

Russian troops from his garrison in Cuba. The U.S. Department of Defense ordered 40,000 American troops out of Western Europe. Score: 40,000 to 6,000, in favor of the U.S.S.R.

On-site inspection: Somehow, the internationally controlled on-site inspection of Cuba fell by the wayside. As President Kennedy said in a recent speech: "No, the camera, I think, is actually going to be our best inspector." Score: 1 to 0, in favor of the U.S.S.R.

Coupled with the Kennedy pledge that the United States will not invade Cuba, the only match Khrushchev has not won in the island playoff with J.F.K. was his later support for Castro's insistence that the United States surrender its naval base at Guantanamo Bay. This may well be the next step.

Investment for Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, economic development and economic growth of the less developed free-world countries, and particularly of our neighbors in Latin America, are of greatest concern to the United States. Our foreign economic policy is designed to help these areas both through direct Government assistance programs and through encouraging private skills and private investment funds to be channeled into their economies. An article from the March 11 issue of the American Banker by Michael Benson, international banking editor, suggests that one important way to harness both foreign and domestic capital resources would be through the establishment of private, broadly held investment companies. Entitled "One Answer to a Latin American Dilemma," the article follows:

ONE ANSWER TO A LATIN-AMERICAN DILEMMA
(By Michael Benson)

The real financial question in Latin America today is how to mobilize adequate development capital? Highly placed Government officials in this country as well as those south of the border have been trying hard to come up with the answer, but without real success.

One reason why this has become such a thorny question of late is that the bold and massive Alliance for Progress program of U.S. Government aid has been lagging rather badly. Another is that foreign private investors have been quietly pulling out of Latin America, rather than plunging more money into that part of the world.

Last week the question came up again, and with it a suggestion for an answer that well may brighten the spirits of many rather disheartened leaders of Latin America's economic development.

It came from a prominent Puerto Rican financier, Gaspar Roca, Jr., a former high Government official of his land's well-known "Operation Bootstrap." He firmly believes that the answer lies in the establishment of private, broadly held investment companies in each of the Latin American countries.

Mr. Roca, who terms his plan "democratic capitalism," holds that investment companies, at least in theory, are a perfect vehicle for mobilizing massive but stagnant

funds currently being held by tens of thousands of business and professional men in Latin America, as well as in other developing areas.

Mr. Roca's idea on the mobilization of local capital—which has probably been the 2-year-old Alliance for Progress' toughest problem—is almost certain to receive a receptive ear in many influential circles.

One reason is that there has been a marked lack of private financial institutions to mobilize local investment capital within Latin America. Perhaps the most notable exception is New York-based International Basic Economy Corp., which operates mutual funds in Brazil, Colombia, Chile, and Argentina.

Even more important, though, is the fact that the need for private investment by Latin Americans has become more widely recognized. This was pointed up recently in a statement by David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank, and Walter B. Wriston, executive vice president, First National City Bank.

The two prominent bankers said the "encouragement of private enterprise, local and foreign, must become the main thrust of the Alliance." They urged that U.S. policies be reoriented to place far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private enterprise and investments.

The bankers' views were included in a separate opinion growing out of the 26-man Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (COMAP), appointed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges to appraise the program.

Mr. Roca has begun in earnest to put his idea into practice. He believes that his 2-year-old San Juan investment company—International Investment Co.—of which he is president and general manager, is a good prototype for ones that can be started by private citizens in Latin American countries. And he is not alone in his belief.

For Mr. Roca has been invited to such countries as Colombia, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic to outline his ideas to government and financial leaders.

Mr. Roca, who is a highly articulate, hard-working executive, feels he has his work cut out for him. "The job is anything but easy, particularly if you consider our experience in Puerto Rico," he said in an interview during a visit to New York.

He noted that, although the island's Investment Companies Act of 1954 offered a group of incentives, principally in the area of taxes, it was not until the 1960's that the first successful enterprises were organized. Resistance to local productive investment in Puerto Rico, he added, was typical of what will be faced in industrializing countries all over the world. He gave these major bottlenecks:

- Tradition of family ownership and operation.
- Distaste for minority investment position.
- Desire for short-term high yield.
- Preference for real property over equity investment.

Nonetheless, Mr. Roca pointed out, in the past few years, the idea has "caught hold and has been worth the fight." His own company, for example, which is the largest in the island commonwealth, has now reached a capitalization of \$1 million.

However, more important, he maintained, is that the company's 150 stockholders represent a cross section of middle-class positions found in all of the developing countries. As typical, he noted physicians, teachers, lawyers, druggists, insurance agents, and engineers.

"Actually in every so-called underdeveloped land there is a nucleus of hundreds of middle-class citizens, with millions of dollars that could be put to work in modern industrial and commercial development," observes the Wharton Business School-educated financier.

"Government-to-government foreign aid, important as it may be," he said, "does little to motivate emerging nations toward dynamic private enterprise and free market economy. To understand these things deeply, people have to participate personally."

The Budget Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President is very clever at turning away every demand for budget cuts by challenging anyone to show where it can be cut as if suggestions have never been made. In my opinion, from \$8 to \$10 billion can be cut from the budget without endangering our defense or national security and without cutting out essential government services. Of course, it will take some discipline by the people, by the Congress, and above all, by the administration, but it can be done.

The following reprint from the U.S. News & World Report shows where \$3 billion can be saved by not adopting new programs and by cutting back on some old ones. In addition I have some further recommendations to save billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. No public works are justified in a time of deficit spending, so let us cut back on all public works until the budget is balanced and we begin to pay down the debt. Get the Government out of the power business, sell the public power projects and return them to private enterprise; liquidate public housing; cut out urban renewal by the Federal Government; eliminate Federal participation in depressed areas, and allow local and private initiative full rein; cut the farm programs 20 percent with eventual elimination; cut foreign aid by \$3 billion; cut military authorizations 5 percent and research and development 12.5 percent for another \$800 million; knock \$1 billion off the space program.

When we make these cuts we can bring about a realistic cut in taxes, allow the people to keep more of their own money, increase risk capital to strengthen the economy and create more jobs which alone creates more wealth.

The U.S. News & World Report article follows:

IF YOU WANT TO KNOW HOW THE BUDGET CAN BE CUT

A flurry of new ideas for trimming President Kennedy's budget is developing in Congress.

Mr. Kennedy himself has challenged Members of Congress to show him where spending can be curtailed without hurting the country.

Both Democrats and Republicans, rising to that challenge, are coming up with proposals of their own.

Most of these plans, to date, are in general terms, not pinned down to specific items in the budget.

Most of the plans, also, are in terms of authority to spend, rather than in actual

spending during the fiscal year starting next July 1.

The result, by late March, was widespread confusion over whether, where, and how actual spending could be cut.

BULLY IN RISES
Big-scale cuts in spending, without halting programs already in operation, were proving hard to find.

The reason: Spending increases are "built into" the system. Programs already voted by Congress tend to increase in cost by the year.

In the end, even if Congress does vote some sizable reductions in the Kennedy budget, the Government is almost sure to spend more money in the coming year than it is spending this year.

These and other conclusions are pointed up by a new study of the budget by the economic unit of U.S. News & World Report.

The subject of that study: where and how much the President's budget for the year ahead can be pared down.

All told, as shown by the chart on these pages [not printed in the Record], here are the reductions economic unit experts on the budget report can be made without using a "meat-ax approach":

In spending authority, that is, authority requested to commit funds for spending in the year starting July 1 and later years—\$5.9 billion.

