

House of Representatives

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 25, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.
JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I John 2: 17: *He that doeth the will of God abideth forever.*

Eternal God, our Father, grant that the motives, which daily impel our thoughts and actions and the aims and aspirations, which dominate our lives, may not be at variance with Thy will and the true, the beautiful, and the good.

Inspire us with a passionate desire to devote and dedicate our strength of body, mind, and heart to every worthy enterprise and forward movement that will minister to the health and happiness of all mankind.

May we never seek to avoid and escape our responsibilities to have a share in promoting not only the material and physical welfare of humanity but in elevating and enforcing its moral and spiritual well-being.

To Thy Name, through Christ Jesus, our Lord, we shall give all the praise and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 21, 1963, was read and approved.

COSTA RICAN CONFERENCE SHOWS SUPPORT FOR ACTION TO ISOLATE COMMUNIST CUBA

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the conference of Central American leaders meeting with the President and congressional representatives recently in San Jose, Costa Rica, has produced evidence that a firm basis for hemispheric isolation of Communist Cuba not only exists, but cries for leadership and action.

The exuberance and warmth which our President and delegation received in

Costa Rica dramatically proves that the hopes and aspirations of our Latin neighbors are riding with the United States, a fact which is given additional credence by the unanimous support which this Nation received in the Organization of American States last October during the Cuban missile crisis.

But the Communists are organizing rapidly in Latin America, ironically they plan to convene in Brazil shortly, a country which is at this moment pleading for U.S. financial aid. In the face of this threat to the freedom of this hemisphere, we cannot withhold a solution to the Cuban problem.

As the President has now stated, our immediate policy is the isolation of Cuba. It is gratifying to see that one of the topics discussed at Costa Rica included measures I have long recommended as necessary to place Cuba in solitary confinement—namely the ban on movement of Castro agents and propaganda, and the restriction of Cuban Government funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the United States assume the first step of leadership by closing U.S. ports to nations which engage in sea trade with Cuba, then make the following proposals to the OAS for adoption by the nations of this hemisphere:

First, close hemispheric seaports to nations engaged in sea trade with Cuba,
Second, close hemispheric airports to airlines flying into Cuba,

Third, ban movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout Latin America,

Fourth, ban relay of unofficial telecommunications messages to and from Cuba, and

Fifth, freeze Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of this plan by the Organization of American States would effectively place Cuba in solitary confinement. Isolation of Cuba is now a matter of official U.S. policy, and the above steps are our only immediate recourse to the Cuban problem short of an act of war.

If we are serious about fighting communism in this hemisphere, we will act quickly in the coming days with a concentrated, hard-driving campaign to place the policy of isolating Cuba into practice.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that all special orders heretofore entered into for tomorrow and Wednesday be carried over until Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would those that were scheduled for tomorrow come first then on Thursday?

Mr. BOGGS. That would be my understanding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, might I inquire of the majority whip whether his request was to the effect that all special orders for today and tomorrow go over?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the request is for those special orders for Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the House that I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. James J. Rowley, Chief, U.S. Secret Service, relative to the protection of the Vice President of the United States.

The letter follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
U.S. SECRET SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In response to your request for my comments on the remarks yesterday by Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE, regarding the Secret Service's appropriation request for additional staff to carry out its responsibilities under present law which calls for the protection of the Vice President, may I say that a number of questions were raised that need clarification.

March 25

As you know, the present law states: "Subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the U.S. Secret Service, Treasury Department, is authorized to protect the person of the President of the United States, the members of his immediate family, the President-elect, the Vice President or other officer next in order of succession to the office of President, or the Vice President-elect; protect a former President, at his request, for a reasonable time after he leaves office."

This law was approved October 15, 1962. The request to the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, made on March 11 of this year, was the first time that the Secret Service sought, in the routine presentation of its operating needs for the coming fiscal year 1964, the funds it had determined as needed to carry out its responsibilities under the law.

At the hearings last week I furnished the subcommittee the number of personnel the Service had determined was needed, after careful consideration of the responsibilities and nature of duties required. As this testimony was made in executive session, and has not been made public by the subcommittee, I feel I must stand upon my position as outlined to the subcommittee.

At this point it is appropriate to point out that Vice President JOHNSON had not made any requests for the protective services proposed nor was he consulted concerning the number of personnel determined to be necessary to properly protect the person of the Vice President. The request for appropriations was made because the present law, Public Law 87-829, broadened considerably the scope of the Service's protective responsibilities which in turn requires additional personnel to carry out its provisions.

The present law differs markedly from the law under which the Secret Service protected the Vice President during the previous decade. On July 18, 1951, spurred by such events as the assassination attempt upon President Truman at the Blair House, the law which set forth the protective duties of the Secret Service was amended to include protection of the Vice President at his request.

The new law has three objectives: To close loopholes that existed in the old law with respect to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who is next in line for the Presidency. Second, to remove from the Vice President the discretion as to whether he should or should not receive Secret Service protection. Third, to authorize Secret Service protection of a former President for a reasonable time after he leaves office.

Therefore it was clear that the intent and purpose of the present law was to focus upon the inadequacies of the old law regarding the succession to the Presidency, by authorizing adequate protection to the President and the Vice President, or in the event of their deaths, the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of State, etc. The law closed the gap by recognizing the reality that Presidents in the past have been killed, or died in office, and so have officers in the sequence of possible succession.

Further than that, the new law took heed of the fact that in the period 1951 to 1962 the President had no choice whether or not he was protected by the Secret Service. But as to the Vice President, he was to be protected only upon his request. Should he not choose to request it, the Secret Service was not authorized to furnish it.

The reasoning behind this phase of the law was clear: If a Vice President did not ask for protection, he was highly vulnerable to attempts upon his life. When he asked for protection only upon occasion, this kind of

part-time protection was highly unsatisfactory, and indeed, ineffectual. Anyone who wanted to harm him need only plan to do so at a time when the Secret Service was not guarding him.

A bill to eliminate the discretion of the Vice President as to whether or not he will receive protection was first proposed in 1960, and was passed by the Senate in that year, but was not acted upon by the House of Representatives. When the law was first proposed, the Treasury Department, in its transmittal of the legislation, expressed the opinion that the existing law, providing protection for the Vice President only at his request, "presents an untenable situation". The Treasury further pointed out that part-time protection is ineffectual, since anyone with a premeditated design to harm the Vice President would be expected to execute his plan at a time when no Secret Service protection was afforded.

The bill was again introduced in 1961, and lay pending until it was passed by the Senate and approved on October 15, 1962. In retransmitting it the argument was again put forth that gaps in existing legislation needed closing with respect to those individuals who were next in line to the Presidency.

I would like to further emphasize that the growing importance of the Office of the Vice Presidency, the troubled times in which we live—marked by international plots and counterplots, the possibility of actions of the mentally unstable—all have fortified my belief that the assignment of Secret Service agents to the protection of the Vice President is in the best interest of the U.S. Government.

Congressman CONTE referred to the difference between the number of men assigned to protect Vice President JOHNSON prior to the passage of the current law, and the number now being requested. In the light of my experience over the past 24 years, and through the accumulated experience of our agents in protecting Presidents of the United States, I feel that I am in a position best suited to make such plans and prescribe the manpower needed.

