the responsibility for designing

structures and supporting systems of balanced strength consistent in resistance to survive an assumed level of nuclear effects, as well as the effects of winds, floods, earthquakes, and other natural disasters.

Seventeen years ago this month I was in Fort Belvoir, 18 miles from Washington, D.C., preparing and editing the physical damage report of these 1945 atomic detonations over Japan. The damage caused to utility powerlines, communications centers, telephone and telegraph lines above and below the surface, power stations, transformers, etc., was evaluated, extrapolated to our own cities, and published, principally in the "1950 Effects of Atomic Bombs."

Eight years ago this month I was at the Atomic Energy Commission's Nevada test site working feverishly in preparation for the 1955 weapons tests series called Operation Teapot. My position was that of director, civil effects test group, one of the four major organizations engaged in field experiments and evaluations at that time. Within the civil effects program were those projects oriented predominantly toward civil requirements for effects information, which we distinguish from military effects and weapons development needs.

Of especial interest to electrical and electronics engineers—and to many others—were two projects: One, sponsored by the Edison Electric Institute and associated companies, and under Project Officer Ralph V. H. Wood, of the Philadelphia Electric Co., sought information on the relative vulnerability of electric transmission substations and distribution systems compared to that of the homes and factories they serve. The other, sponsored by the Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers' Association and member companies, and under the direction of Project Officer Raymond H. Williamson, of General Electric, sought information on the effects of a nuclear explosion on typical communications equipment. Both projects participated in a detonation which occurred on May 5, 1955, and both projects obtained valuable and useful data which have been reported in the unclassified literature. It is safe to say that our confidence in electrical systems and in communications equipment rose when we surveyed the results of the shot.

If you will think back to 1955 for a moment, you may reach the conclusion that the only thing in the world that hasn't changed is the Volkswagen. They are others, of course; we all realize, however, that the last 8 years have been dynamic years.

During the 1955 tests in Nevada we were concerned with the response of various items, in addition to electrical and communications systems, to the effects of a device having an energy release comparable to 29 kilotons; i.e., 29,000 tons of TNT. Today, the advances in weaponry require that we consider defensive measures against explosions in the megaton range; i.e., comparable to millions of tons of TNT.

Changes in the delivery systems have required that we shift our focus from delivery by the manned bomber to delivery by manned bombers and high-velocity missiles. While the yields have been going up, the delivery times—and thus the warning times—have been contracting.

Fortunately, the picture is not entirely one of foreboding, because the active defenses of the United States have been enhanced. Nevertheless, in the summation, the threat we face today is far more serious than the threat we faced 8 years ago.

The prospects of facing this threat are less terrifying if one understands that:

My topic tonight is the economics of reclamation and I want to use my time to put into proper perspective the various facets of multipurpose development in the States of the Colorado River Basin. To borrow an old phrase, we sometimes have a tendency to get so close to one tree of benefits we cannot see the whole forest of multiple purposes and benefits. It is only when we accomplish this total purpose that the Colorado River Basin is assured of maximum benefits. This, I am sure, is your desire as well as ours.

I want to emphasize first that the historic mission of the Bureau of Reclamation was and is to conserve and put water to a useful purpose. Our job is the saving and salvage of water—the storing, controlling and regulating of water supplies for beneficial consumptive uses by the people in the cities and towns and on the farms of the West.

In accomplishing that objective, we have the responsibility to give full consideration to all water resource development functions. We must build our projects to fulfill as many purposes as possible in order that the maximum number of people can realize the maximum benefits from this most valuable of our publicly owned natural resources.

This multipurpose concept has become increasingly important. More and more attention is being given to purposes such as recreation, fish and wildlife, water-quality control, area redevelopment and others that were fully considered in the early days of reclamation. Hydroelectric power, however, was one of the first multiple uses incorporated into the reclamation program and continues today to be one of the most important.

Hydroelectric power plays a crucial and a most significant role in the Federal reclamation program. Important in itself for the energy it provides for farms, homes, and industries in the area, it is doubly so because power revenues are a critical part of the economics of reclamation as we presently know them. The keystone of these policies is reimbursability. The ever-present, hard fact of life in Federal reclamation may be stated simply—a project is feasible if reimbursable costs can be repaid over a specified period of time. The principle was written into the original Reclamation Act of 1902 and is as good and effective today as it was then.

I personally would have it no other way and I do not believe you would either. I believe in paying my own way and I believe Government projects should, too, to the maximum of their ability. I am more than a little proud of the fact that the total Federal investment for reclamation is more than 92 percent reimbursable and that we are more than 89 percent current in these repayment obligations. I say "we" not solely in the sense of a Bureau of Reclamation employee, but we in the sense of the beneficiaries of reclamation, primarily the water and power users.

Now then, how does Federal reclamation power fit into this picture? I say Federal reclamation power because it clearly defines a particular specie of power in the large family from which our various types of energy come. Federal reclamation power is power with a particular purpose which comes from a multipurpose development plan. It is power which is the paying partner making such reclamation dams and reservoirs feasible.

It is public power not only by generation at a publicly owned facility, but because Congress has prescribed that it be marketed with preference to public and cooperative agencies. Thus, Federal reclamation power is so distinct and unique that its place in the total energy catalog should be clearcut.

So tonight, as we discuss kilowatts on the Colorado and their relationship to the eco-

nomics of reclamation, we are talking about Federal reclamation power—hydroelectric power that provides the financial assistance that assures repayment ability—hydroelectric power that is the prime mover in the entire scheme of water resources development in the Colorado River Basin. Without it, it is safe to say, the Colorado would still be a wild and unruly river, its resources largely wasted. Either that or there would be a tremendous Federal subsidy poured into the efforts to control the river and put it to useful purposes.

I will not attempt to go into the past development on the Colorado and its tributaries. Let it suffice to say that there are presently reclamation facilities for serving 2,212,000 acres of land in the basin and adjacent service areas, and that last year crops harvested from the lands grossed \$345.6 million. There are an estimated 9 million people receiving municipal and industrial water in the Colorado River Basin service area. Last year there were nearly 5.5 billion kilowatt-hours of energy generated by Bureau of Reclamation hydroelectric plants having a total capacity of nearly 2 million kilowatts.

Take these contributions from Federal reclamation development out of the economy of the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Southwestern States and you would have a great void. Reclamation has made an invaluable contribution to building up the economy of this fastest growing area of the United States during the last half century. Yet, almost every penny of the Federal reclamation expenditure is being repaid. Surely there is no better investment. And hydropower has been a key to this development by providing a means of reimbursement to the Federal Government of the hard dollars put into it over the years.

Specifically now to the upper Colorado River project. Here the law requires that the power costs be repaid within 50 years from date of completion of separable features. Irrigation costs in the major reservoirs must be repaid in 50 years from completion of the dams. Power revenues must repay those irrigation costs on participating units which the irrigators cannot repay in 50 years.

The power payout period and the reservoir irrigation cost payout period, for all practical purposes, are simultaneous. Because power cost is interest-bearing and irrigation cost is not, the minimum annual cost, and hence the minimum power rate, results when power costs are paid in less than 50 years and the irrigation cost in the remaining period. Thus repayment is accomplished at a minimum power rate consistent with legal requirements of the project.