In actual spending during the year to start July 1—\$3.1 billion.

LEVEL: \$55.7 BILLION
This would mean reducing actual spending in the year ahead from the proposed \$58.8 to \$55.7 billion.

The Government itself would spend \$1.4 billion more next year than it is spending this year.

A cut of \$3.1 billion amounts to little more than 3 percent of the Kennedy budget. Still, some groups would be hurt, and stiff resistance would be felt.

Note that this budget reduction would not affect some of the biggest items of spending in the Kennedy budget.

National defense would not be touched. The cuts that could safely be made in this field come down largely to a matter of military judgment.

Major farm programs are not covered by the study. Cuts could be made, but Congress is unlikely to upset these programs at the start of a new crop year.

All items of budget saving set out in the economic unit study are specific. No blanket economies are shown—such as a flat percentage cut in money or personnel for each agency of Government.

All major new programs that have been recommended by Mr. Kennedy, except for those involving national defense, would be omitted.

This would mean no general aid to education, no new program of aid to urban transit, no youth-employment program, and no new system of developing recreational areas. A total of nine new programs would be dropped.

The result would be to cut \$1.7 billion out of the requested authorization, but only \$340 million out of actual spending in the year to start next July 1.

The reason: In the first year of a new program, spending usually is relatively small. In later years, once the new program gets into full operation, the cost tends to mount.

The bulk of any cuts, thus, must be made by trimming the cost of programs already in operation.

In these existing programs, the economic unit study lists 19 specific reductions in spending below the Kennedy estimates for the coming year.

These economies would reduce total authorization of new funds by \$4.2 billion, and actual spending by \$2.8 billion.

BIGGEST CUT: SPACE COSTS

For civilian space programs, the spending cut would be \$800 million. This would be the biggest single economy of all. Space projects would proceed more slowly than the White House has in mind, but spending still would be \$3.4 billion. That is \$1 billion more than in the current year.

Foreign economic aid, in terms of spending, would be reduced by \$400 million. That would leave \$1.9 billion to spend. There are widespread demands in Congress for cuts here.

The special program of public works in depressed areas, authorized by Congress last year, would get no additional funds. Saving, \$197 million.

School aid for areas burdened by the children of Federal workers would be reduced by \$148 million. This would mean an end to Federal funds to help educate the children of parents who work on Government property but live elsewhere. Federal money still would be used for educating children of those parents who both live and work on Government property.

Relief money—public assistance—would be trimmed by \$200 million, which still would leave \$2.7 billion to spend. Many believe this program could be tightened up considerably. Reports of cheating on relief have been widespread.

Veterans' programs would be cut back. Direct loans to veterans would be ended, saving \$216 million. Medical care for veterans would be reduced in cost by \$200 million, or about 18.3 percent, necessitating some tightening up in this program. Veterans' pensions for illnesses not service connected would be trimmed by \$200 million, or about 11 percent. This would mean setting up stricter standards of eligibility.

A budget item of \$200 million for further pay increases to civilian Federal employees—on top of raises voted last year—would be cut to half.

These and other economies listed in the economic unit study would be strongly resisted in Congress.

Yet many members are demanding cuts far more drastic than those listed in this study. The 1963 battle of the budget is just beginning.

Legislative Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Government often discourages what it attempts to encourage.

"Government Bewildered" is an editorial from the Santa Cruz (Calif.) Sentinel reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor:

GOVERNMENT BEWILDERED

As so often happens when lawmakers decide to make some major changes in legislation, they often start working at cross purposes and wind up with even greater confusion and ill-defined regulations than when they started.

Let us take a look at what is happening in the complex field of labor laws now the focus of considerable legislative attention on several fronts.

In Congress the subject of overtime is due for some hearings. Several Representatives have expressed the idea that instead of time and one-half pay for overtime, it would be better to make it double time. Their theory

is that with overtime so expensive, employers would hire more people to eliminate the overtime.

The weakness of the theory that banning overtime would create more jobs is the fact that so much of the extra costs of business are tied to the fringe benefits which are charged per employee, not for the total amount of earnings.

If we continue to invoke such artificial controls, assertedly designed to create more employment, we are liable to stifle whatever chances we have to employ a greater portion of the existing labor force.

The way to create more jobs is to ease regulations, make it possible for business and industry to expand with the economy instead of continually increasing costs both in taxes and in the area of fringe benefits per employee.

Centennial Birthday of Rev. Andrew Pavco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during September of this year, Slovaks in the United States, and particularly in Pennsylvania, will pay tribute to the late Rev. Andrew Pavco, a zealous priest, author, and fraternalist. From the time he arrived in America, Reverend Pavco lived in the Pennsylvania anthracite coal region. He aided the struggling miners and encouraged them to use for their children our Nation's educational opportunities of which they themselves were deprived in their native country, Slovakia. In joint effort with his friend, the late Rev. Matthew Jankola, he helped the newly organized Congregation of the Slovak Sisters, whose first members were daughters of Slovak miners. He inspired them and others to use the opportunities of our free Nation in order to build a better future. During many strikes and mine tragedies, he was always an adviser to those who needed help and guidance.

The State of Pennsylvania owes much to leaders such as Father Pavco. In gratitude, I join his many admirers in calling the attention of the Senate to his exemplary work. I ask unanimous consent that an article written by a native Pennsylvanian, Mr. John C. Sciranka, be printed in the Appendix of the Record. Mr. Sciranka, a well-known American Slovak journalist, composed the article for the March 1963 issue of the Zenska Jednota (Ladies Union), official organ of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union of the United States of America and Canada, the largest Slovak women's organization in the world.

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

CENTENNIAL BIRTHDAY OF REV. ANDREW PAVCO

(By John C. Sciranka)

On September 3, 1963, American Slovaks will observe the centennial birthday of Rev. Andrew Pavco, Slovak Catholic priest, who labored in the Scranton diocese since his arrival from Slovakia in 1897.

but very sincere words the emotion, sympathy and deep sense of loss which all Members of this body, some 50 years later, have experienced in connection with the death of our dear and honored colleague, CLYDE DOYLE.

The prayer I offer reads:

We come to Thee, O God our heavenly Father, with hearts bowed in sorrow, because death, always mysterious and unbidden, has visited this congressional body and taken from its midst a Member who was peculiarly fitted by natural gifts, education, and experience to serve his people and his country. But Thou art God; Thou knowest the beginning and the end; Thou hast ordered all things, and Thou doest all things well. Comfort us, his people, the stricken wife and children, by the eternal faith revealed to the world in the life, death, and resurrection of the Christ who thus brought to light life and immortality in Thee.

Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day;
Earth's joys grow dim, its glories pass away;
Change and decay in all around I see;
O Thou who changest not, abide with me.

Amen.

American Rights a Vital Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Paul Pattysen of Annandale, Va., in my congressional district, has recently called to my attention a need for the teaching of sound principles of democracy in the schools of our several States.

As I share Mrs. Pattysen's concern over this problem, I welcome this opportunity to read into the Record Mrs. Pattysen's letter to me of January 29, and the article by Dr. Leslie J. Nason, to which she referred.

The letter and article follow:

2511 CREST DRIVE,

Annandale, Va., January 29, 1963.