Under the old law, the protection by the Secret Service was intermittent, and not around the clock. To provide the manpower needed, the Service drew upon its existing personnel, generally from the field offices. Now that the law calls for adequate, full-time protection, it is obvious that more individuals are needed.

In order to carry out its responsibilities, the Secret Service must now provide full-time around-the-clock protection for the Vice President's residence and for his person. To provide such protection on a minimum basis it estimates 36 persons will be required on the basis of a 40-hour working week for each agent, plus time off for holidays, sickness, and annual leave.

Congressman CONTE indicated he would agree to protection of the Vice President 24 hours a day for 365 days a year, but that no more than two agents should be made available to do this entire job except when the Vice President was on an exceptionally important mission. Such a limited number of agents, of course, could not even begin to provide protection on an around-the-clock basis, 365 days a year.

I agree as to the inadvisability of taking agents away from their duties in the field in order to provide protection. This is just what our request for personnel is designed to avoid. The only way to insure adequate protection is to establish a detail specifically charged with the task, and not to rely upon part-time services from personnel assigned to other duties.

The issues raised by Congressman CONTE are sensitive ones. No one impugns the courage of the President or the Vice President, or any of the gentlemen covered by

the provisions of the law. This is not a question of their courage, nor of their own desire for privacy or freedom from the burden such protection necessarily imposes. The responsibilities we face are the safety of the men who stand at the highest elective posts in the land. We must adequately plan to meet such contingencies as accidents, or deeds of violence, as unpleasant as they may be. The Secret Service as the organization which must meet this full-time responsibility, cannot do so on a part-time basis.

It is clear that the protection called for in the law, and for which we have asked the necessary appropriations, is not for the individual, but for the position of the Vice President—a position second only to that of the Presidency of the United States—the position from which the Nation will draw its next Chief Executive in the unhappy event that this would become necessary because of death.

There are a great many Americans whose lives may be in greater potential danger than that of the Vice President, as Congressman CONTE said, but they are not the President nor those who would be, in the event of tragedy. We in the Secret Service feel strongly that this is what the law considers in assigning us the responsibility of providing the necessary protection.

If Congress does not wish to provide the funds necessary to carry out the mandate of the new law, it should be repealed. As long as the law is on the books, however, I feel that it is my duty to provide for its proper administration.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. ROWLEY.

—
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

The Treasury Department today said that the request of the Secret Service for 36 positions in order to fulfill its statutory responsibilities of protecting the Vice President has apparently been subject to misunderstanding because of the nature of protective work.

There will not be 36 agents accompanying the Vice President at once. There will normally be only 4 assigned at any one time to protective duties, which means advance work as well as on-the-spot protection. The protective organization would also include two agents assigned to the Vice President's Washington residence and one agent to his Texas home.

How, then, does the total figure come to 36? Because there are three 8-hour shifts to be filled, because the weekends must be covered as well as week days, and because sick and annual leave must be taken into account. The overall number includes supporting personnel bringing the total to 36.

Under the old law, Vice Presidents were furnished protection upon request (not necessarily the request of the Vice President, but also of the President or the Secretary of the Treasury). This was unsatisfactory because a Vice President or other people acting on his behalf should not be required to make the decision as to whether or not he needs protection. That is the reason for the legislation giving this responsibility to the Secret Service through the Treasury Department. It was first proposed and passed by the Senate in 1960. It became law last October.

The following points will also help clarify recent discussions of this matter:

1. The Secret Service as an interim measure assigned 19 agents to the protection of the Vice President last fall after the new legislation was approved. In order to meet its responsibilities to the extent possible in the absence of any appropriated funds, it became necessary for the Secret Service temporarily to draw agents from the field for this purpose.

Despite this heartbreaking disaster there was no anguished cry for aid from Washington or the State capitol at Columbus. True, the refinements of Federal aid had not been thought of then, but Congress was only too happy to logroll a hodgepodge of river and harbor bills to relieve localities of the costs of local improvements. Instead of calling on the logrollers, the thoroughly drenched Miami Valley citizens took the quaint stand that control of the river was their job, and not a legitimate burden on the taxpayers of Montana or New York.

All they asked from the lawgivers at Columbus was permission to form the conservancy district, with power to levy taxes for the purpose of keeping the rivers from their doors and barnyards. That permission was granted by the State legislature. No appeal of any kind went to Washington, and the only entrance of the National Government came when a Federal district court ruled that the United States had no objection.

The district issued almost \$34 million in bonds. Proceeds were used for construction of dams and channel regulation, and that ended the floods for the Miami Valley. In this engineering project there were no extras such as hydroelectric power, swanky fishing and recreation resorts or resettlement projects. Flood control was what the Miami Valley people paid their money for and flood control is what they got.

Today, as the district prepares to levy the final assessment for retirement of the last bonds, the flood-free communities, farms, and individuals of the Miami Valley are pretty proud of their accomplishment. It's theirs and they paid for it without outside help, advice, second guessing or the nostrums of the District of Columbia school of medicine. Equally pleasing to most is the fact that the district provided no plum tree for anxious jobseekers. Only 56 persons are employed on the entire project, hardly enough to staff the public relations office of almost any Washington bureau you care to name.

Cuba file
COMMUNISM IS NOT NEGOTIABLE

(Mr. STINSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, many of the citizens in this country will argue that communism is negotiable. The people using this argument are usually those who have only a surface understanding of communism. The following article from the Northwest Progress, of Seattle, Wash., very graphically points out our current stance against communism:

NOT NEGOTIABLE

If there is any lesson that can be learned from Castro's takeover of Cuba it would seem to be this: That as far as our State Department goes, we have learned absolutely nothing at all.

The U.S. policy in Cuba is based upon the same political principle that has determined our dealings with atheistic communism in China, Hungary, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, Poland, and all the other nations that have fallen to Red aggression.

Our State Department has always operated on the principle that communism, however dangerous, is negotiable. As long as that principle is maintained as a modus agendi by the U.S. Government, regardless of the sincerity of the men involved or the name of the administration, what happened in Hungary had to happen in Cuba and what has happened in Cuba must happen in all of America, North and South, unless we change our policy.

No. 45—12

Communism is not negotiable. The reason for saying this is not political but philosophical. Despite the new "nice guy" mask Khrushchev is wearing, he is still a Communist. As such, he will be content with but one objective: mastery of the entire world. He has told us this, he has set about scientifically and methodically to prove it. Cuba is just one more step along the way.

Communism understands but one law: force. And brute force is not negotiable. Force is only countered by counterforce. The brief blockade was a beautiful example of this simple fact.

We have been told that we must not "fear to negotiate." Where communism is concerned, dare we make such a statement? It might be good rhetoric—but what about the logic? It would seem that in dealing with Khrushchev, negotiation ought to be our greatest fear. If Cuba has not taught us this, it has taught us nothing.

Our verbal threats against Russia's presence 90 miles off the Florida coast are beginning to sound about as dangerous as the "do that again and I'll spank" of an indulgent mother to her spoiled child.

Soviet presence on the island of Cuba cannot be tolerated. Everybody in the free world agrees to this. This presence cannot effectively and completely be removed by mere negotiation. Recent history attests to that.