In the Colorado River storage project, estimated to cost over a billion dollars, power pays about 84 percent of the total, while all other uses pay about 8 percent. Another 8 percent is nonreimbursable. These figures well illustrate the role power plays in reclamation.

At the present time, we and the upper basin are moving ahead together on the Colorado River storage project. Navajo Dam is virtually complete. Flaming Gorge Dam has been topped out and the storage of water begun. Less than a million cubic yards is needed to top out Glen Canyon Dam, and the first steps have been taken to enable storage of water in Lake Powell when the spring runoff comes in April or May of this year. Ground was broken at Blue Mesa damsite on the Gunnison River last July, the first of three dams which will make up this fourth major storage unit, the Curecanti.

The first Colorado River storage project power is scheduled for production next September at Flaming Gorge Dam and by mid-1964, at Glen Canyon Dam. Construction of transmission lines was started in 1961 and has been speeded up since completion of

negotiations for the interchange and wheeling of Colorado River storage project power by your own and other non-Federal utilities. The animated map on display here shows the wide distribution of this new power supply to preference customers.

Work on the participating projects, which are the end result of the total project authorization, was initiated in 1959. This year will mark the beginning of the harvest of the vast benefits which will accrue. Not only will the first hydropower be produced this year, but irrigation water will also be available to supply more than 7,500 acres of new lands and more than 37,000 acres of supplemental lands on the completed participating projects. With lakes forming behind Navajo, Flaming Gorge, and Glen Canyon Dams, the first benefits from recreational use will also be realized.

Thus, there is little doubt about the place of Federal reclamation power in the economics of development of the Colorado River Basin. Without the financial assistance from these power revenues, we could not achieve the great multipurpose benefits which mean so much to the future of the areas which you serve.

Keep in mind, too, that as economic growth continues in the basin—growth fostered in large measure by expanding our available water resources through the Federal reclamation program—the demand for power skyrockets.

It is clearly evident in the basin, as elsewhere, that we must combine all of our efforts to meet the power needs with maximum output from total investment and facilities. To do otherwise would be wasteful and could possibly increase the cost of energy.

That is why we have sought a middle-of-the-road course to bring all utilities into the picture in working out the best arrangements from the project standpoint. In the challenge of meeting our power needs, I believe there is a place for all of us, public and private utilities, and the Federal Government. That is why I insisted on negotiating agreements with the private utilities for the interchange and transmission of Colorado River storage project power. It is why we reached an agreement with the Colorado-Ute Electric Association and the Salt River project for interconnection and exchange of power at proposed thermal generating plants near Craig, Colo., and Shiprock, N. Mex. This agreement, like those with the private utilities, would be mutually advantageous to all parties.

The decision of the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, announced last week on February 21, enables Colorado-Ute to proceed at one with construction of the first unit of the Hayden steamplant. This will assure savings of construction costs for the storage project and bring to closer realization the benefits that will accrue to the Upper Colorado River Basin through coordinated operation of this plant with the hydroelectric plants of the storage project.

The Colorado Public Utilities Commission is to be congratulated in reaching a decision which will assure Colorado of development of a thermal plant ultimately to be a market for about 1½ million tons annually of its huge coal reserves in western Colorado.

It is worthy to note, in bringing the Upper Colorado River development up to date, that the last Congress authorized three major projects which will make further use of the waters of the Colorado.

One is the Fryingpan-Arkansas which the people of the Arkansas River valley have sought for so long to relieve a critical situation there. It was pleasing indeed to see the people of Colorado united in support of this project. In such unity there is strength. I think we can all borrow a leaf from Colorado's book in burying our differences and

A1190

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 6

working together in support of reclamation for the common good throughout the West.

The other two projects in the Colorado River Basin area authorized by the last Congress were the San Juan-Chama, which will accomplish for the Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico what the Eryingpan-Arkansas project will accomplish for the Arkansas Valley people in Colorado, and the Navajo Indian Irrigation project. Both are participating projects of the Colorado River storage project and are major steps forward in the plans by New Mexico to use its allocated share of Colorado River Basin water.

Now what of the future? The upper basin is well on its way to putting its allocated share of water to work. The lower basin set the early pace in development with construction of Hoover, Davis, Parker, and Imperial Dams, the All-American and Coachella Canals, and of course the much earlier construction of the Salt River project, and others in Arizona. But the lower basin has been marking time in recent years pending a Supreme Court decision in the contest between Arizona and California over rights to the water in the lower river.

That decision is anticipated momentarily. Regardless of which way it goes, it should clear the way for necessary further development of the lower Colorado.

Secretary of the Interior Udall set the pattern for this new development when he announced, only a month ago, in response to a request from Chairman ASPINALL of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, a new study of the water needs of the Pacific Southwest which is without parallel in scope. Secretary Udall said, and I quote his announcement: "A critical period is at hand, a more critical period lies ahead for millions of people who are flocking to the Pacific Southwest to establish permanent homes. This burgeoning population will require vast quantities of additional water for industrial and municipal use; greater quantities of electricity and other basic services; and more irrigated land. Piecemeal development cannot do the job. Only regional planning and action will enable us to meet the growth needs of this area."

This is the challenge of the future in the lower Colorado River Basin. It is a challenge which cannot be ignored. It is a challenge which is vital to the continued prosperity of this fast-growing section of our United States.

But it is a challenge which also involves the economics of reclamation about which I have been talking here this evening. It involves Federal reclamation power and it involves complete maximum use and returns from that power to aid in the financing of further development work in the basin.

If the Supreme Court decision goes to Arizona, as the Court's master has recommended, the Bureau of Reclamation will be prepared, as a part of the first phase of the revitalized program for lower basin development, to initiate work on the central Arizona unit as a partial answer to Arizona's long-term needs. It will be expensive and it will require a considerable quantity of pumping power as well. Added power and power revenues from the Colorado will clearly be needed. If the decision goes to California, it will not mean any additional water for that State, but merely a postponing of the day when the metropolitan areas of southern California must go farther afield in their search for water. The need to provide more water for the lower basin, including central Arizona, will remain. In any event, as Secretary Udall has pointed out, there is work to be done and benefits to be realized from further coordinated development in California.

At the same time, there is potential future development in the offing by which Nevada can further utilize its share of Colorado River Basin water. Even Utah, while pri-

marily an upper basin State, has a lower basin project which gives considerable promise but which will require some financial assistance from power revenues of the lower basin in its payback. This is the Dixie project.

Thus, the lower basin now finds itself in the position the upper basin occupied 15 years back when it got down to solid planning to put its allocated share of Colorado River Basin Water to maximum use. A major problem in both instances is finance.

The answer of the upper Colorado River States was total Federal development and utilization of a basin fund for financing more than a billion dollars worth of work. There was no thought of fragmentizing the total basin concept by single-purpose projects to be built and operated by other agencies with their administrative headaches, not to speak of the much greater threat of resulting losses to the all-important basin fund.

Such a basin fund is now contemplated as a part of the proposed future lower basin development. The lower basin will have a running start with three major power facilities, Hoover, Davis, and Parker, already constructed and in operation and their payout is well along.