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROYHILL: I am enclosing a copy of an article by Dr. Leslie J. Nason which appeared in the Sunday Star on January 27, 1963. I wish I knew the procedure to get this article before our people formulating the curriculum for our schoolchildren.

Therefore, I am forwarding it to you with the hope, and request, that you will have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. PAUL L. PATTYSON.

[From The Washington Sunday Star, Jan. 27, 1963]

AMERICAN RIGHTS A VITAL STUDY

(By Leslie J. Nason)

In our concern about being fair and allowing students to hear about the Communist system, we are falsely assuming our children are thoroughly grounded in the free enterprise system.

Our students are not prepared to understand a discussion of Communism until they have a background of knowledge of our rights and freedoms.

Recently I talked with a junior home from a State university for the holidays.

He said: "My father did a wonderful thing for me a couple weeks ago. I had sent him a copy of a Communist-front paper, saying we students found little wrong with their theories.

"My father returned the paper to me with marginal comments, statement by statement, paragraph by paragraph, pointing out the inaccuracies, the omissions and distortions. "For the first time I had a good understanding of the free enterprise system. That annotated paper changed the thinking of a group of students with whom I discussed these things."

OUR BILL OF RIGHTS

As parents we must explain the rights and privileges, as well as the responsibilities that are part of life of a citizen in the United States. These should be illustrated in schools with examples and case studies from preschool grades through college.

Schools should make sure students really understand the individual rights set forth in the Bill of Rights. These are the things, they stand to lose. Students should understand:

Their right to accumulate and save money, and have these savings guaranteed up to a substantial amount.

Their right to devise new mechanisms, and have these guaranteed by patents.

Their right to express themselves in books and protect such efforts and property with copyrights.

Their right to choose and pursue any education they are qualified to master.

Their right to live as respected citizens equal under the law and follow whatever profession, trade or occupation they choose.

Their right to move freely within the boundaries of the United States and with our Government's protection throughout the free world.

FOUNDATION NEEDED

Not until our children are secure in this knowledge should they be subjected to the claims of another system. And surveys indicate an alarming percentage of college students are not aware of them.

Moreover, many adults have not had the opportunity to take courses in school covering the free enterprise system, its workings and advantages.

In our American system we have everything we are willing to go out and get. Communists will promise all the things we think we don't have but, in reality, they give nothing and take everything.

Views of Former President Eisenhower on Honorary Citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by a friend of mine that General Eisenhower has authorized the following statement of his views on the proposal to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary American citizen:

Sir Winston Churchill has been my warm personal friend for more than 20 years. I have known him both in wartime and in peace as an inspirational leader and a man dedicated to the promotion of Anglo-American friendship and the solidarity of the English-speaking community. In a long

and varied career he has many extraordinary achievements to his credit, of which his reputation as the political leader of Great Britain during World War II, and his brilliance as an author are unquestionably the most widely known.

All these facts, to which must be added the circumstance that his mother was of American birth, clearly justify in my opinion the awarding to him of an honor that has previously been given to only one other, General Lafayette. It is my further opinion, that in taking this action, the Congress would not in anyway create a precedent. I believe that the circumstances are such as to make the case so exceptional as to stand as practically unique.

Stop Sending Brazil Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include in my remarks another article appearing in the March 16, 1963, issue of the Columbus Evening Dispatch.

The Dispatch is one of Ohio's outstanding newspapers and this article provides some very thought-provoking reasons why the U.S. loan to Brazil should not be made.

For those of my colleagues who are interested in this issue, I commend the article to them. It points out very vividly some unique aspects to this problem. Following is the article:

DEMANDS GROW IN CONGRESS TO STOP SENDING BRAZIL AID

WASHINGTON.—An official U.S. statement that Communists have bored into Brazil's Government put new steam Saturday into a congressional movement to bar aid to the huge, trouble-racked South American country.

Pouring more millions into Brazil now would be "an exercise in futility," one congressman said. There were demands that assistance be denied until Brazil cleans house of Reds or extreme leftists in any positions of power and shows that American aid will not be used to promote Brazilian trade with Russia.

The U.S. statement about Red infiltration came out in a curious, mixed-up way at a time when Francisco San Tiago Dantas, Brazilian Finance Minister, was here trying for multi-million dollar aid. A powerful man in the Brazilian Government, he is an advocate of a soft policy toward Communist Cuba.

On Thursday, a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee issued a transcript of testimony attributing the following statement to Lincoln Gordon, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil:

"Their number (the Communists in Brazil) is small but their influence is much larger than those numbers would suggest. The principal field of infiltration and influence is in the labor unions. In the Government itself there has been infiltration. The student movement is another major area of penetration, with the national student union now being dominated by Communists."

This statement was reported to have brought a hot, indignant reaction in govern-

41558

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

ment circles in Brasilia. Evidently, the State Department felt Gordon might meet an embarrassing reception when he returned there.

The Department got out a statement saying the remarks had been submitted to the House subcommittee by the Department itself, not by Gordon. Still later it was explained that the Department and Gordon were really in accord on the remarks.

The fact that the Department took responsibility for the charges raised speculation that it was trying to get the Brazilian Government, headed by President Joao Goulart, to take a harder line on Communist issues, including Cuba.

The Communist Party is outlawed in Brazil and no known Communists hold important posts in the Government. However, the party operates openly and six men backed in last October's election won seats in the Chamber of Deputies. Also, leftwing Nationalists hold several high offices.

Brazil's Foreign Minister, Hermes Lima, expressed regret over the State Department's assertion. "I lament that an occasion such as this publicity should have been given the testimony," in the subcommittee report, he told a reporter.

Goulart declined immediate comment, although he said he might have a statement later. Meanwhile, his leftist brother-in-law Deputy Leonel Brizola, an anti-American firebrand, said of Gordon: "He doesn't have the minimum respect for Brazil's sovereignty."

In Washington, Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Jr., Republican, of Ohio, called attention to a recent acknowledgment by Dallas that U.S. aid money would be used in part to promote trade with all countries, including Russia.

"At a time when we are using American tax dollars in the Alliance for Progress to try to strengthen Latin America against communism," HARSHA said, "I think it would be an exercise in futility to turn over money to Brazil so it can promote trade with Russia."

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, said he would look with "extreme distaste and indeed abhorrence" on aid to Brazil at this time. He said:

"There is no question that there is substantial subversive activity in the Brazilian Government, including the armed forces. This is a real danger and threat."

Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, said he would reserve comment until he could study the matter further. Many other legislators were unavailable for comment, but there was little doubt that developments had made the road for Brazilian aid more rocky.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, recently Westchester County was deeply saddened and left the poorer by the loss of a most illustrious and distinguished Methodist clergyman, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. Bishop Oxnam before his retirement in 1960 had a varied, long and rich career. Prior to his election as bishop in 1936, he was the president of DePauw University. In addition to

being the Methodist bishop of the areas of Omaha, Boston, New York and Washington he was the president of the Federal Council of Churches from 1944 to 1946 and one of six presidents of the World Council of Churches from 1948 to 1954.

Bishop Oxnam was the exemplar of a dynamic combination of physical, intellectual and moral excellence. He was a former football player at the University of Southern California, where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, before he went to pursue his theological studies at Boston University.

Upon his passing Bishop John Wesley Lord was quoted as saying:

Bishop Oxnam was recognized by friend and foe alike as one of the "summit souls" with whom God on occasion blesses mankind.