An editorial in this week's issue of Life magazine outlines some excellent steps that could be taken to rid ourselves of Castro's so-called defensive Russian army.

While the Life editorial's specific recommendations may not be in every instance as carefully conceived or outlined as those of a military strategist, still the principle upon which they are based is absolutely correct. The editorial rightly contends that "It is time for deeds as well as negotiations * * *"

BRAZILIAN LOAN

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, again we have been had. The Brazilian Government has announced plans for hemisphere Communists to hold a conference in Sao Paulo starting today.

On March 18, in a speech in the House of Representatives, I called to the attention of Congress the fact that Brazil was going to host the second Communist-inspired continental congress of solidarity with Cuba. The first such congress, 2 years ago in Mexico City, is widely regarded as having brought about violent efforts to subvert the Governments of Venezuela and Peru and with organizing leftist agitation in Panama and Puerto Rico.

This is obviously giving aid and comfort to the enemy of democracy, and literally thumbs the Brazilian nose at the United States.

Furthermore, in a speech on the floor of the House on March 21, I called attention to the fact that three members of the 15-man Brazilian Cabinet are notorious Marxists, two others were former Communist Party members. Goulart's press secretary is a self-declared Communist. The powerful National Industrial Workers Confederation, which unites industrial unions, is under Communist control. The big oil monopoly, Petrobras, is run by an extreme leftwinger.

Irregardless, the State Department will loan Brazil the money she requested.

While we heard anguished cries from the Brazilian Government when the State Department announced Communist infiltration of Brazil, it has yet to refute these charges.

As far as I am concerned, Brazil should not get a plugged nickel from the United States.

YUGOSLAV MILITARY ATTENDING ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE AT FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

(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, I wonder if our citizens know that a uniformed military officer from Communist Yugoslavia attends the regular Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. I wonder if they know that no less than four general officers of the Yugoslav Army are graduates of our top staff college. I wonder if they know that clearance for this must come from the White House. I wonder if they know that this has been happening for some years.

Mr. Speaker, what goes on here? Even the most uninformed among our citizenry knows that such military men have sworn allegiance to a Communist flag; that everything they learn at our General Staff College goes right back to Communists; that Yugoslavia is in close military liaison with the Soviet general staff.

Whether or not attendance at classified classes is barred to these men, the vast military knowledge they gain in a full course at Fort Leavenworth is undeniable. It is the sheerest lunacy to condone educating Communists about the operations of our general staff on the theory that it encourages splinter groups within the Soviet periphery.

I believe that we should investigate so that we can know just who cleared this assignment in this administration as well as under whose individual direction and initiative this sorry practice was initiated years ago. It is not the Army's fault. Orders for such inanity come from on high, not from the Army, of that we can be certain.

This is further glaring evidence that the present administration does not understand that all genuine Communists are deadly serious in their fanatical desire to destroy the United States. This is so whether they are Russian Communists or Chinese Communists or Yugoslav Communists. One does not appease a rattlesnake by inviting him into his house.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest, over the weekend, the

Clay report on foreign aid and think that there is much of value in it. Many of the things that it points out are matters which some of us in the Congress who have been studying the aid program have been saying for years.

Perhaps, the thing that catches the attention first is the suggestion that hundreds of millions of dollars can be cut from the annual programs without damaging them. In fact, the inference is clear that the programs would be better for having reduced amounts of money to spend.

But, there are other, less obvious, but equally important proposals. One of those relates to the selection of the countries which receive our aid. From the report, I gain the very strong impression that the committee feels that we should be much more selective in the matter of our aid and should concentrate our efforts in those countries with which we have a community of interest and which will not treat our assistance as a mere basis for bargaining with the Communists to get aid from them also.

Reference is made to the participation of the private sector of our economy and here again is a matter upon which most of us in the Congress acted a year ago over the strong protests of the Agency for International Development and the State Department. Now, the committee finds that this action has been helpful. On the whole, Mr. Speaker, one feels anew that before we act upon the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills this year most careful scrutiny should be given to the whole program to the end that, as a minimum, very substantial dollar reductions be made and that the recipients of our assistance be more carefully chosen.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PEACE CORPS PERSONNEL

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the stated dedication of higher echelon personnel in the Peace Corps, I offer the following news article without comment:

TOP PEACE CORPS PERSONNEL TO TAKE 2-WEEK RETREAT

Some 160 executives of the Peace Corps will spend 2 weeks at the Corps training camp in Puerto Rico, reports Deputy Director William Moyers.

"The idea is to spend 2 weeks in a close and familiar setting with the volunteers and also to bask desk flabbiness," explains Moyers.

While on the Caribbean island they will collect their regular salaries (\$11,000 a year and up) and have their expenses paid.

WHY THE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE 15-ACRE FARMER, MR. FREEMAN?

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 of this year I expressed my fears to this House that Freeman and company would attempt to use a double set of standards for our Nation's farmers in the forthcoming wheat referendum in that one method of voting would be required for the small 15-acre wheat farmers and another for the larger producers. My fears were not unfounded as the Department of Agriculture has now filed its "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" in the Federal Register to amend existing regulations relative to voting in the 1964 wheat referendum. The Department is proposing that the regulations be changed to read as follows:

(4) WHEAT

Any producer who has a farm acreage allotment shall be eligible to vote in any wheat referendum held pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1336, as amended: *Provided*, That a producer on a farm with a wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres shall be eligible to vote only if the operator on such farm files with the county committee, not later than 7 days prior to the date of the referendum, an election in writing to be subject to the wheat marketing quota for the farm.

Should this regulation be put into effect by Mr. Freeman it would mean that our Nation's 15-acre wheat producers would have to agree in writing at least 7 days before they voted that they would comply with the administration's program—should it be approved in the referendum. If they did not so signify their intent to comply with these new Freeman rules, they would be ineligible to vote. Large wheat farmers would be eligible to vote on election day automatically without previously signifying their intentions to do so.

Is it consistent for the administration to protest the inability of some citizens to vote in general elections due to unnecessary and discriminatory voting regulations and then to arbitrarily place such regulations in the paths of the Nation's small wheat farmers to keep them from voting in a referendum?

Why double standards for our American wheat producers, Mr. Freeman? Is it necessary to make first- and second-class citizens out of our wheat farmers in order to make your supply-management theory work? If so, this is another good reason why your supply-management approach for agriculture should not be adopted.

What is the real reason for this pre-election signup for our 15-acre wheat farmers, Mr. Freeman? You cannot argue that you need this information in order to ascertain who these 15-acre farmers are as your county committees already have this information. It cannot be argued that a farmer could not just as easily and as quickly signify his intent at the time he came in to vote. It could, however, be argued that since your program will be extremely detrimental to our small wheat producers

and as a consequence they will probably not look upon it with favor, that the powers that be do not want them to vote and this accounts for these additional and burdensome regulations being placed upon them. It also could be argued that a 7-day open season on our 15-acre farmers who do sign up will be needed in order to launch an all-out, concentrated attack upon them in the hope of convincing them to vote right. If this is the case, someone has misjudged these farmers as they do not succumb to badgering and cajoling.