But there is potentially great storage and hydropower development on the river upstream from Hoover Dam, particularly at the Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon sites. Both have been a part of comprehensive development plans for the lower basin for many years. Action on their authorization has awaited settlement of the California versus Arizona dispute and, in the case of Marble Canyon, the control which has been placed on the upper river by Glen Canyon Dam making this project possible.

Now, as Glen Canyon Dam nears completion and is ready to provide this control, and as the Supreme Court nears a decision, there is a new threat to comprehensive development. A non-Federal agency is proposing construction of a single purpose hydro dam at Marble Canyon. The application of the Arizona Power Authority for development of this site is now before the Federal Power Commission.

It has been opposed by Secretary of the Interior Udall and has even been the subject of a bill introduced in Congress by that great leader in Western development, Arizona's own Senator CARL HAYDEN. The bill, introduced by Senator HAYDEN, with the accompanying sponsorship of Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, Senators BIBLE and CANNON, of Nevada, Senator MOSS, of Utah, and Senator ENGLE, of California, would prohibit the Federal Power Commission from issuing license for a power development in the reach of the river between Glen Canyon Dam and Lake Mead during the period ending December 31, 1968. This would give Congress time to consider the overall comprehensive development plan.

We and other Interior agencies are moving rapidly to implement Secretary Udall's study. We obviously cannot complete any report until the Supreme Court renders its decision.

In the meantime, the threat of fragmentation of the lower basin development creates the most serious threat to a carefully considered and orderly plan which the lower basin has yet faced. It could knock the economics of reclamation which I have discussed here tonight into a cocked hat as far as the lower Colorado Basin is concerned.

For unless there is some major change in national policy which is not now apparent, reclamation must continue to pay its own way. This we are doing and can continue to do within the pattern provided by congressional action and developed over more than 60 years of operations. But fragmentation will hinder, if not make completely impossible, the overall total development which is so necessary to our future.

*Cuba*  
Marquis Childs Asks for White Paper on Bay of Pigs Invasion

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is good to welcome the distinguished journalist Marquis Childs aboard. He joined in the call for the full Bay of Pigs story today in an excellent article in the Washington Post. This arguments parallel those I have expressed on the floor this year when I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 82, to create a special joint committee to investigate and report on this ill-fated venture. It is the only way we will ever eliminate political bickering which is hampering development of a genuine bipartisan foreign policy against the common enemy of Republicans and Democrats alike—communism.

Mr. Childs' article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

FOR A WHITE PAPER ON BAY OF PIGS  
(By Marquis Childs)

Only a white paper giving a complete account of every aspect of the long Cuban misadventure, with the administration putting it squarely on the line, not glossing over the failures or exaggerating the successes, could at this late date be expected to damp down the political quarrel over American policy.

That is the view of observers more and more concerned lest Cuba become a major issue in the presidential campaign of 1964 with unforeseen and perhaps disastrous consequences. It could spell the end of any bipartisanship in foreign policy at a time when there are likely to be greater strains on the management of that policy than at any point since the war's end.

With a rising emotionalism generated by political charges the administration could be goaded into unwise and dangerous adventures. The temptation would be to prove the critics wrong and throw restraint to the winds.

Yet the objection within the administration to a white paper—a sober, thorough, careful let-the-chips-fall-where-they-may summing up—is that there would be too many red faces. These would not necessarily—nor even probably—be political faces. They would be the experts, the specialists, the weapons counters, on whose secret knowledge in the last analysis the decisions, beginning in mid-1959, were taken. Such a paper might prove to be the best analysis the public has been privileged to have of what is right—and wrong—with the far-reaching American intelligence apparatus.

Short of this the game of pinning the blame on the nearest political target will go on with the technique of leak and counter-leak. That technique is calculated to cause the greatest confusion in the public mind.

Short of a frank disclosure the strain on certain individuals is too great. As one of his stoutest journalistic admirers noted recently, John McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, is on the hottest of hot seats. He is a Republican who worked for the election of Richard Nixon in 1960. When President Kennedy asked him to succeed Allen Dulles as head of the CIA he felt that in accepting he was taking on a disinterested public service.

1963

But now he finds his party in Congress making a major issue of the wrongness of the Kennedy decisions on Cuba and that wrongness goes back in part to the expert opinions on which they were based. McCone is a man of strong convictions. As Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission under President Eisenhower he did not hesitate to oppose the Eisenhower policy of trying to get a nuclear test treaty with the Soviet Union.

McCone believes he was right on the danger of offensive weapons capability being installed in Cuba before anyone else. By implication others were slow to appreciate this threat. Inevitably members of his party, who want to get all the mileage possible out of Cuba, would like to see him become the hero of the occasion. This explains the hotness of the hot seat and the significance for 1964.

In this atmosphere minor differences are exaggerated. On October 3 Under Secretary of State George Ball read a statement to a congressional committee in open hearing, saying there was no evidence of any offensive buildup in Cuba. He based his statement on the latest intelligence reports.

Had McCone approved it? At first he said "No." Roger Hillsman Jr., head of intelligence for the State Department, said he had read it to McCone and the CIA director then recalled that it had been informally cleared with him.

Members of congressional committees have been concerned at McCone's statement in executive session that the President's definitions of offensive and defensive weapons were not of his making. Yet, he has himself said on several occasions that until the actual photographic evidence was obtained from the U-2 flights of October 14 it was impossible to confront Moscow with the challenge the missiles offered to America's security. Going further he has said that not until the far more complete photographic evidence of October 16 and 17 could the proof be put before Latin American and European states in such a way as to gain their undivided unity in support of the United States.

This last is the important aspect of the matter in the view of those arguing for frankness. Since the final evidence was complete and convincing the outcome was never in doubt. That is the answer to accusations that have seeded in some instances reckless and even hysterical. And it is conceivable that a full and frank account might buttress this matter.

### Plentiful, Pure Water a Must

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Winnsboro, S.C., News and Herald of February 28, 1963:

#### PLENTIFUL, PURE WATER A MUST

As of the morning of February 28, 1963, the water situation in Winnsboro—and for that matter, in most of Fairfield—would probably be described by most intelligent laymen as "A-OK." What the situation will be 6 months from now, in mid-August, a year ahead, or 5 years in the future is

anybody's guess but it is hardly too early to be taking thought of tomorrow.

There is no water problem here as of this moment for a number of obvious reasons. Rainfall has been heavy, existing industry has made no exorbitant demands, and no new industry that would be a big water user has been secured nor is one on the immediate horizon. Our storage reservoir has a good supply. But then, of course, no industry that demands a tremendous supply of water could logically consider Winnsboro under present conditions, nor would our area go all out to get such a plant.

For many years now, town authorities have been battling the baffling problem of whether it would be wise to spend a lot of money to guarantee the area an abundant and ever-available surplus of the precious fluid; and if the decision for additional water were made, what route should we take? More storage basins? Go to Little River? Or go to one of the big rivers, to the east or to the west? As a matter of fact, the town council, a few years ago, had decided to have a referendum on the matter, even published comprehensive information on the subject, only to let the issue rest for the time being.

A protracted summer drought, the influx of new industry, a sizable increase in population, or a combination of these things could, no doubt, put us into a critical situation within a relatively short period of time. But, for the moment, water is no problem.