We in Westchester share this sentiment and to his wife, the former Ruth Fisher, his sons and daughter and his eight grandchildren we send our deepest sympathy. Their loss and ours and the Nation's is very great.

Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, by granting Sir Winston Churchill honorary American citizenship, the House pays a great man a singular and well-deserved tribute.

His contributions to the preservation of American freedom in a time of supreme crisis, for all of Western civilization, fill the pages of modern history. In the 1930's he courageously defied the appeasement policies of his own country which culminated in the Munich capitulation and the advent of World War II. In the early months of the war, when Hitler's armies had triumphantly subdued the European Continent, leaving England to fight on alone, his eloquent voice and masterful personality provided a rallying point for the hopes of both the free and the enslaved nations. His dogged determination sustained England during her darkest hour and held the Atlantic frontier safe until America entered the war. Thus, he gave his nation one of its finest hours.

For these and other acts born of consummate wisdom and indomitable courage, we owe Sir Winston an immeasurable debt of gratitude which House bill 4374 discharges in part. Our affection for him is deeper, not only because his mother gave him American blood and ancestors who fought side by side with General Washington in our War of Independence, but because he represents one of the finest statesmen produced by the English-speaking peoples. In addressing the Virginia House of Delegates March 8, 1946, Sir Winston

gave expression to his hope for union and understanding which we will do well to recall: "Above all, among the English-speaking peoples, there must be the union of hearts based upon conviction and common ideals. That is what I offer. That is what I seek."

In honoring this great man, we also honor ourselves.

J.F.K. Loses the Playoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, while a committee of this House holds hearings on managed news and the New Frontier's own brand of almost total censorship, the so-called country press is anything but fooled. Daily in newspapers arriving in my office, I find editorial expression of the insight and knowledge about today's events possessed by midwestern newspapers.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD, as an example, an editorial from the Madison Courier of March 15, 1963, which shows graphically what the editor of that newspaper, Mr. Lloyd G. Neal, thinks about our Cuban fiasco:

J.F.K. LOSES THE PLAYOFF

Although New Frontiersmen in Washington insist that President Kennedy made no deals with Premier Khrushchev to obtain removal of offensive weapons from Cuba, an exchange of letters from October 26 to October 29, 1962, reveal a number of conditions and demands laid down by the two leaders.

Mr. K. demanded as a condition for removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba that the United States close its Jupiter bases in Turkey and guarantee Cuba against invasion.

Asked for, but not as a condition for removing missiles, was the closing of all other bases surrounding Russia, including other Jupiter bases in Italy, and the airfields from which U.S. bombers carrying nuclear weapons could attack the U.S.S.R.

Several days after the initial exchange of letters, Khrushchev said the Soviet Union would back Cuba's demands that the United States give up its naval base at Guantanamo Bay.

J.F.K.'s requests were less complicated: Removal of offensive weapons systems from the island nation and supervised inspection to guarantee that all missiles and bombers were removed.

Today, just 4 months after the conditions were laid down by both sides, the box-score reads like this:

Missiles: The U.S.S.R. dismantled and removed 42 medium-and intermediate-range missiles from Cuba. The United States ordered shut down 15 Jupiter intermediate-range missiles in Turkey and 30 in Italy. Score: 45 to 42, in favor of Russia.

Bombers: Khrushchev ordered 42 Russian IL-28 jet bombers from Cuba. The Kennedy administration has ordered the eventual closing of all B-47 jet bomber bases around the Russian periphery, approximately 1,000 aircraft. Score: 1,000 to 42 for the U.S.S.R.

Troops: Khrushchev, with great fanfare from the Kennedy administration, announced, and did, recall an estimated 6,000

To them, religion in its truest and finest sense is a certain way, based upon man's awareness of God and God's requirements of His children, of looking at all things. For them religion is only partly concerned with enabling souls to enter heaven. Its principal purpose is to help create a little more heaven on earth for all the children of God as taught by the prophets of the Bible. That is why the prophets preached against corrupt politics, land monopoly, social injustice, racial bigotry, national arrogance. Micah summed up his concept of religion in the famed utterance wherein he declared that walking humbly with God constitutes just one-third of our Heavenly Father's requirements of man. The other two-thirds consist of doing justly and loving mercy.

It is, of course, one thing to proclaim lofty teachings which envisage a society wherein all human beings live together as brothers. It is quite something else to implement these principles of simple justice. When a priest, minister, or rabbi exercises his right, as a teacher of religion, to denounce not alone evil but evil doers and speaks out forthrightly in defense of those who are denied the elementary rights which belong to all human beings, he is likely to share the experience of Amos, who was told in so many words by Amaziah, the priest of Beth-El: "Go peddle your radicalism somewhere else, where the overhead isn't so high."

In the minds of many laymen, and some ministers of religion, there appears to be a dichotomy between religion and life. They insist that preachers confine themselves to purely religious matters, which have little or nothing to do with the practical affairs of life. Several years ago a young rabbi expressed both amusement and sadness when he learned that an important member of his congregation vigorously objected to a passage in one of his sermons wherein he expressed sympathy for a young Negro who had been brutally murdered by a mob. His congregant objected on the grounds that his rabbi "had no business mentioning politics" in his sermon. The pulpit of this rabbi, by the way, is not in Mississippi or in some other southern community, but in enlightened California. Basically, race prejudice is not a political or an economic problem but a moral and religious problem.

If this Conference on Religion and Race is to succeed in achieving its objectives, we must make it crystal clear that while we are all uncompromisingly loyal to our respective religious convictions, practices, and ceremonies, we are united as sons and daughters of Catholicism, Protestantism, and Judaism in our equally uncompromising affirmation that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17:26) and that all human beings are descended from one common ancestor, proving thereby that no man is racially superior or inferior to his fellow man. Created in the image of the Divine, all men enjoy equal spiritual dignity. They are entitled to the same rights and upon all alike devolve the same responsibilities.

It is well known that proponents of racism and segregation have quoted the Bible to prove the existence of superior and inferior races as a manifestation of God's will. Thus, shortly before the outbreak of the Civil War a distinguished rabbi of New York City, Morris J. Raphael, delivered a scholarly address which brought comfort to believers in human slavery. Rabbi Raphael was only one of numerous ministers of religion throughout the centuries and even to our day who pointed to many Biblical ordinances and laws as evidence that the Bible condones slavery. That the Bible also condones polygamy seemed to have escaped their notice. The fact is that a great many customs and practices to be found in the Bible merely reflect the mores of ancient society. Rabbi Rap-

hall's far more scholarly contemporary, Rabbi David Einhorn, then of Baltimore—he was forced to flee from this city when a mob threatened to lynch him—called slavery "the greatest possible crime against God."

The fact is that the Bible, while recognizing slavery, constantly tries to humanize the institution. Thus, while as late as 1854 the Congress of the United States passed a law making it mandatory to restore fugitive slaves to their master, the Book of Deuteronomy (23: 16-17) commands:

"Thou shalt not deliver unto his master a slave that is escaped from his master. He shall dwell with thee * * * in the place which he shall choose within one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not wrong him."

Even more significant is the experience of Miriam, sister of Moses, as recounted in the Book of Numbers (12: 1-9), when she and Aaron "spoke against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married." She is punished by being stricken with leprosy. Aaron pleads with Moses that she be forgiven. Moses prays to God on her behalf and after 7 days she is healed.