Whatever the reason for this proposed regulation, it is not sufficient to warrant such rank discrimination among the wheat producers of America. I therefore, urge you, Mr. Secretary, in fairness to these small wheat farmers, not to put this proposed regulation into effect.

THE NEW FRONTIER

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, after reading the President's speech made at Chicago on Saturday, I am wondering when he is going to stop his changing moods and let the American people know when and where he expects to find the New Frontier. On Saturday he said that perhaps if we do not have a tax reduction we may not have a recession, but here he changed his mood. He went on to say:

But, if we do not have tax reduction our unemployment may go from 6 to 7 percent.

In the campaign in 1960 President Kennedy promised he was going to end unemployment, but I say seriously that in his changing moods and changing course of action, he might at least let everybody know what the New Frontier is and whether he ever expects to find it. His changing mood is giving the American people and business the jitters. Perhaps if he stopped changing his position so frequently, business could settle down, expand, and be in a position to put more people to work and end the rise in unemployment.

CAN WE CUT FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN YOUR DISTRICT?

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing much talk about the need for reducing Federal expenditures for years, but getting very little action.

Although the talk still continues, the fact remains that in fiscal 1963, out of a total Federal budget of \$94 billion, the following appropriations were passed unanimously: About \$50 billion for national defense, \$5½ billion for veterans' benefits, and \$3½ billion for space exploration. These items, together with interest on the national debt which is a fixed charge, account for approximately 75 cents out of every tax dollar.

Because of the unanimity with which these appropriations were endorsed by

my colleagues, those who are calling for decreased spending evidently want cuts to be made in the appropriations which consume the remaining 25 cents out of every tax dollar.

Since each Congressman knows his own district the best, I would appreciate hearing from each of my colleagues about his suggestions for cutting down on Federal spending in his own district. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would be pleased to total the suggested amounts and pass the information along to my chairman.

If a flood control or land reclamation project which is scheduled for construction in a Representative's district is considered unnecessary by him, I would appreciate hearing from him about it. Likewise, those of my colleagues who object to their districts receiving area redevelopment funds or moneys for their local schools under the aid to federally impacted areas legislation should not hesitate to let me know about it.

Those of my colleagues from farm areas should feel free to tell me how much less they want spent in their own districts for price supports, and those who represent urban districts should similarly advise how much less they wish their districts to receive for urban renewal.

Does any Congressman wish to file objection to the spending of money in his district under the Federal road program? If so, just let me know. For that matter, I should also like to hear from anyone who dissents from the expenditure of Federal funds in his area for hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act.

Naturally, I should also welcome any information from anyone who would like a large defense contract terminated in his district.

When I total all the response, I shall announce the result. I doubt that I shall require an adding machine.

WASTING MONEY

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Printing of the Committee on House Administration, I have been advised that a number of bills will be considered tomorrow. This has reminded me of a wasteful practice that has gone on for years and which is proposed to be perpetuated in another way. I am referring to the printing of calendars which are distributed to the Members. Now that is a small item and I will probably be branded as a nitpicker. But we are spending \$27,473 a year to print calendars to be distributed to the Members, and each one of us gets 10 of these calendars and more if we request them. To me that is an utter waste of money and I intend to try to stop it. If there are others who concur in my views with respect to this, I would appreciate it if they would so inform the Subcommittee on Printing stating that they do not endorse this waste of money. With mil-

lions of calendars of every conceivable size and design being distributed by all types of businesses as well as individuals, I cannot believe that anyone is being denied a free calendar, and for that reason can see no reason why the Congress should approve this waste of money. This is just one of many small ways in which Members of Congress can effect small savings, which total a substantial sum. The greatest good that can come from this action of discontinuing this practice is that it would indicate Congress desire to practice economy—and once we make the start, I believe it will result in greater and substantial savings.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET HYPOCRISY

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the partisan statements of Republican leaders in reference to the President's tax reduction and budget proposals border on political hypocrisy.

They have apparently forgotten, in their zeal to discredit the Democratic program, that the largest peacetime deficit in history occurred during a Republican administration in 1959 and totaled \$12.427 billion.

They have apparently forgotten that the cumulative deficit during the Eisenhower Republican administration was \$21.953 billion.

They criticize the President's efforts to stimulate the economy with a tax reduction at a time when a deficit will occur.

I would call their attention to the year 1954—during the Republican administration—when there were tax reductions totaling an estimated \$7.4 billion. This came at a time when it was obvious there would be a deficit, and there was a deficit.

The tax reduction included removal of excess profits tax, reductions in individual income taxes, reduction in excise taxes, and revisions of the Federal Revenue Code.

The Republican leadership now takes the position that tax reduction in the face of a deficit is an unpardonable financial sin.

But in 1954, when the economy was lagging, the Republicans turned to tax reduction and the economy showed a substantial upswing. With the healthier economy, the Republicans were able to achieve surpluses.

The Republican leadership questions an increase in the national debt ceiling. Yet during the Republican administration the debt ceiling was increased for fiscal 1955, for 1958, for 1959, and 1960.

So it is apparent that the criticism of the Republican leadership stems from sheer partisan politics. When a Republican President called for tax reduction, an increase in the debt ceiling, and a deficit budget, this was acceptable, even praised.

But when the Democratic administration in office attempts to stimulate a lagging economy and increase Federal revenues looking toward ultimate bal-

ancing of the budget, then—in the Republican view—an outrageous financial crime is being committed.

The facts are that we are falling \$30 to \$40 billion short of our potential in national output, \$18 to \$20 billion short in wages and salaries, and \$7 to \$8 billion in business profits. We have an unemployment rate of more than 6 percent and persistent, large budget deficits.

Failure to act now to stimulate the economy is inviting another recession. Our high tax rates are repressive. A tax reduction is needed urgently.

Certainly our expenditures should be carefully studied. They have been carefully studied. Some reductions are being made. But to achieve the sort of budget reduction the Republicans advocate would seriously hamper our defense efforts—because that is where the bulk of the budgetary increases have been.

The best way to balance the budget is to balance the economy. The increased economic activity from a tax rate will produce more revenues which can and will be used to achieve a balanced Federal budget.

The Republican leadership would do well to lend its support to a sensible economic program of this kind, rather than devoting its time to irresponsible sniping for political purposes.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to correct what I believe to be a serious inadequacy in this legislation.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall include in his standards for designation of counties under this act, standards based on the migration out of the county.

The present law provides that this shall be one of the things considered in formulating the standards. But it is very necessary to make counties eligible on this basis alone if we are to stem the tide of migration to already overcrowded metropolitan areas.

The many communities which are losing population today because of a lack of jobs would like to be able to retain the young people who are leaving today. With just a little help, such as assistance through the Area Redevelopment Act, these communities could establish new industry and provide new jobs for these young people.

The figures on unemployment and income do not show these counties to be within the standards adopted by the Secretary of Commerce for designation under this law. However, the fact is that many of these counties which are rapidly losing population are in very serious trouble. What has happened is that, instead of hanging on, these people who have lost jobs have moved out of the county. Those who had businesses have shut them down and gone elsewhere,

usually to work for someone else rather than open a new business.