Chester, our near neighbor to the north, thinks it has a serious water problem and a move is currently being considered to lay pipe 20 miles to the river to assure a steady and unlimited supply. But Chester is larger than Fairfield, is apparently doing much better in securing new industry, and is preparing for a future that its citizens look forward to with considerable optimism. Its water program, if carried to completion, is an ambitious and expensive one.

We were forcibly reminded of this omnipresent, nationwide problem, which has reached the acute stage in so many areas, by the excellent NBC program Sunday evening, emceed by Chet Huntley and appropriately titled "The Trouble With Water Is People." (Parenthetically, it might be observed that the trouble with everything is people—or to say it another way, U.S. citizens, by not taking thought together and in time, have squandered an untold amount of their rich natural resources: First the forests, next the land, and now the water. In large part, we have corrected our excesses in destroying our trees and our good earth, but billions of dollars went down the drain before we came to grips with reality. Now, late again in many places, we are waking up as to our water shortages.)

To the problem, here and elsewhere, there are no easy answers, no one solution. Many factors enter in, among the most important of which are pollution by untreated human and industrial wastes, chemicals, and detergents—which put a head of foam on our once pure streams that is distressing to see. The NBC report showed graphically that California, where millions live, Arizona, growing industrially, and other adjacent Western States are in a tragic and deplorable condition as to water, despite Hoover Dam and vast reclamation projects, and before matters get better lawsuits will have to be resolved and billions of dollars expended—to furnish people with a commodity that once was cheap and abundant—pure water. So desperate is the situation that converting ocean water—an expensive expedient but one that is becoming more practical—is being seriously considered as an alternative.

In Winnsboro, in Fairfield, in South Carolina we yet have time to consider alternatives. There should be some definitely de-

finied water laws—for, should we go to a river, what assurance has one that its waters will not be preempted later for other uses? As for the present, however, the News and Herald would suggest that the town and county set up a water study commission to see, first, that sewage is properly treated and disposed of everywhere and to be sure that none of our streams is being unnecessarily polluted. Then, let us together decide, scientifically and intelligently, what is the best approach to assuring a steady and pure supply of water to our centers of population.

In one way, Fairfield is fortunate in that it is sparsely populated. Hence, we have time to face up to the problems of water and pollution and to arrive at an areawide sensible solution—probably at reasonable costs. Time is now on our side but time is fleeting. Let's keep Fairfield a county of green pastures, clean waters, and luxuriant forests—meantime planning to supplement our too meager incomes with desirable industries which we will be prepared to service properly.

The sooner we plan our future, the better that future will be.

### Small Business and the Surtax Exemption

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. David I. Pursley, has a background which renders him exceptionally well qualified to speak on the matter of small business exemptions from the surtax. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am presenting his letter and commend it to the attention of the entire Congress:

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

March 1, 1963.

Subject: Small business and the surtax exemption.

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: Congress has demonstrated its continuing interest in small business enterprises and their vital contribution to the gross national product by such legislation as the Small Business Administration and Investment Act, changes in the Internal Revenue Code such as subchapter S, and other moves aimed at stimulating the economy through encouraging growth of new business enterprises.

However, Congress has overlooked the one item of legislation which would help small business most—legislation to change the code to enable small businesses to grow through the retention and reinvestment of earnings.

Today's small businesses do not have this opportunity as did our giant corporations during their formative years. Du Pont, American Can, General Motors, and virtually all others among our large corporate enterprises were able to grow to their present stature because they enjoyed corporate tax rates of only 1 to 19 percent (as they were from 1909 to 1939). These reasonable rates enabled the giants to grow through retained earnings, and enabled these companies to attract adequate equity financing from the public during their growth years.

A1192

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 6

It is impractical to suggest that Congress roll back the corporate income taxes to the 1 percent or even 19 percent levels enjoyed by these present day corporate giants in their formative years. However, Congress can give the small businesses of today an opportunity similar to that of their present big brothers by increasing the surtax exemption from \$25,000 to \$250,000. This proposed \$250,000 surtax exemption is based on one of the SBA's definitions of a small business, "an enterprise with an average annual net income, after taxes, for the preceding 2 years, of not more than \$250,000."

At this moment it is being proposed that the ordinary tax rate on the first \$25,000 of taxable corporate income be reduced from 25 to 22 percent. This indicates an awareness of the small business problem, and is a step in the right direction. Nevertheless, the surtax exemption of only \$25,000, if continued, will mean that profit for retention and business building will continue to be taxed away if the small enterprise is capable of earning over \$25,000. Furthermore, we have experienced a substantial inflation so that today's surtax exemption is much less than half of \$25,000 in 1909 or even in 1939 dollars.

This relief for small business can be accomplished without loss to the Federal Government of corporate income tax revenue if the Congress, at the time the surtax exemption is increased to \$250,000, maintains the surtax rate at 27 or 28 percent instead of reducing it to 25 percent as proposed in the President's current tax proposal. Of course, large corporations would enjoy the \$250,000 surtax exemption also; but this higher surtax exemption, combined with a reduction in the ordinary tax rate to 22 percent, would give small corporations nearly the same opportunity to insure their future growth by retaining part of present earnings as their big brothers enjoyed from 1909 to 1939.

Furthermore, an increase in the surtax exemption combined with a revision of the capital gains tax will greatly enhance the ability of small business to attract equity capital from the public.

This recommendation for legislation is based upon my professional experience in the field of small business enterprises. I hold a degree in economics, augmented by 3 years of graduate research in corporate finance and taxation at the Graduate School of Business, Stanford University. I am the son of a successful small business merchant. After college graduation, I managed a furniture and appliance store for 8 years. Since the four World War II years as an officer in the U.S. Navy Supply Corps, I have been continuously associated with small business enterprises as a financial consultant, and as the owner of a substantial equipment leasing corporation. I have acquired more than \$50 million for small business enterprises. Several of the Nation's largest banks and institutional investors have indicated that they regard me as an authority in the field of leasing industrial equipment and the tax factors involved.

I regard the increase of the surtax exemption to \$250,000 as vital to the growth of American business, to the stimulation that our economy needs in plant and equipment investment, and to the growth in employment opportunities so urgently required for our future prosperity.

I believe all small businesses will appreciate your consideration of this neglected aspect of our tax law, and I would greatly appreciate your comments on this suggested legislation.

Very truly yours,

DAVID I. PURSLEY.

## A True Summer Intern Program

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the recent White House concern with the political upbringing of students working in Washington, D.C., during the summer, has focused attention on efforts to provide educational opportunities to summer students. Foremost among the organizations providing political education is the National Center for Education in Politics.

The students working in Federal, State, and local political offices under this program are not summer employees but rather student interns enhancing their political education. Last year, 54 students were active at the congressional level, 16 worked on campaigns and another 48 with political party committees, 16 served with State and local executives, and 5 worked with interest groups. A total of 139 undergraduates, 40 more than the year before, benefited by the program.

In cooperation with the American Political Science Association, the National Center for Education in Politics has set up a Internship Coordination office, headed by Prof. Royce Hanson of American University, in space provided by the American Political Science Association here in Washington. The steering committee has stressed the distinction between an educational Internship program and summer employment for students and concentrates on political internships rather than administrative positions.