Like all peoples, ancient and modern alike, the Hebrews of Bible times regarded themselves as the chosen of God. As proof of their superiority, they would point to their miraculous deliverance from Egypt by God's mighty hand and outstretched arm. The prophet Amos reminds his people that all races and peoples are equally loved by God when he cries: "Are ye not as the Ethiopians unto Me, O children of Israel? saith the Lord" (9: 7). Yes, God brought Israel out of Egypt, but He also brought the Philistines out of Caphtor and the Syrians out of Kir.

The glorious and undying message of the Book of Jonah is oft obscured in the minds of many by reason of the unimportant and inconsequential incident of the whale or, as the story has it, the "great fish" which God had especially prepared. Jonah is commanded by God to journey to Nineveh, "that great city," and plead with the people to mend their ways lest they be destroyed by the corruption and wickedness into which they had fallen. The prophet flatly refuses to obey God's command, boards a ship and begins his journey westward toward Tarshish rather than eastward in the direction of Nineveh. Why? Because he feels himself superior to the people of Nineveh, has no pity for them and is quite content for them to be destroyed. Whereupon God again orders him to go to Nineveh and this time he obeys. He preaches to the people and mirabile dictu, they hearken to him, repent and are saved from destruction.

Now one might think that the prophet would have rejoiced over his successful preaching mission. But not Jonah. He is exceedingly displeased and downright angry over the outcome, even to the point of wishing that he were dead. Then he is again filled with anger when a gourd which God had caused to grow out of the earth to shield him from the sun withers the next morning. The sublime lesson of God's concern for all His children, whatever be their race or creed or nationality, is driven home in the last two sentences of the book of Jonah:

"And the Lord said: 'Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for which thou hast not labored, neither madest it grow, which came up in a night and perished in a night; shouldst thou not have pity on Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand, and also much cattle?'"

In view of its significant and enduring challenge to humankind throughout the ages and even to our own times, it is not surprising that the ancient rabbis ordained that the Book of Jonah should be read in

all synagogues on the Day of Atonement, the most sacred holy day in the Jewish religious calendar, a practice which is observed to this very day.

Racial discrimination has been defined as "the unjust separation of people from things and circumstances" and segregation as "the immoral separation of people from people" (Kyle Haselden). Many organizations are dedicated to breaking down the cruel walls and barriers which divide people from people. They demand that the right to vote, to equal educational opportunities, to equal employment opportunities and to adequate housing shall be denied to no man on account of difference in race. In this battle to build a society and a world in which the dignity of every human being is jealously guarded and the equality of all men taken for granted, the forces of religion, if they are true to their purpose, must, both by precept and example, be in the forefront, leading and not following, courageously fulfilling their prophetic mission of being the conscience of humankind.

Watch Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, Gov. James Rhodes and his Republican administration in Ohio have entered into a sound fiscal program which has attracted nationwide attention. I think it is refreshing to most people to see a government even though it be on the State level which believes in economy and balanced budgets. The following editorial from the Washington Daily News is an example of favorable reaction and I am asking that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that it might inspire our National Government to follow the same course.

The editorial follows:

WATCH OHIO

One of the most interesting developments in government in the Nation today is occurring in Ohio.

There the new Republican Governor, James A. Rhodes, is doing something most of his fellow Governors, and President Kennedy, claim is impossible.

In office only 8 weeks, he has ordered 7,000 State employees cut from the payroll, imposed a 9.1-percent cut in funds of all State departments, dropped \$120 million of State-financed projects and even sliced welfare and relief funds. The point in reducing State relief contributions is not to cut payments to recipients but to force relief administrators to tighten the relief rolls.

Governor Rhodes is trying to make Ohio the testing ground of an economic program in sharp contrast to that of the New Frontier. He thinks by rigid government economy and no increased State taxes for 4 years, his program will encourage industry to expand and locate in Ohio, thus relieving the State's economic and fiscal problems.

Only time will tell whether his slashes in State services will arouse the wrath of a majority of his constituents—most of whom, as judged by Washington politicians, want only more and more from Government.

Whatever the outcome, Governor Rhodes at least has the guts to try to restore old-fashioned frugality. If successful, he will

have provided an invaluable lesson for other political leaders who just might be persuaded to emulate him, with resulting benefits to all taxpayers. And, of course, a successful ending to his experiment would make him a national political figure of prime importance.

Col. Albert S. Callan

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963**

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, during my early years as a young prosecuting attorney of my home county, I heard and was greatly impressed by an address delivered by Colonel Callan. Many years passed before I had the opportunity to compliment him, but he recalled the occasion vividly, in his own words, as speaking from a high place and looking down into a multitude of faces. It was characteristic of the colonel to speak on a high plane and his forensic ability was attested by the fact of his reputed appearances in each and every county in his native State of New York.

On Friday, we of the 28th Congressional District, sadly gathered at the little church around the corner from his home in Chatham, N.Y., for the last rites of this great American, a man of strong character and even stronger faith in this Republic and its institutions. Now he rests among the scenes that he loved so well, among the hills and hollows, the fields and streams of upstate New York.

While engaged in public service, including an outstanding military career, Colonel Callan for more than half a century was the owner and publisher of the Chatham Courier and one of his finest tributes appears in the columns of a friendly business competitor, the Hudson New York Register-Star. Under unanimous consent, I include herewith their editorial under date of March 13, 1963:

COL. A. S. CALLAN

The ranks of stalwart Columbians lessened in the death on Tuesday of Col. Albert S. Callan, Sr., of Chatham. He was a vigorous and active man throughout his lifetime in many lines of endeavor and his passing came as a severe shock to countless admirers and friends, even though they had known for some time he was in failing health.

There were so many facets associated with his life and career that a writer has the problem of dealing sufficiently with them and their order of importance. Included were over 50 years as publisher of the Chatham Courier, historian, political leader and adviser, legislator, soldier. He might be called the father of the American Legion in Columbia County as it was he who fostered practically all the posts numbered here. He was the first commander of the county Legion and he was one of the earliest of the State commanders.

Colonel Callan was a rugged exponent of the philosophy of the Republican Party principles, both with pen and voice. His belief in that party was so staunch that he never wavered in his support of that organi-

zation no matter how strong his personal regard, admiration or even affection of members of the rival major party, was. Over the period of a great many years, it was his judgment, advice and counsel that enabled the GOP to maintain its weight and preponderance in Columbia County. His counsel was also sought by State leaders and he always responded to appeals to stimulate campaigns in other areas. He truly was one of the vanishing school of old-time and effective orators. He did not become a disciple of the modern school which produces readers chanting or parroting the works of ghost writers. He was invited to speak in every county of New York State in political campaigns over the years and the power and appeal of his voice was widely recognized.

He thrilled to the combat of political war but he was a generous victor in thought and action. He was always a friendly business competitor and frequently visited this office to chat and exchange greetings with old friends and acquaintances and it can be said his visitations were relished and enjoyed by us. A vigorous and enthusiastic man, he possessed a most appealing personality and it was a pleasure to meet and visit with him on many and all occasions.

There are many who will remember Col. Albert S. Callan for a long time and there are many who will always cherish memories of his kind and generous acts. We are included among the friends who mourn the passing of a fine citizen and an intense and outstanding son of Columbia.

Cuba
Why Should Any Remain?