The net effect has been that the unemployment rate and the income rate in the counties do not reflect the total situation. Those who are unemployed show up on the rolls of a big metropolitan city. They show up on the welfare rolls of these cities. The effect is the same on the national economic picture. The people are still unemployed. The county still is deteriorating from lack of industry and employment opportunity. And we are now doing nothing about it.

The expansion of this program, Mr. Speaker, as proposed in the bill I have introduced today, will have an immediate stimulating effect on the economy of many rural areas across our land just because of the existence of this provision. The effect when the provision is implemented with proper funds and administrative action would be tremendous.

When people want to help themselves, I feel we should assist them in this effort. That is the purpose of this bill. I hope my colleagues will give it their prompt and serious consideration.

Cuba file
COMMUNIST INSPIRED CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF SOLIDARITY WITH CUBA MEETS IN RIO WHILE UNITED STATES GIVES MORE AID TO BRAZIL—TO BUILD TRADE WITH RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I along with other Members of this House of Representatives had the privilege over the weekend of visiting Guantanamo Bay, the American military base in Cuba. I do not want to make that particular visit the principal subject of my remarks, but it does have a relationship to the subject which I do want to discuss rather briefly and that is the question of the proposed foreign aid to Brazil, particularly in view of the announcement which we see on the UPI ticker just today, to the effect—it has been known before of course, but the number of countries attending has not been known—the fact that the Communist-inspired Continental Congress of Solidarity With Cuba meets in Rio de Janeiro the 28th of this month, Thursday of this week, and who is going to be in attendance—78 countries have decided to attend at this meeting which is commonly known as a meeting for the purpose of ultra liberals and some Communists to carve out a solidarity with Cuba—that means Communist Cuba program. Included in these 78 countries are Cuba itself, Russia and Red China, and a number of other countries are to be involved including many in this hemisphere. Representatives from 78 countries are attending. Despite this and other evidence of the growth of communism in Brazil as even stated by

the State Department itself in Brazilian Ambassador Gordon's testimony before the Selden subcommittee to the effect in Brazil the Government has been infiltrated with Communists, the student movement has been infiltrated with Communists as well as the labor union movement.

Of course, there was an effort by the State Department to claim that this testimony which appears in the record of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs was taken out of the context and did not really mean what it says. Anybody who reads it will note that it is very clearly stated that there has been Communist infiltration in the Government, in union movements, and in student groups—on page 247 of the hearings I quote "The principal field of infiltration and influence is in the labor unions. In the Government staff there has been infiltration. The student movement in another major area of penetration with the National Student Union now being dominated by Communists."

What does all this amount to? And I am going to take a few minutes to review the extent of Communist infiltration and buildup in Brazil. As a matter of fact, the fearless reporter who had the intestinal fortitude to state the facts of what is going on in Brazil was just recently declared to be persona non grata by the Government because he had the intestinal fortitude to put in the record for all to read the story of the Communist buildup in Brazil. I am sure most of you have read that article by Mr. Stein with regard to the amazing Communist buildup in Brazil which is, I believe, self-explanatory. I include the article at the close of my remarks.

Here is what happened, for instance, in Costa Rica during the visit of the President on March 20 with regard to our policy in giving foreign aid to these Latin American countries who still recognize and do business with Castro's Cuba and who do not do all they can to oppose Communist subversion within their countries, but, as a matter of fact, in some instances are even encouraging it.

Here is what one Costa Rican student stated at the time of this visit at the University of Costa Rica:

It is foolish for you Americans to give money to corrupt, oligarchy-controlled Latin American governments without supervising the expenditure of every dollar. You're throwing money down the drain, and in the end you'll lose both the money and the country. And you shouldn't make an exception of our own Government, however advanced it might be.

These were students in a university in a country with a long history of democracy and social progress, conditions lacking in most Latin American countries. This was the advice of students given to reporters at the time of the President's visit at the Costa Rican Conference on March 20, 1963. Good advice, I believe, but advice which we are not heeding these days.

Who is going to be in attendance at this conference in Rio, in a country to whose Government we are proposing to

give \$55 million of a \$1½ billion program for the purpose of building up the economy of Brazil so she can continue to trade with Soviet Russia? I understand, although it has not been officially announced at the movement, by the wire services, that the President is expected to make a pronouncement concerning it sometime today that this \$55 million to Brazil has been agreed to as the first installment despite the fact the Government of Brazil refuses to condemn this conference, as a matter of fact is going to let it go on in Rio de Janeiro, is weakening in its opposition to communism, is doing business with Russia, and continues to recognize Castro.

Who are some of the Brazilians who are going to be in attendance at this conference? I think this indicates the extent of the infiltration of communism in the country. Who are some of the Brazilians who are going to be in attendance at this Red continental congress?

There is going to be Luis Carlos Prestes, Secretary General of the Brazilian Communist Party. Another is General Luiz Gonzaga de Oliveira Leite, president of the Brazilian Association of Reserve Officers; and Francisco Juliao, a federal deputy and founder-president of the Castroist Peasants League.

Dante Pelicani, president of the National Federation of Industrial Workers, and Almino Afonso, Minister of Labor in President Goulart's Cabinet and leader of Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party in the Federal Chamber.

Clodsmith Riani, a Labor Ministry functionary and chief of labor's general strike command. Mario Shemberg, a well known Sao Paulo physicist, and Roberto Morena, who, according to Lacerda, served as a political commissar with the Communist forces in the Spanish civil war.

Where did this list come from? This list came from a list of those expected to be in attendance, taken from the luggage of Luis Carlos Prestes, secretary general of the outlawed Brazilian Communist Party, as he departed recently on a trip to Havana, Prague, and Moscow. It was taken from his luggage by Carlos Lacerda of the city where the convention is going to be held; namely, Rio de Janeiro. His public security officers were the ones who got possession of these documents. No one has denied them. There is not any question but what in all probability these persons named are not only going to attend but it also gives best evidence of their background and their inclination.

Many of them are very substantial people in the Goulart government. How could these people maintain these positions under the Brazilian Government setup if the President did not agree to their receiving these positions, because the appointive power in Brazil is with the Executive, not even subject to confirmation by the legislative branch.

So these people are in the government at least by sufferance of the President himself.

I am not going to read in detail, but I have in my possession a document that

reviews the history of the buildup of the Communist Party and of Communist subversive activities in Brazil, starting back in April of 1960, when Francisco Juliao, whose name I just mentioned, and Santos Morais, accompanied the Brazilian presidential candidate on his visit to Cuba in April 1960.

During that visit, Juliao and Morais had a personal meeting with Fidel Castro in which they requested Castro's financial support for the Peasants Leagues. Castro studied the request, and after consultation with Che Guevara, he informed Juliao that his decision was to not support the leagues, a decision that was due in great extent, to the observation made by Guevara that there was no existing proof that these leagues were organized.

In November 1960, Juliao made a visit to Red China, where he again requested financial assistance, this time from the Communist Chinese government. Juliao obtained the promise of financial help which would have to be channeled through the Castro government.

The reason I am spreading this information on the Record is I believe our Government should seriously reconsider any approval of a loan to Brazil until Brazil shows its ability to clean out the Communists that are known to have infiltrated the Brazilian Government, and insist that Brazil withdraw recognition of Castro's Communist government and stop doing business with him and to side with the forces of freedom—having opposed the United States at Punte del Este and during the quarantine refusing to join it.