I have observed in the past, when commenting on any patronage approach that might be applied to summer positions in the executive branch, that there is little need, if any, for political appointments for such positions on the grounds that they have some connection with policymaking. This is supported by a comment in the National Center for Education in Politics report on summer interns for 1962. No survey of possibilities in executive offices will be made on the grounds that the likelihood is not great for developing many genuinely political internships in administrative agencies.

Besides the summer intern program, the National Center provides for 15 to 30 fellows in State and local government. Open to graduate students in political science, law, and related social sciences, this program works with State and local government officials, political parties and major interest groups. Two fellows are also selected from university faculties to serve as special consultants to the chairman of the Republican and Democratic National Committees. In addition, 6 to 10 faculty members have an opportunity each year to work on the staffs of Governors, mayors and other

State and local executives and with political parties and interest groups.

Summer internships are financed through matching fund contributions from the National Center for Education in Politics and the participating governmental or political office or official. Such a program deserves the continued support of all of us in positions of governmental responsibility.

It would be inappropriate for the National Center for Education in Politics program to become involved with summer employment programs. At the same time, I have no doubt that an informal sharing of experiences and approaches to the educational interests of the students here in Washington during the summer would contribute greatly to the success of any summer student employees program such as the one I have suggested to the American Political Science Association. To illustrate the difference in approaches between the National Center for Education in Politics program and that of the White House last summer, I am including, under unanimous consent, portions of the National Center for Education in Politics Summer Intern Program Report for 1962.

To illustrate the concern that reports of political patronage in the summer employment program have caused on college campuses, I will also include, following the National Center for Education in Politics report, a news article appearing in the Yale Daily News of February 26, 1963:

EXCERPTS FROM A REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION IN POLITICS

Our comments about matching contributions to political internships lead to a related and more important consideration; namely, the necessity to distinguish the internship from ordinary kinds of temporary employment of students by the Government. This problem is highlighted by the public attention and partisan overtones of the meetings conducted by White House officials in Washington last summer. The seminars (actually lectures to large numbers of students) were described as being conducted for the political interns working for administrative agencies. These so-called interns were in fact temporary employees, mainly holding low-level civil service ratings, with summer jobs in Washington. Very few seem to have been in contact with political decisionmaking, or to have arranged their summer activities with a view to complementing and enriching their study of politics and government. Without these elements, the summer employment of such students may have been of value to the employing agencies, financially helpful to the students, and even educational in some ways—but they can hardly be described as political internships in the sense in which we regard our own internships.

We are obliged, then, to distinguish the internships we sponsor from any kind of mere summer employment of students in governmental jobs. We can do this only by making clear, at every point, and to all concerned, that we regard these internships as learning experiences, integrally related to the interns' wider study and understanding of politics. It is important that our interns themselves understand this distinction. It is equally important that the political officials with whom they serve appreciate the intern-

1963

ted children a necessary and integral part of any program on a national basis having to do with juvenile delinquency?

Sam Goldsmith, the executive director of this federation, is now serving as a very useful and hard-working member of a citizen's committee on the family court which is supervising a study of the court and Audy Home which will soon be released. I am happy that Mr. Goldsmith is on this committee because he brings to it a wealth of talent and understanding in the solution of social problems as I believe no one in this entire State can surpass. I believe this study will point to the need for adequate shelter facilities in this county for neglected children. I hope that it, unlike some studies which have gone before, will not be placed in a filing cabinet until its existence is forgotten.

We may not yet live in one world, but it is certain we live in one land. No metropolitan area in America is an island. The problems of each are those of the Nation. To solve them we must free ourselves from the dogma that there is either sanctity or American tradition in undiluted local activity. Belief that activity by local government is a safer guarantee of liberty than participation by our Federal Government is a delusion. Our National Government and its courts have done as much to uphold freedom and civil rights in our land as State and local government entities, and more than many of them.

Our welfare needs will be fully and adequately satisfied only by strengthening the national program now in existence and by adopting bold and new programs designed to secure and strengthen all the citizens of our land.

### Does the United States Have Nuclear Weapons Superiority?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 argument for a nuclear test ban treaty given by U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Administrator William C. Foster, and others on behalf of the administration, is this: The United States has nuclear superiority and unless further nuclear testing is prohibited the United States will gradually lose that superiority.

This squarely brings into issue the following question: Does the United States have nuclear weapons superiority?

Careful examination of statements by the President, Mr. Foster, his deputy, Adrian S. Fisher, and others reveals the following:

#### SUPERIORITY

Claims for superiority: First, regarding nuclear weapons yield to weight ratios—that is, more bang per pound of warhead—and, second, greater variety and numbers of tactical nuclear weapons in stockpile.

#### PARITY

In general, parity between the United States and the U.S.S.R. seems to be admitted respecting first, lack of complete knowledge of weapons effects—that is, effects of radiation on radar detection,

communications, command and control systems, "hardened" installations, and so forth—second, unavailability of really effective antimissile warheads, and third, nondevelopment of pure fusion weapons—that is, the neutron bomb.

#### INFERIORITY

No claims are made respecting very high yield U.S. weapons superiority. The Soviets are known to have tested a 58-megaton weapon and claim the ability to scale it up without further testing to 100 megatons.

The foregoing may be assumed to be a relatively accurate assessment of the relative capabilities of the United States and the U.S.S.R. if it also is assumed those making the claims have relatively accurate information regarding: first, the Soviet stockpile; second, all Soviet tests, including small, undetectable yield underground experiments with tactical and pure fusion weapons.

In evaluating whether or not the assessment of relative capabilities actually supports the advantage claimed for a test ban treaty—that is, that the United States, will retain its lead longer under conditions of nontesting than conditions of testing—the following should be in mind:

First. Small yield-to-weight ratios are important to the American military which does not possess very large thrust rocket engines and thus must rely on lighter warheads for its missiles. This ratio is less critical to the Soviet military which does possess very large thrust rocket engines.

Second. Tactical weapons will be most useful to the American military in defending the homelands of its allies against invasion by an aggressor. Severe limitations on the actual use of tactical nuclear weapons on free world soil in defense of free world soil will be imposed by the necessity to protect friendly populations from the effects of fallout. Additionally, defenders must have in stockpile many such tactical defensive weapons at a variety of locations which the aggressor might choose for its thrust.

Since the Soviet military can expect its role to be that of the aggressive invader of foreign soil at locations of its own choice, it has little need in its arsenal either for variety in or large numbers of tactical nuclear weapons. On the contrary, relatively crude and dirty weapons might conceivably appear advantageous to Soviet tacticians.

Third. In relation to facts set forth in the previous paragraph, it is obvious that pure fusion tactical weapons capability would be of markedly greater advantage to the American military than the Soviet military.

Fourth. In the role of defender rather than aggressor, it would seem that knowledge of weapons effects and truly effective antimissile warheads would be of much greater relative advantage to the American military than to the Soviet military. On a recent occasion Premier Khrushchev claimed Soviet scientists had "solved" the antimissile problem.

Fifth. In light of Defense Secretary McNamara's recent testimony that considerable hardening of Soviet missile bases is taking place, the advisability of

including very high yield warheads in the U.S. stockpile deserves knowledgeable consideration.