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963**

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Washington Star of March 11 contains an interesting editorial that I would like to call to the attention of the Senate. In discussing the rumored removal of Soviet troops from Cuba, the editorial says:

After all, since there are at present about 17,000 Soviet soldiers and technicians in Cuba, the withdrawal of, say, 5,000 would still leave the Kremlin with a relatively formidable force on the small captive island. And why should such a force be maintained there?

Why, indeed? I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

GET ALL OF THEM OUT

As far as it goes, it is welcome news that Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin has publicly reaffirmed Premier Khrushchev's promise to withdraw "several thousand" Russian troops from Cuba by the end of the week. But what is meant by "several"? four? five? six? The Kremlin remains altogether vague on the subject, and the Americas therefore have reason to feel a continuing sense of deep concern.

After all, since there are at present about 17,000 Soviet soldiers and technicians in Cuba, the withdrawal of, say, 5,000 would still leave the Kremlin with a relatively formidable force on the small captive island. And why should such a force be maintained there? One plausible explanation is that

it could be used effectively in a long-term program designed to train traitorous Latins to carry out sabotage, subversion, and guerrilla warfare against their native countries—a program with the ultimate objective of communizing the hemisphere. And another explanation is that the force could be put into swift action to smash any possible popular uprising against Fidel Castro's tyranny.

It is because of these and kindred considerations that Defense Secretary McNamara has warned Moscow that the United States will never tolerate Russian combat operations in the Americas. And for the same reasons Secretary Rusk has declared: that so long as there is a Soviet "military presence" in Cuba, and so long as a Marxist-Leninist situation exists there, there will be "unfinished business" in the Western Hemisphere. Certainly, even if there is a pullout this week of 5,000 or so of the Kremlin's troops, the basic menace will still remain—a menace grave enough to call for the closest possible inter-American cooperation to contain and counter it, politically, economically, and otherwise.

This prospect will change for the better only when, as, and if the men of the Kremlin decide to remove from Cuba all their troops and arms. Clearly, unless and until that decision is made, there will be precious little chance of easing international tension and promoting a trustworthy peace.

**Deputy Federal Highway Administrator,
the Honorable D. Grant Mickle, Calls
for Expansion of Research and Development
Effort in Speech Before Regional
Highway Research and Development
Conference, Columbus, Ohio;
West Virginians Attend**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963**

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on March 12, 1963, the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce, State highway departments, and various educational and research institutions sponsored a regional conference on highway research and development at Lincoln Lodge, Columbus, Ohio. Gathered at this meaningful conclave were representatives from 11 States and the District of Columbia, and officials of the Federal Government who met together to consider how best to solve the problems of national growth which today beset the highway industry.

Participating in this significant conference were the following leaders from West Virginia: C. A. Arents, dean of the College of Engineering, West Virginia University; George F. Fenton, division engineer, Bureau of Public Roads; Burl A. Sawyers, commissioner, State highway department; Dr. J. A. Shaub, chairman of the Department of Civil Engineering, West Virginia University; Harry C. Schwender, director of the planning and traffic division, State highway department; Irving I. Varon, planning engineer, Bureau of Public Roads; and, Col.

can citizen for working at one, two, or more jobs, in order to make a living rather than accept unemployment compensation or welfare aid? Surely all of the people in Government can't be so stupid that they can't see they have made liars, cheats, and lazy bums out of millions of Americans with these two laws, to say nothing of what you have done to the rest of us with your unfair, outdated, personal income tax laws. In all of your investigations I have never heard of you investigating abuses of the unemployment compensation and welfare aid. It would seem that you have half of the people working to support the other half and it's about time something was done about it. If you ever bothered to take a poll of the working mothers you would find that they are working because after taxes and insurance are deducted from their husbands' checks there isn't enough left to meet the current bills. These are the people who strive every day of their life to get ahead and have a better life, the people who spend their money if they have any left to spend.

Oh yes, progress has been made and the American housewife has lots of timesaving devices but let us not forget that most housewives and mothers of today must also be painters, plumbers, electricians, carpenters, besides holding down a part-time job outside of the home. Sure, we are taking jobs away from professionals, but what else are we to do when you don't leave us enough money to hire these jobs done? In other words, your personal income tax laws and Government spending are to blame for all our country's problems such as unemployment, poor economy, and even juvenile delinquency. If you people bothered to figure it out they all tie in together. Your Internal Revenue Service is a nightmare with Mortimer as the dictator.

You have taken our life's blood and given it to others long enough. I still believe that charity begins at home. Most of us find great happiness and contentment in giving but it would be nice if we were allowed to choose to whom we wished to give part of the time.

My definition of a liberal is a man who tells you to live conservatively so he can spend your money liberally. My advice to him is to mind his own business.

I am sending this letter to you, Senator, as I believe you are trying to do your best for the people of North Dakota. I would only wish that the people who really deserve this letter might read it.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. DUNN.

THE ENEMY'S NAME IS KHRUSHCHEV—NOT KENNEDY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am taking it upon myself to perform some surgery on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I am going to direct my efforts toward removal of a cancerous growth which may have been planted in the minds of some of my constituents in Utah by a vicious little pamphlet called "Has Cuba Been Abandoned to Communism?" The author is W. Cleon Skousen, and the booklet was sent to me compliments of the Citizen's Information Committee of Salt Lake City, which I suspect is a front for the John Birch Society.

What disturbs me about this little booklet is that it goes far beyond the usual distortions contained in this type of material. Playing upon the real concern of every loyal American citizen over

the serious stakes involved in the Cuban problem, this booklet strikes at the very roots of our form of representative democracy. It implies that the President of the United States has betrayed and lied to the American people, and irony of ironies, it uses the words of a Communist to prove its point.

President Kennedy had made two commitments to Khrushchev which Cuban freedom fighters could scarcely believe:

First, a personal guarantee by the President that the United States would not attempt to liberate Cuba.

Second, a personal guarantee by the President that the United States would not allow any other Western Hemisphere country to liberate Cuba.

Both of those statements, as we all know, are completely, unequivocally, yes, outrageously false. But what is really galling about this poisonous little pamphlet is that it goes on and cites as proof for these statements, a letter from Soviet Premier Khrushchev which was published in the New York Times on October 29, 1962. The booklet states that the Khrushchev letter was in reply to Kennedy's secret letter to Khrushchev 2 days earlier.

Thus, Mr. President, the American people are asked to believe that their President had deceived them, and to prove it we are given the word of the No. 1 Communist in the world, Mr. Khrushchev. The American people were asked to believe in the Premier of the Soviet Union, not the President of the United States, despite the fact that America was passing through an intense period of danger at that very moment.

Any of my constituents unfortunate enough to have read this little booklet might have been misled—for sure enough, there was a quote from the New York Times of October 29, giving a portion of Khrushchev's answer to Kennedy's so-called secret letter of 2 days earlier. But how cruel and deceitful this booklet is, Mr. President. There, in the New York Times of October 29, on the very same page, not 2 inches away from the text of Mr. Khrushchev's letter, was the text of our President's letter. What utterly galling, lying hypocrisy this represents. Mr. Khrushchev, being a good Communist, distorted and exaggerated the President's letter in his reply, pretending that he understood the President to say one thing when the President clearly said another. Mr. Khrushchev, being a Communist, can be expected to lie and distort. But who are these self-appointed saviors of the American people who lie to the people and distort the position of our President in the name of patriotism? I am ashamed that this document was printed in Salt Lake City.