I made a similar request that related to Mexico the other day. Until Mexico stops permitting the inflow of persons for subversive purposes—including U.S. citizens—through the open door of subversion out of Mexico City and the Cuban Embassy, we should not give it any aid. Even the CIA Director himself admitted there were individuals going to Cuba for training purposes in 1962, at which time I brought out the fact that there were some 73 Americans as well going down there in violation of the U.S. laws—and unprosecuted.

After a strong protest, that aid should be withdrawn from Mexico until this open door is closed.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to commend him for the statement he has just made. For the life of me I cannot understand how this Government can seriously consider giving one thin dime to Brazil under the circumstances that exist. The Finance Minister of Brazil and the Ambassador of that Government in Washington told our subcommittee that Brazil would not hold the Continental Congress for Cuban Solidarity or whatever the specific title of that meeting, the Communist meeting in support of Cuba. But now the meeting is to be held, apparently, with the sanction of the Government of Brazil, and President Kennedy and this administration ought not to give Brazil one single

dime as long as this meeting is in the works.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. Of course, he is an authority on this subject, being a member of the Selden subcommittee, at least to that extent, and I am glad that he placed on the Record the fact that assurances were made to that committee. This is something I did not have knowledge of myself, that Brazil did make assurances that this congress would not be held, which obviously seems to me to be a condition precedent in Alliance for Progress funds being seriously negotiated at this time. And, I will say to the gentleman further that I called the State Department, Mr. Moscoso's office, and I inquired in regard to the Alliance for Progress funds and I tried to get some information even in regard to what requests had been made, and that was denied me. As to the conditions that were being considered, they would not even discuss that. I said, "Are you going to attempt to gain assurances that if they get this money, they are going to fight communism instead of permitting it to grow in that country, as part of the policy of the United States, and what should be the basic policy of our Alliance for Progress funds" and I was denied any information of any kind at that time and have received none subsequently.

So far as the buildup is concerned, I could quote, for instance, from the Worker, the Communist newspaper in this country, on Sunday, March 17. And that happened to be the very weekend that I was asking for this information, the very weekend that the State Department was trying to expunge from the official records of the Selden committee the testimony of its own Ambassador to Brazil to the effect that there was infiltration in the Government, in the unions, in the student movement. Here is what the Worker said on that very Sunday, March 17, when the papers reported the fact that the State Department did not mean what it said. This is a report by Art Shields:

Brazil Communist Party's strength doubles in 2 years, says Carlos Prestes.

The very man I was just referring to who is going to this Rio conference:

Big changes are coming in Brazil, and the Brazilian Communist Party is much in this changing picture.

Its strength has doubled since 1960, says Luis Carlos Prestes, the party's general-secretary.

They say in the last 2 years that the Peasant Union has expanded from 50,000 2 years ago to 600,000 today.

Further quoting from the article:

The movement for peace, which is the party's central issue, has made great advances.

I met Prestes when he talked to a group of correspondents during a short visit to Moscow.

Further quoting from the article:

Prestes gave us many details of the rising strength of the people's forces. Thus the Communist Party's ties with the militant working class of Brazil have grown much stronger since the late 1950's.

The student movement is rapidly growing. It is led by Communists in alliance with members of the Catholic youth.

"The influence of the Communist Party and other democratic groups is rising in the ranks of the Brazilian Army," said Prestes, who used to be an army colonel himself.

Further quoting from the article:

The big job internationally is to win socialism with the least sacrifices. "But socialism" he said, "cannot be prevented." He proudly declared, "We Brazilians are fighting to become the second people in Latin America to open the door to socialism."

This was the very day the State Department was trying to expunge from the records of the Congress its own testimony with respect to the Communist buildup in Brazil.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that the gentleman made a request of the State Department to give the gentleman information as to the amount of money we have spent in Brazil in this Alliance for Progress program?

Mr. CRAMER. No; that information is readily available to everyone, including the gentleman from Florida, and the gentleman from Florida is well aware of it. What I asked for was how much they are now negotiating for; how much have they requested? The news reports vary as to the amount of money involved.

I was told that I could not get this information—that I was not entitled to it—and they would not discuss what the Brazilian Finance Minister asked for.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, how long ago was that request denied to the gentleman?

Mr. CRAMER. That was on Saturday, March 16, 1963, the very day before this Worker article came out.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The reason I ask this is the fact that I have a constituent who is interested in the amount of money being proposed that we spend in Brazil. He asked me that question in a letter.

Has the gentleman from Florida any information or is the gentleman going to place in the Record the amount of money that has been spent heretofore in Brazil?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado if the gentleman will look at my remarks of March 18, 1963, page 4189, the gentleman will see that information, indicating that some \$450 million to date is to be repaid by Brazil, and they are asking for forgiveness on that. He is asking, according to the press, for release of \$84 million to the \$553 million U.S. aid which was given to Brazil since 1951. And according to today's report, \$55 million more is requested as the first of three yearly amounts.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman discussed with them the question of the request that had been made, did they give the gentleman any substantial reasons why they would not give the gentleman the information?

Mr. CRAMER. They said negotiations were underway and that they had no in-

formation to give, even though my request related to the request of the Brazilian Government at the outset of the negotiations which, at least speculatively, was printed in the press time and time again. But a Member of Congress is not entitled to have this information. Mr. Moscoso, who is in charge of the Alliance for Progress administration, would not advise me as to present demands or negotiations which were made even at the outset, and this I cannot understand.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa. However, permit me to say before I yield to the gentleman that my interest is obviously not only a personal one but I believe the people of this country are entitled to know that information under these circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that the asking price of the Brazilians is the round figure of \$500 million—one-half billion dollars. That is what they want.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand from testimony which is available that the asking price now by Brazil is that they want one-half billion dollars for next year?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will have to take my word for that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Oh; surely.

Mr. GROSS. The asking price, the Brazilian asking price, is in round figures \$500 million. This is on top of, as I understand it, somewhere near \$1.5 billion already made available to Brazil in various financing deals. And from the \$500 million there would be a refinancing, as I understand it, of payments to Soviet-bloc countries of certain short-term credits that are due or very shortly coming due. In other words, they would like to obtain money from U.S. taxpayers to refinance their obligations to the Soviet-bloc countries, among other things.

This is a rather complicated thing, but it boils down to the asking from this country in various ways of refinancing, new money, and so on and so forth, approximately one-half billion dollars.

Mr. CRAMER. To substantiate what the gentleman from Iowa says on trade with Russia as part of the Brazilian deal it was reported from Rio de Janeiro in the press that just before Dantas, the Finance Secretary, came to this country to negotiate as follows:

Brazil is about to sign a long-term \$180 million-a-year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance.