Sixth. Inasmuch as this argument for a nuclear test ban treaty does not contend the United States will succeed in keeping its "nuclear superiority"—only that it might do so for a longer time under conditions of nontesting—it implies that Soviet laboratories would move faster than our own under a test ban. Inevitably then Soviet capability would catch up with us. Then surpass us. What happens then?

It is desired to emphasize that U.S. nuclear capabilities as set forth above are only those collected from various statements by administration officials while speaking on test ban questions. Therefore they do not necessarily represent my own opinions or the actual situation.

### Hungarian Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have received a memorandum from the Committee for Hungarian Liberation which I feel speaks for itself and under leave granted, I insert it in the Appendix of the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

I wish to call to the attention of the Members the continued colonial control which Moscow exercises over the Hungarians, other satellite countries of Eastern Europe, and millions of people within the boundaries of the various Soviet Socialist Republics, who have been deprived of their rights of self-determination.

The memorandum follows:

COMMITTEE FOR  
HUNGARIAN LIBERATION, INC.,  
Cleveland, Ohio, December 31, 1962.

#### MEMORANDUM

It is with understandable disappointment that the Hungarian living in the free world received knowledge of the fact that the United States of America made the recommendation to revoke the authority vested in Sir Leslie Munro in the matter of the question of Hungary. It becomes even more difficult to understand this recommendation when it is considered that Moscow and the Moscow-run Government of Budapest have done nothing to satisfy the resolutions passed by the United Nations in 1956 and later. It is absolutely certain that it is the Russian Red army which kept the Kadar puppet government in power in Hungary. As a result, human rights and national independence do not exist as far as the Hungarian people are concerned. The only change which has taken place in Hungary is the improvement of the Communist propaganda techniques aimed at the free West and elsewhere.

The Hungarian people the world over clearly see the consequence of the revocation of the authority of Sir Leslie Munro. There will be no more discussions in the United Nations concerning the brutal and colonialist suppression of the Hungarian people. It appears to many as the final burial of the international significance of the Hungar-

March 6

ian question. The Hungarian freedom fight is no longer a moral and political weapon in the hands of the free nations. It will appear to eastern and central Europe and the Balkans and the suppressed nationalities of the Soviet Union and proof that individual rights and national independence from 1962 forward, will be measured in terms of double standards. It further appears as a silent acceptance of the status quo.

In view of the above, hope for the liberation of the enslaved nations will diminish. At the same time the power of the Soviet Union and its puppet governments will be increased. In the eyes of the enslaved nations there has been decline in the moral reputation of the Western peoples. Furthermore, this recommendation will in no way improve the spirit of resistance to Communist slavery among the enslaved peoples.

It is understandable that the enslaved nations are deeply disturbed because the champion of freedom, the United States of America made the recommendation, and the protector of small nations, the United Nations, accepted it. The explanation made by U.S. Representative Rowan has not alleviated the unfortunate impression. The transfer of the Hungarian question to the personal authority of the U.N. Secretary General is not comforting, since specific instructions were not provided.

Small nations under these circumstances again are experiencing two great powers taking steps toward agreements without raising the Iron Curtain. The struggles toward liberation and freedom of the small nations which have fallen into an unfortunate sphere of influence became nothing more than sacrificial offerings. Yet, these peoples have been required to sacrifice immeasurably as a result of arrangements made at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. Not only did they lose human rights and national liberties, unnumbered millions have lived through the anguish of elimination of free speech, fear, want and death by torture.

The enslaved nations and the Hungarian people would like to believe that this step was taken as a tactical necessity. They would like to believe that the free West has not abandoned those principles which form the foundation of individual and national existence in the free world. For these reasons we respectfully ask you:

1. That the free nations do not support any action to minimize the significance of the U.N. resolution concerning Hungary, or that these resolutions be stricken from the record with their silent consent.

2. That the free nations refuse to recognize the representative of the Russian puppet government of Hungary, Kadar's government.

3. That the United States of America not give recognition to the Russian colonial rulers in Budapest as being the legitimate government of Hungary by establishing diplomatic relations with it.

4. That the free nations exercise in the United Nations the same energy and sincerity for demanding the disintegration and abolition of the Eastern slave-empire as the United States of America have exercised in demanding the freedom of the Asian and African colonies.

The people living under international or national communism still consider communism as an institution which does not recognize moral codes or political boundaries and an international menace just as under Stalin. They draw these conclusions from personal experience. Today as well as under Stalin, they are living under a complete dictatorship. Behind this dictatorship stands the powerful Red Army. The happy and free nations living at a safe distance are in no position to clearly understand the true nature of that slave-system.

The enslaved peoples cannot share the optimistic views which was implied in a

talk given by Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant on December 2, 1962 or by Mr. Ball, Undersecretary of State in New York on December 13, 1962. In the service of a principle, it does not make much of a difference who the individual is and who holds the flag. There is no difference in the purpose of office whether it is filled by Stalin or Khrushchev.

The experienced people of the enslaved nations watched the Cuban developments with critical awareness. The result of the Cuban situation was not one of victory of the principles of the Free West over that of communism, because this never developed into an issue. It was primarily a victory of the United States of America over the Soviet Union in the area of power-politics. The Communist ideology and the way of life it represents never was threatened during the critical period.

There is considerable apprehension among the enslaved nations that the extremely serious reverses which occurred under the effects of Stalin's personality during and after World War II will be repeated now under Khrushchev's personality. Because of an error in the interpretations of Stalin's intentions, very grievous errors were made with reference to the small nations and consequently to the entire world. Not only over 200 million people were tossed into slavery, but the present cold war is a direct consequence.

Authorized by the member and cooperating organizations, societies, groups and branches in the United States of America, Canada, South America and Europe.

JULIUS KOVACS,  
 Executive Vice President.

*Julius Kovacs*  
 Should Cuba Policy Criticism Cease?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton (N.Y.) Evening Press of February 14, 1963:

END CUBAN POLICY CRITICISM?

Republican attacks on the administration's Cuban policy and on foreign policy in general is causing not a little discomfort in Democratic circles. And some Democrats are criticizing the critics, the idea being to quiet them.

Under Secretary of State George Ball and other administration supporters call for an end to "irresponsible congressional attacks" on the President's Cuban policy. Mr. Ball condemns voluntary intelligence gatherers. Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD sees some Republicans as playing dangerously with the fires of public emotion about Cuba.

New York's Representative STRATTON has charged disgraceful irresponsibility to Senator KEATING who has claimed a continuing Soviet military buildup in Cuba. Politics is imputed to both critics and anticritic critics, and the charge is tenable. Just about anything done or said in government is political. And it can't be, nor is it desirable that it be, otherwise.

Bipartisanship, except in times of crisis, doesn't go with our form of government, and for the most part is more myth than reality. Bipartisanship has existed in foreign aid, making possible huge waste, futility, and

even corruption without accountability to the people.

Whatever concerns the well-being of the people and the security of the Nation is a political issue. Cuba is a political issue. And it is good that it has been treated so.

Criticism of the President's Cuban policy has educed valuable and reliable information, perhaps going beyond even that possessed by the administration. Senator KEATING's record of calling the turn on Cuban developments has been amazing.