The President wrote to Mr. Khrushchev, and I will quote from the New York Times, October 29, 1962, and from the very same page on which Mr. Skousen found the Communists' reply to the President's so-called "secret letter." I quote from the secret letter:

1. You would agree to remove these

weapons systems from Cuba under appropriate United Nations observation and supervision; and undertake with suitable safeguards, to halt the further introduction of such weapons systems into Cuba.

2. We, on our part, would agree—upon the establishment of adequate arrangements through the United Nations to insure the carrying out and continuation of these commitments—(a) to remove the quarantine measures now in effect and (b) to give assurances against an invasion of Cuba. I am confident that the other nations of the Western Hemisphere would be prepared to do likewise.

Now to anyone who understands English, this is quite clear. If you do X, we will do Y. But we all know that the Russians never did allow inspection and observation in Cuba, and we all know that the President has stated, and the Secretary of State has stated, that since the Soviets did not fulfill their obligations, we were not, and are not under any obligation whatsoever to undertake either of our contingent commitments.

But what disturbs me still is the question—why did the author and the publishers of this disgraceful example of yellow journalism deliberately deceive the Americans at whom this booklet is directed—citing the words of Communist Dictator Khrushchev to back up false charges against our President? Why did they state that Kennedy's letter was secret, and therefore did not cite it—although the letter was on the very same page of the same issue of the New York Times of October 29, 1962? Why did they want the American people to believe a Communist but not their own President?

The answer is very clear to me, and that is why I was so disturbed when I read this booklet. Its clear purpose is to undermine the confidence of the American people in their own form of democratic, freely elected, representative government. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in his book "Masters of Deceit," written to warn Americans of the dangers of communism says on page 312:

Too often I have seen cases where loyal and patriotic but misguided Americans have thought that they were fighting communism by slapping the label of Red or Communist on anybody who happened to be different from them or to have ideas with which they did not agree.

Smears, character assassination, and the scattering of irresponsible charges have no place in this Nation. They create division, suspicion, and distrust among loyal Americans—just what the Communists want—and hinder rather than aid the fight against communism.

I would like to believe that Mr. Skousen and the perpetrators of this pamphlet are merely "loyal and patriotic but misguided Americans." But their deceit is so calculated, their methods are so purposeful, and their objectives are so obvious that I find it difficult to forgive this booklet as merely "misguided." For my part, I will continue to do everything in my power to see that such cancerous ideas are not planted in the minds of Utah people, and if planted, are ruthlessly exposed to the light of truth in all their falseness.

March 19

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Because I have dealt herein with the Cuban lie, I do not overlook the vicious, if tired, old charge that "a certain body of powerful policymakers who serve in the State Department and the White House" are steering the United States into socialism and communism. The indefensible tactic of quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without identifying which of the 100 Senators or 435 Congressmen made the insert or even whether that person uttered the words or placed in the RECORD a newspaper clipping or a speech by some notorious or obscure person, should discredit the whole pamphlet.

Nor do I ignore the 15 incidents, many of them so patently and deliberately false. I just feel sick inside to note this calculated and vicious effort to destroy our democracy by destroying the confidence of our people in their leaders. Why? Why?

Mr. President, on another subject, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I call attention to the fact that the morning hour was conceivably designed to permit Senators to be recognized at 3-minute intervals. The time has run for more than 25 minutes without a Republican Member being recognized.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, after having read with such rising ire the Skousen pamphlet, "Has Cuba Been Abandoned to Communism?" it was refreshing to pick up the Washington Post on Sunday morning and see the sane, factual article on Cuba written by the able president of the Post, Philip L. Graham. I hope it will be read carefully by every "armchair warrior" who insists that we must get the Castro regime out of Cuba no matter how we do it.

Mr. Graham gives a masterful account of how President Kennedy has tuned out the irresponsible demands of his self-styled critics, and turned his back on both proponents of armed invasion and of near appeasement, to restore faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy. He further reports that the Cuban exiles in the Caribbean, who are in touch with their compatriots in their homeland, know that the Cuban people do not want their country liberated by the United States or by any other outside force, and are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph," written by Philip L. Graham, and published in the Washington Post of March 17, 1963.

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

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

(By Philip L. Graham)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the U.N.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this big stick was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That was the President's preemptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity

and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

"RESCUE" ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be "rescued" from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should resume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already a-building takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Vietcong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of "war of liberation" that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards, and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a "smash and grab" raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A genteel smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. Then negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

PATIENT—TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the

United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counterrevolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well-educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men of our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

THE UNIT SYSTEM OF VOTING AND POLITICAL EQUALITY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Supreme Court yesterday handed down a decision which may be as far reaching as any which it has ever issued in connection with the American political scene. I applaud the Court on the reasons advanced for making its decision and suggest it apply the same reasoning to unit voting in our electoral college.

This particular decision involves the so-called unit rule system of voting in the State of Georgia, about which I know very little; but the philosophy which impelled the Court to rule as it did, and the reasons given by the Court for its decision, it seems to me, raise a great question on the constitutionality of the use of the unit system in casting and counting votes in the national electoral college system by which we report and tabulate the votes cast in our presidential elections.

I call attention to an editorial entitled "One Person, One Vote," published in the Washington Post this morning. The editorial sets this question forth rather clearly. Strangely and curiously, whoever wrote the editorial for the Washington Post had a myopic viewpoint. He evidently kept one eye closed, because he neglected to relate the reasoning which applied to the unit rule in Georgia to the same type of unit rule which prevails in the tabulation of votes in the electoral college system of America generally under the existing system of bloc voting or unit voting. Under this system we operate with a winner-take-all formula in which there is no equality and very little similarity in the voting weight or power of the votes cast by individual citizens in their choice of President of the United States. Actually, in some States individual voters speak with 12 to 15 times the power and influence of equally well qualified voters in other States.

The arguments advanced in the editorial, supported by the decision of the Court, clearly point out the inequity of any system which gives preferential treatment to one class of voters in America. In the decision, Justice Douglas asked:

How can one person be given twice or 10 times the voting power of another person in a statewide election merely because he lives in a rural area or because he lives in the smallest rural county?

The editorial states:

Surely equality in the voting booth, so far as that can be attained, is a principle that must command respect.

Let us relate that Supreme Court reasoning to our most important election, the election of the President of the United States, in which the unit vote prevails from the standpoint of our electoral college. For example, the District of Columbia has only 3 votes in the electoral college, as do the States of Alaska, Delaware, Wyoming, Nevada, and Vermont. Those States might be classified as "Very Little Orphan Annie States," so far as voting for President is concerned. Their 3 little votes must be compared with the more than 40 votes of the States of California and New York. This would not be unjust nor unfair except for the fact that under the prevailing system of unit voting or bloc voting in the electoral college each individual voting citizen in fact actually casts the full strength of the electoral votes awarded his own State. Thus in reality a citizen of Delaware votes 3 times for President whereas his neighbor in New York State votes more than 40 times for President. Thus a glaring disparity exists in what Justice Douglas referred to as the voting power of individual citizens.

Then there are a number of States whose citizens might be called "steerage class citizens." The votes of citizens in the "steerage class" States count less than 10 percent, individually, compared with those of the voters of California, and New York, to mention our two largest States. The States in the "steerage class" are Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Utah. In those States the individual voter has less than 10 percent as much impact in his choice of President as does the individual voter in one of the major States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the entire editorial published in today's Washington Post.