The announcement further stated:

Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may be increased to as much as \$300 million a year by 1965.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman, with reference to his treatment by the State Department, that Mr. Martin, who is Chief of the Latin American Desk in the State Department is the same Mr. Martin who not too long ago stated in hearings before our own subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture that he had proceeded to carry out one program, having to do with Brazil, by the way, without any regard to the wishes of the Congress or even, for that matter, taking the trouble to bring the matter to the attention of his superiors as under the law he was supposed to do.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I believe that the American people are entitled to this information. That is why I requested it, as well as because of my concern over the statement of the Department of State itself to the effect that Communist infiltration in Brazil had reached what I would call serious proportions and still existed, which is found in the record of the hearings of the Selden Committee.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about training schools for subversives in Cuba, by Castro and the Communists. This report which I am placing in the Record gives an example in very specific detail of how these schools are carried on, how the students are brought in, and even names some of the students. They follow up their activities in Brazil, after their training.

For instance, from July 28 to August 20, a total of 52 Latin Americans attended the guerrilla warfare instruction course. Besides the 12 Brazilian students from the Peasants Leagues there were 12 Venezuelans, 17 Argentines, 6 Paraguayans and 5 Panamanians.

This was away back in 1961. The principal Brazilians taking the course were the same men who later directed the development of the guerrilla movement of the leagues in Brazil. They were, for instance:

Clodimir de los Santos Morais, ex-Deputy of the state of Pernambuco, member of the Communist Party of Brazil (PCB) and the principal aide of Francisco Juliao.

Joaquin Ferreira, member of the Communist Party and ex-Economist of the "SUDENE," a state organization for the so-called development of Northeast Brazil, under the direction of Celso Furtado.

Pedro Mate de Barros, leader of the youth sector of the Communist Party and law student in Pernambuco.

Adamastar Antonio Bonilla, one of the secretaries of the state committee of the Communist Party in Rio Grande do Sol.

Armando Luiz de Carvalho, also known as Palmeira, member of the Communist Party of Pernambuco.

The instruction course was given in Managua, a camp near Havana, where the general headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Army is situated. Maj.

Guillermo Franco was in charge of the course. The holding of this guerrilla course was carefully disguised, even within Cuba. The "students of guerrilla tactics" were presented officially as delegates to the 26th of July anniversary festivities and after that date as visitors and tourists. This was the second course of this nature under the patronage of the Cubans, the first having been held in May 1961.

These instructions included daily rifle practice, guerrilla maneuvers simulated in the mountains of Los Organos, the handling and identifications of weapons and ideological indoctrination. The "students" were instructed in the dismounting, handling, and maintenance of various American firearms, including models M-1 and M-3, Garand, and Hotchkiss and Browning machineguns. The instruction was limited to American weapons, according to explanations of the instructor, because they, as guerrillas, should capture and use the arms of the enemy. They were familiarized with the manufacture of "Molotov cocktails" and the M-26 incendiary bomb. The instructor explained that this bomb has been perfected by Che Guevara to be shot from a rifle.

Some theoretical classrooms were operating in Granja del Pueblo Hermanos Saiz [Saiz Brothers People Farm] under the direction of Major Franco, where the "students" attended classes. Franco, a very close confidential friend of Fidel Castro, also held the position of paymaster, handing out funds for the occasional expenses of the "students." These latter were constantly reminded that a good revolutionary must be well indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist theories. Besides Major Franco, the following members of the Cuban Revolutionary Army acted as instructors: Rolando Lazaro Requeijo, Antonio Reina Jimenez, and Teodoro Braunn. The Panamanians, under the direction of Jorge Ferreira, were subjected to a special rigorous course.

It goes on to describe the balance of the course and how they were hidden in the hotel and were taken out on a 1-day basis for the trip, so it would not appear they were other than tourists:

The majority of the trained guerrillas returned to their respective countries on August 20, 1961, arriving on the 21st or 22d. The plane that was to take the Brazilians, Argentines, and Paraguayans were overfilled, because some visitors—not "guerrilla students"—also had taken passage on that plane. For this reason, those who had less urgent needs to return remained another 2 days in Havana, as tourists, leaving on a second Cuban plane on August 22. This plane also transported the Uruguayan delegation. The plane returned via Port of Spain, reaching São Paulo on August 23. The Brazilians who landed on this occasion were arrested by the police, charged with carrying subversive propaganda. But they were set free, together with the propaganda, on the same day.

After the resignation of Janio Quadros in August 1961, and the absence of a subsequent revolution, Fidel Castro decided that he should give massive financial support to the peasants leagues in Brazil—

And that is what has been happening—transforming the revolutionary sector of the leagues into a liaison agent for the Brazilian revolution in the same manner as his group had acted for the Cuban Revolution. In the

meanwhile Juliao would continue his preaching that the leagues constituted an organization whose objective was to better the status of the peasants.

They set up a general headquarters in Recife, at 216 Respiolo Street. These headquarters consist of the following personnel. I will put those names in the Record.

They went on with the initiation of the establishment of Peasants' Leagues Councils in several states of Brazil. The name of the head of this movement to maintain contact with the Cuban movement and the description of these activities likewise will be in the Record.

Quoting again:

Morais began the supervision of the purchase of a number of farms in which guerrilla training could be held. In each one of these farms, Moraes placed a director who was responsible for this training. In October 1962 six separate locations existed, in Goias, Maranhao, Matto Grosso, Estado de Bahis, Rio, and Rio Grande de Sul. During the previous year, at least two other farms were closed down. One in Matto Grosso, and the other in Parana. At the end of 1961, the director of the Dianopolis Farm in the State of Goias, was Amaro Luiz de Carvalho, known by the name of "Palmeira," member of the Brazilian Communist Party of Pernambuco.

It goes further through the buildup of the Peasant League movement, how they operate, the training they receive, the contact they have not only with the Cuban Embassy but the Embassies from Russia and Red China and Communists from throughout the world as well.

I think you will find this heretofore unpublished documentation in detail of the buildup in the Peasant's League, a Communist organization in Brazil not only interesting reading but essential information in connection with this consideration of a loan to Brazil at this time. This entire history of the League from which I have taken excerpts appear at the end of my remarks. This comes from a source I consider beyond question—and related to known incidents reported to the press and from other sources.

HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PEASANTS' LEAGUES IN BRAZIL—PROOF OF SUBVERSION IN BRAZIL

Deputies Francisco Juliao and Clodomir de los Santos Moraes accompanied the Brazilian presidential candidate, Janio Quadros on his visit to Cuba in April 1960. During that visit, Juliao and Moraes had a personal meeting with Fidel Castro in which they requested Castro's financial support for the Peasants' Leagues. Castro studied the request, and after consultation with Che Guevara, he informed Juliao that his decision was not to support the Leagues, a decision that was due in great extent, to the observation made by Guevara that there was no existing proof that these Leagues were organized.

In November 1960, Juliao made a visit to Red China, where he again requested financial assistance, this time from the Communist Chinese Government. Juliao obtained the promise of financial help which would have to be channeled through the Castro government. This financial aid would not be extended under the heading of support to the rural organizations led by Juliao in Pernambuco, but would be for the purpose of creating and developing the guerrilla groups in Brazil which would be capable of

spearheading a violent revolutionary movement with the objective of overthrowing the Government of Brazil.