Senator KEATING was reporting a Soviet missile buildup in Cuba last summer many weeks before the President made public report of it in October. And more recently Mr. KEATING, charging a continuing military buildup, pressured the administration and the Defense Department into making new disclosures on what is going on.

It would be unfortunate for this country if an administration in power could cover up questions as vital to security as those of Cuba. More, not fewer, critics are needed. Congress should have more Keatings. A voluntary intelligence gatherer, he has acquired new stature as a New York Senator, and in the Nation. For his courage and purposefulness, a debt is owed Senator KEATING.

Not without due regard for the responsibility for grave decisions the President must carry, many Americans question Cuban policy. Why wasn't more pinned down in regard to Cuba when the President went to the brink with Khrushchev in October? Why was the blockade removed before Russian troops and large quantities of weapons were out of Cuba?

Why was Khrushchev yielded a strategic victory in being permitted to keep a military base in Cuba? Knowing the duplicity practiced by the Russians, why did the President settle for a promise of removal of Soviet troops in due course?

It is, of course, easier to criticize past Cuban policy than to say what should be done now to reverse the Cuban situation. But that isn't to suggest that there be an abatement of criticism. Cuba is very much a political issue, and so it will remain and should remain.

Congress Should Pass Legislation To Eliminate National Origin Quota System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1963, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, introduced H.R. 3926 to eliminate our national origin quota system. I am heartily in favor of this proposed legislation and have introduced today an identical bill, to indicate my strong support.

Since 1924, our immigration system has been based upon the unfair and discriminatory principles of national origin. Under present laws, controlling factors as to whether an immigrant may be admitted to the United States, his admission delayed, or refused, are area of the world in which he was born, his race, and nationality. My bill would eliminate this

delivered by the consul general of Lithuania, the Honorable Petras Dauzvardis, at Maria High School auditorium in Chicago, Ill., on Sunday, February 17, 1963, on the occasion of the observance of the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Under unanimous consent, I include this address into the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS BY PETRAS DAUZVARDIS, CONSUL GENERAL OF LITHUANIA, AT OBSERVANCE OF 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, MARIA HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM, CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 17, 1963

February 16th is the fourth of July—the independence day—of Lithuania.

The concept of independence is concisely described in the U.S. Declaration of Independence, which reads:

"When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;"

The declaration of Lithuania's independence was drafted and executed in a similar spirit and philosophy:

"The Council of Lithuania in its meeting on February 18, 1918, voted unanimously to address the Governments of Russia, Germany, and other states with the following declaration:

"The Council of Lithuania, sole representative of the Lithuanian people, in conformity with the recognized right to national self-determination, and in accordance with the resolution of the Lithuanian Conference held in Vilnius from September 18 to 23, 1917, hereby proclaims the restitution of the Independent State of Lithuania, founded on democratic principles, with Vilnius as its capital, and declares the rupture of all ties which formerly bound this state to other nations.

"The Council of Lithuania also declares that the foundation of the Lithuanian State and relations with other countries will be finally normalized by a Seimas (parliament), elected in a democratic way by the people of Lithuania."

Lithuania's constituent assembly ratified this declaration (on May 15, 1920) and proclaimed the fact that the independence of Lithuania is restored and the state is to be a democratic Republic.

Shortly thereafter (on July 12, 1920) a treaty of peace was concluded between Lithuania and Soviet Russia, article I of which provided:

"Pursuant to the declaration made by the Federated States of the Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia to the effect that all peoples have the right to self-determination until they become completely separated from the state of which they are a part, Russia without any prejudice recognizes the self-determination and independence of the State of Lithuania with all the juridical consequences resulting from such recognition and for all time renounces with good will all the sovereign rights of Russia, which it has had regard to the Lithuanian nation or territory.

"The fact that Lithuania ever was under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lith-

uanian people and the nation or territory under any obligations to Russia."

Soviet Russia flagrantly violated all of these solemn pledges and the sovereign rights of the Lithuanian nation by forcibly seizing, occupying and annexing Lithuania to the Soviet Union—converting it into a colony of the Russian empire—during World War II.

The Soviet aggression against Lithuania, carried out in conspiracy with Hitler, and the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, are the most shameful and perfidious acts ever perpetrated by any nation in the mid-20th century.

This fact is evidenced by the free world's nonrecognition of the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. The Soviets themselves do not dare to come forth openly before a world tribunal and request recognition of the fruits of their aggression. They continue to use subterfuge and devious processes to try to gain some sort of recognition or at least a trace of justification of their seizure of the Baltic States. One such subterfuge recently appeared in the UNESCO publication, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," prepared by the Soviet delegation. Among the statements in this publication is this one:

"In 1940 the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic Republics (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia) which voluntarily joined the Union."

The Spectator magazine, published in London, branded the statement as, "This is simply a lie," and substantiated it by incontestable facts.

The Earl of Dundee, replying in the name of the Government to the question put by Lord Conesford in the House of Lords, said: "This particular booklet falls far short of the standard of objectivity and meticulous regard for the truth. \* \* \* This is a Russian publication."

The U.S. Department of State qualified the cited quotation as, "The completely false statement \* \* \*. It is too bad that an international body such as UNESCO lends its imprimatur to this kind of thing."

These facts give additional proof to the importance and significance of the case of the Baltic States. From the legal point of view the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have every right to be free and independent countries. The Soviet Union holds them under duress by force of arms, against the will of their people, and in violation of international law and solemn Soviet pledges and declarations. The Soviet Union attempts, through divers and often devious means, to legalize her illegal acts, involving and compromising even the United Nations and its members, as in the UNESCO publication mentioned before.

The free world refuses to justify the crime and injustice perpetrated by the Soviets, but refrains from asking any clearer and firmer denunciation, and a stronger demand for redress of the wrongs—the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to the people of the Baltic States, of which they were forcibly deprived by the Soviet Union.

This incongruous situation of the Baltic States demands the crystallization of their case and its placement in the true light of facts and of law, so that there would be no doubt as to who is right and who is wrong—a peaceful positive action is imperative. It would be beneficial to the victims of Soviet rapacity and to their defenders. It would place the Soviet aggressor on the defensive and properly deprive him of the assumed role of defender of the oppressed colonial peoples.

Occasionally I contemplate, what would the Russians do or say if one of the major Western countries were to seize and hold some smaller neighboring countries in the same manner as Russia holds the Baltic States? Invariably I come to the conclusion

that the Russians would work the case up to such magnitude, and raise such a hue and cry, that the Western Power, holder of the smaller states, would be put to shame before the entire world.

Bearing this in mind, we appeal to the free nations of the world and entreat them to bring up the case of the Baltic States before the tribunal of world opinion. The salient points of the case should bring out the forceable seizure of the Baltic States by Stalin in collusion with Hitler, the subjugation of these nations in contravention of the United Nations Declarations and Charter, and even Khrushchev's proposals that all subjugated nations be freed and made independent states. It should demand that the Soviet troops, administrative personnel and colonists be withdrawn from these states, and their people be allowed to choose their own governments and govern themselves according to their own determination.

May the might of freedom speak out and liberate Lithuania and the other Soviet-subjugated nations.