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

ONE PERSON, ONE VOTE

The concept of political equality advanced another long step forward yesterday when the Supreme Court upset Georgia's county unit system in a sweeping opinion. In the nomination of candidates, at least, the Court laid down a flat and unmistakable principle—"One person, one vote." Though Justice Douglas, in the majority opinion, warned that the decision in this case has no bearing on the apportionment issues still before the Court, it certainly carries Amer-

ican law significantly further along the road to greater equality at the polls.

To our way of thinking, the logic of the majority is conclusive. Indeed, only Justice Harlan dissented. The other eight Members of the Court could find no semblance of "equal protection of the law" in Georgia's outrageous discrimination against urban voters. The vice of the county unit system, which was used for the nomination of candidates for U.S. Senator, Governor and various other States offices, is well illustrated by the fact that it gave one resident in Echols County the same influence upon the nomination of candidates that it gave to 99 residents of Fulton County. This is not democracy or representative government but the reverse. It is true that Georgia revised the system when it came under sharp attack, but some of the taint of invidious discrimination remained.

Justice Douglas noted that if the State law gave greater weight to white votes than to Negro votes, or to male votes than to female votes, "none could successfully contend that the discrimination was allowable. How then," he asked, "can one person be given twice or 10 times the voting power of another person in a statewide election merely because he lives in a rural area or because he lives in the smallest rural county?" Surely equality in the voting booth, so far as that can be attained, is a principle that must command respect.

The Court wisely repudiated the device that had been invented by the district court to measure the constitutionality of the Georgia system. The lower court had held against any county as exists in the electoral college which theoretically chooses the President of the United States. The Supreme Court saw no virtue in the analogy. The Federal electoral system reflects a compromise between the large and small States. It has no bearing whatever upon the relations between voters within a State.

The Court recognized once more that the States do have control over the qualifications of voters. "But once the class of voters is chosen and their qualifications specified," the opinion concluded, "we see no constitutional way by which equality of voting power may be evaded." It is heartening to have a basic principle so emphatically undergirded.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if the Supreme Court would consider the operation and implications of the unit rule in the Federal electoral college system, it must, with consistency, rule that it also is unconstitutional, so far as the utilization of the unit rule on a State-by-State basis is concerned. Actually under existing practices we have no "first-class voting citizens" in this country except for the voters in California and New York.

I suggest that the Senate at this session of Congress pass Senate Joint Resolution 12, which provides for an equal voting opportunity and equal voting authority for every American citizen, regardless of where he lives. This would eliminate the unit rule and would provide a national election for President, instead of a sectional selection method of voting for President, such as prevails in America today. It would retain the electoral college and the total voting strength of every State, but it would eliminate the evils and injustices which have developed as a consequence of the unit voting procedures which distort the voting weight of ballots cast by individual citizens and which serve no useful purpose.

ELECTION OF SEIJI HORIUCHI TO COLORADO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the people of Colorado have once again exhibited their basic belief in a fundamental concept of this country; namely, recognition of ability in an individual regardless of race, creed, or color. I refer to the recent election of my very good friend, Mr. Seiji Horiuchi, of Brighton, Colo., to the Colorado House of Representatives. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Horiuchi is the first Japanese-American to be elected to a State legislature in the continental United States. While the great State of Hawaii led the field in this respect in Congress, it remained for the people of Colorado to take the initiative for such an achievement on the mainland.

Seiji Horiuchi was born in Auburn, Wash., October 14, 1924, but has lived in Colorado for 36 years. He is a graduate of the Brighton, Colo., High School and of Colorado State University with a major study in horticulture. He also attended the University of Minnesota Institute of Agriculture for advanced graduate work.

From 1942 to 1944 he was in the U.S. Army—technical sergeant—and was an interpreter at general headquarters in Manila and Tokyo.

After his election to the Colorado General Assembly, he resigned as president of Agriculture Consultants in Brighton, and is now a farm management consultant and farm appraiser.

Mr. Horiuchi is a past president of the Colorado Jaycees; past vice president of the U.S. Jaycees; past president of the Brighton Jaycees, and in 1954 received the Jaycee Distinguished Service Award. He is a member of the Brighton Chamber of Commerce, American Society of Farm Managers, and a board member of the Brighton Methodist Church.

He is married to a most attractive lady, the former Kay Imamura, of California, and they have three fine sons; Paul, 12; John, 10; and James, 7.

I wish to commend, first, Mr. Horiuchi for his hard work and high ideals and his tremendous campaign; secondly, the Republican Party of Colorado for its endorsement of Mr. Horiuchi; and finally, but of most importance, the citizens of Adams County, Colo., for their wisdom in electing such a dedicated gentleman.

I also wish to thank Mrs. Jane Harper, editor of the Colorado Trumpet and Public Ledger, for sending me her editorial on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

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

COLORADO FIRST.

It turned out that Colorado made history during the last election and although it's kind of nice for the rest of us, Seiji Horiuchi thinks it's all a bunch of nonsense.

Seiji, who is an agricultural consultant from Brighton with a highly commendable and recognized civic service behind him, is the Republican representative from Adams County. Seiji is also the first American of

Japanese extraction (or Japanese-American; we forgot to ask because it didn't seem very important) to be elected to a State legislature in the continental United States. (Hawaii isn't continental United States.)

Seiji wouldn't have mentioned it, but we were inquiring about a speech Governor Love is going to make to the Japanese-American Association on February 23—a statewide meeting—and it developed that the association is going to honor Seiji at the same time Seiji thinks to have the Governor is enough for one evening.

Furthermore, in some pretty colorful, but discreet, language, Seiji lets it be known that this "first" is something he'd just as soon someone else had.

We probably could have looked into this "first" and discovered it ourselves but, as we said to Seiji, it seems quite natural for Colorado to be the State to elect a Japanese-American, first or last. People in Colorado look at ability, not color or ancestors and when you have a candidate with the proven ability of Seiji, naturally you elect him.

But the thing about it all that made us rush home to tell the children was what Seiji said:

"I didn't get here (the house of representatives) because I'm a Japanese-American. I got here because I went out and worked like a fool to get elected. (He did, too.) You can't legislate anyone into success—we all have to go out and earn it. That's one reason I'm a Republican; Republicans go out and work for what they want. They don't sit around and wait for someone to legislate them into their goals.

"Anyone could have been the first Japanese-American to get elected. It just happens to be me."

We're proud of Seiji—the Adams County representative—and we're proud of his voters for electing a good man. We're proud that Colorado can claim this "first."

Somehow, it makes us feel a little bigger and a little bit better to know we live in a State which does something important not because of any ulterior motives, but because it's the logical thing to do.

U.S. SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this distinguished body has already heard much praise bestowed on a program created by Resolution No. 324, known today as the U.S. Senate youth program.

We have heard praise of the William Randolph Hearst Foundation and of the American Political Science Association for the fine contribution these two organizations made in making the inaugural program for these young American high school leaders a success here in Washington.

All of us are aware of the results of this program; but I wish to take a few minutes to inform the Senate of the prologue of this important Senate activity.

Very few of us know that the original concept came from the late distinguished Senator from Kansas, Andrew F. Schoepel. It was on May 16, 1961, during a luncheon in the Senate dining room, that he asked Randolph A. Hearst, a trustee of the Hearst Foundation, "How can we help change the impressions that many of our youth have about politicians and the science of politics?"

At that time, Mr. Hearst and his associates outlined to the Senator a program that eventually was used as the