*Cuba file*  
Why Aren't We Told?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people are more and more concerned with the manipulation, censorship, or complete suppression of the news which are becoming daily occurrences. This administration is determined to feed the American public what it wants them to believe, think, and accept. A typical example of this news suppression was the Kennedy administration's attempt to withhold the information that four Americans were killed in the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

I feel the public should know, officially, and from official sources what is going on in Cuba. An excellent editorial on this subject appeared recently in the Troy Record newspaper, Troy, N.Y., entitled "Why Weren't We Told?" and I wish to include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHY WEREN'T WE TOLD?

The irritation resulting from the Kennedy administration attempts at withholding information has increased with the disclosure that four American pilots were among those who died in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, April 17, 1961.

Why could the American people not have been told of this at the time it occurred? The deaths would have been accepted as part of the risk in an attempt to overthrow the regime of Fidel Castro and the four men would have assumed heroic stature.

Instead, it has taken nearly 2 years to learn the truth. The facts came out through Republican sources in Washington which have been sniping at the administration for failing to give proper public information on the invasion. Hiding facts made partisan exploitation possible. Confidence in official statements has been damaged.

The American people have received bad news before, far worse than anything that happened in Cuba and they have accepted it without panic. There is always bound to be bad news with the good. It seems that

A1188

the official Washington attitude is that the American people must not be given bad news. They cannot be trusted with it. This is a strange sort of reasoning.

When an election campaign is in progress, those seeking office emphasize they are appealing to the intelligence of the electorate. Once the elected officials have won office their assessment of the public changes. This once intelligent public cannot be trusted with the truth. The people must be kept in ignorance.

The belated admission that four Americans died in the invasion doesn't change anything relative to dealings with Cuba. Castro remains in power and he is a Communist. Soviet Russia is turning the country into an armed camp. The four who gave their lives pursued an ideal which sought to remove a tyrant and a Communist threat. They were not the only ones who died in Cuba. Other Americans also shed their blood and when Castro announced executions there was no withholding of news.

When an American reconnaissance pilot was shot down over Cuba during the Soviet crisis he was given posthumous honors. The pilots who died in the invasion have been overlooked.

Possibly the administration was striving to tone down American involvement. If that was the objective it was wasted effort. Everyone knew that Americans as well as Cubans were involved.

The administration in Washington is running far behind the times. It will not trust the thinking of the American people and it gets itself into hot water constantly because of its shortsightedness. The people in the administration should remember they are the agents of the American people, not their lords and masters.

Lewis Deschler

SPEECH  
 OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our distinguished Speaker and the majority and minority leaders in extending my congratulations and best wishes to our well beloved and dedicated Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. At the same time I want to wish him a very happy birthday.

I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation for the counsel and advice which I have received from him over the years. I can recall numberless occasions when his assistance proved invaluable.

It is a great privilege for all of us who come to the House of Representatives to meet and know Lew Deschler. He has proven to be a great champion of this legislative body and a symbol of reverence for its traditions.

Moreover, I want to associate myself with the remarks which have been made here about Lew. These tributes are sincerely meant and keenly deserved.

We wish you, Lew, many more years of fine service in behalf of the House of Representatives, and our Nation.

Poland Is Part of Vast Communist  
 Prison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
 OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of a brief address I delivered last Sunday afternoon, March 3, 1963, at the annual convention of the Connecticut District of the Polish American Congress, held in Hartford, Conn. I was very pleased to meet with my Polish friends and to express my support for their cause.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, MARCH 3, 1963, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here with you today and to have the opportunity to address your annual convention. As you know, I came specially from Putnam to be here with you and to meet many of my friends.

Just as many of your leaders and members are well known to me, so the objectives and activities of the Polish American Congress are not unfamiliar to me. Your work in behalf of the people of Poland in the past, and your deep anxiety about your kinsmen abroad who are suffering now under the yoke of communism, is a chapter in itself which is well known to many Americans. We are with you in this struggle and in your efforts to help them.

We in Connecticut are very proud of our citizens of Polish ancestry. They are a good, sturdy, hard-working, industrious, and patriotic element. The men, women and children of Polish origin who have immigrated into this country in substantial numbers over these many decades brought with them the rich heritage of their culture, civilization, religion, as well as their passionate love for freedom. They have made great contributions to America in every sphere of activity. They have helped to enrich the American way of life and American democracy.

Americans of Polish descent have not forgotten their motherland, Poland, nor have they forgotten the millions of freedom-loving Poles who live there today under a ruthless regime. Your anxiety about them is understandable. They are your blood and flesh. Poland is your ancestral homeland. You have cultural and religious ties with the country and its people.

About 2 weeks ago I introduced a resolution in Congress requesting that the United States do all in its power through the United Nations to obtain the liberation of the Baltic States, which have been incorporated into the Soviet Union lock, stock and barrel. In the case of Poland, however, there exists the myth of an independent country, but you and I know well that the people of Poland no more enjoy freedom and independence than do the people of the Baltic States. They are just as enslaved to Communism, just as subservient to the leaders of the Kremlin.

The people of Poland today are a silenced, grim, and unhappy people. They are not free to speak their mind. They cannot practice their religion freely. They cannot observe their historic events and holidays. Poland is not a happy land, a free "People's

Democracy," as the Communist leaders would have us believe. The truth of the matter is that Poland is a part of that vast prison of captive European nations which make up the Communist empire.

Neither Poland nor any of the other countries subjugated to Moscow are today independent and sovereign states. They have no freedom. They have no right of self-determination. They are not the masters of their own destiny. Those masters sit in the Kremlin.

The masters in the Kremlin are dedicated to their goal of world domination. That goal does not change, it remains constant. Today it is directed against your kinsmen in Poland and the other countries of Eastern Europe. Tomorrow it will be directed against free nations in other parts of the world. Eventually, it will be directed against us in the United States. They are conducting the cold war in deadly earnest—make no mistake about it!

But let me say to you, my friends, that it would be a hopeless and depressing picture if we were to look at it from one side only. We know that the Poles and the other peoples have a profound attachment to Western culture, civilization, and ideas. Their desire for freedom cannot be crushed. Their hopes for self-determination are burning bright in their hearts. We must nurture those hopes. We must give them all the courage we can.

I am convinced that we, in our lifetime, will yet see the liberation of the enslaved nations of Europe. I am convinced that communism is not the wave of the future, but the nightmare of the past. Let us all work together to bring this nightmare to an early end.

The Economics of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
 OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1963, Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy made an excellent speech before the annual meeting of the Colorado River Basin Power Consumers at Las Vegas relating to development in the Colorado River Basin. Mr. Dominy gave the status of development in the basin and discussed future needs and the challenge they present. I believe many Members will be interested in Mr. Dominy's speech, and I am therefore including it in the Record with these remarks.

The speech follows:

It is always good to see old friends of the Colorado River Basin, and especially your executive director, Harvey McPhail. As Reclamation's Power Chief and Assistant Commissioner until his retirement, Harvey had a reputation as a hard-nosed, tough-minded but fair negotiator on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Government. Now that he is on the other side of the table, he is doing the same good job for you. Of course, I lose a little skin now and then but as long as we are seeking the same end objectives, as I believe we are, I do not mind that too much.