Juliao returned to Brazil at the end of December 1960, and immediately left for Cuba in order to attend the celebration of the second anniversary of the Cuban Revolution. When he returned later to Brazil, he selected Clodomir Moraes to head the revolutionary groups of Peasants' Leagues, while he acted as the figurehead of an organization ostensibly dedicated to the peaceful promotion of interests of the Brazilian farmers. In his speeches and statements to the press in the beginning of 1961, Juliao said that he hoped that the P.S.B. Socialist Brazilian Party and the P.T.B. Brazilian Workers' Party, presided by João Goulart and the Communist Party would be able to unite in their efforts to bring about agrarian reform through peaceful means. When he was reminded of the belligerent nature of communism, Juliao answered the reporter by stating that "communism is different in Brazil."

While Clodomir Moraes was engaged in the work of the basic organization of establishing the mechanism of guerrilla warfare, Juliao alternated his tasks between making speeches in favor of the Leagues and traveling between Brazil and Cuba. In 1961 Juliao made three trips to Cuba. In June and July of that year, Moraes selected 11 members of the Peasants' Leagues to accompany him to Cuba, where they were taken for a specialized course in guerrilla warfare.

This group of 13 Brazilians left Recife on July 21, 1961. They traveled together with a group of Argentines and Paraguayans in a Britannia plane chartered specially by the "Compañía Cubana de Aviación." The plane made a stop at Rio de Janeiro to take on other passengers, also making another stop at Port of Spain, for refueling before landing on July 22, at the José Martí airport in Havana.

The group were welcomed and shown around by representatives of the Cuban Institute of Friendship with Nations (ICAP) an organization which ostensibly promoted the trip. The group pretended to be members of the Brazilian delegation to attend the 26 of July celebrations.

They were lodged in the hotel Riviera in Havana. During the first few days they took an active part in all the various festivities commemorating the 26th of July anniversary. On the afternoon of July 24, a reception was held in honor of the Soviet's cosmonaut, Maj. Yuri Gagarin, who was visiting Cuba, followed by a public dance, that night. On July 25, a sports parade was held; the following day, the 26th, a huge public demonstration was held and on the 27th, the visitors were taken on a tour of Cuban beaches in Havana. On the night of July 28, together with a representatives from other Latin American countries, the Brazilian left the hotel and riding in official Cadillac cars they were taken to the instruction camps for guerrilla warfare, where they were divided in nationality groups and lodged in different instruction centers.

From July 28 to August 20, a total of 52 Latin Americans attended the guerrilla warfare instruction course. Besides the 13 Brazilian students from the peasants leagues, there were 12 Venezuelans, 17 Argentines, 6 Paraguayans and 5 Panamanians.

The principal Brazilians taking the course were the same men who later directed the development of the guerrilla movement of the leagues in Brazil. They were the following:

Clodomir de los Santos Moraes, ex-Deputy of the State of Pernambuco, member of the Communist Party of Brazil (PCB) and the principal aid of Francisco Juliao.

Joaquin Ferreira, member of the Communist Party and ex-Economist of the "Sudene" (a state organization for the so-called development of Northeast Brazil, under the direction of Celso Furtado).

Pedro Mate de Barros, leader of the youth sector of the Communist Party and law student in Pernambuco.

Adamastar Antonio Bonille, one of the secretaries of the state committee of the Communist Party in Rio Grande do Sol.

Armando Luiz de Carvalho, also known as Palmeira, member of the Communist Party of Pernambuco.

The instruction course was given in Managua, a camp near Havana, where the general headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Army is situated. Maj. Guillermo Franco was in charge of the course. The holding of this guerrilla course was carefully disguised, even within Cuba. The "students of guerrilla tactics" were presented officially as delegates to the 26th of July anniversary festivities and after that date, as visitors and tourists. This was the second course of this nature under the patronage of the Cubans, the first having been held in May 1961.

These instructions include daily rifle practice, guerrilla maneuvers simulated in the mountains of Los Organos, the handling and identifications of weapons and ideological indoctrination. The students were instructed in the dismounting, handling, and maintenance of various American firearms, including models M-1 and M-3, Garand and Hatchkies and Browning machineguns. The instruction was limited to American weapons, according to explanations of the instructor, because they, as guerrillas, should capture and use the arms of the enemy. They were familiarized with the manufacture of Molotov cocktails and the M-26 incendiary bomb. The instructor explained that this bomb has been perfected by Che Guevara to be shot from a rifle.

Same theoretical classrooms were operating in (Granja del Pueblo Hermanos Saiz) (Saiz Brothers People Farm) under the direction of Major Franco, where the students attended classes. Franco, a very close confidential friend of Fidel Castro, also held the position of paymaster, handing out funds for the occasional expenses of the students. These latter were constantly reminded that a good revolutionary must be well indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist theories. Besides Major Franco, the following members of the Cuban Revolutionary Army acted as instructors: Rolando Lazaro Requesojo, Antonio Reina Jiménez and Teodoro Braunn. The Panamanians, under the direction of Jorge Ferreir, were subjected to a special rigorous course.

When the other students asked why this special treatment for the Panamanians, they were informed that the group from Panama were being prepared to act as saboteurs in the Panama Canal Zone.

In order to maintain their appearances as tourists, the students returned to the point of their departure, the Havana Riviera Hotel. While there, they told everyone who asked that they had been visiting the interior of the island on a tourist jaunt. The students in the hotel made contact with delegations of Czechs, Russians, and Red Chinese, who were introduced to them as "technicians." The guerrilla students had little contact with these visitors from the Iron Curtain because they remained aloof and unfriendly, limiting their encounters to more social amenities.

On completing the course, the Brazilian students were told that they had passed the course with exceptional qualifications and as a premium for this achievement they would be given the honor of an informal meeting with Fidel Castro in the Cienega de Zapats, where they were taken in Fidel's personal helicopter. Castro congratulated them on

the splendid results they obtained from the course, relating some of his own experiences as a guerrilla fighter and entered into the discussion of the political scene in Latin America. He exhorted them not to be deceived by apparent measures of agrarian reform, such as those proposed by Janio Quadros, of Brazil, but to continue fighting for revolutionary and radical reforms.

The majority of the trained guerrillas returned to their respective countries on August 20, 1961 arriving on the 21st or 22nd. The plane that was to take the Brazilians, Argentines and Paraguayans, was over-filled because some visitors—not "guerrilla students"—also had taken passage on that plane. For this reason, those who had less urgent needs to return, remained another 2 days in Havana, as tourists, leaving on a second Cuban plane on August 22. This plane also transported the Uruguayan delegation. The plane returned via port of Spain, reaching Sao Paulo on August 23. The Brazilians who landed on this occasion were arrested by the police, charged with carrying subversive propaganda. But they were set free together with the propaganda on the same day.

After the resignation of Janio Quadros in August 1961, and the absence of a subsequent revolution, Fidel Castro decided that he should give massive financial support to the Peasants Leagues, transforming the revolutionary sector of the leagues into a liaison agent for the Brazilian revolution in the same manner as his group had acted for the Cuban revolution. In the meanwhile, Jullião would continue his preaching that the leagues constituted an organization whose objective was to better the status of the peasants. In this interim, the major part of Cuban money poured in for the organization of guerrilla fighters. Jullião and Moraes decided to adopt the following measures to give shape to the leagues:

1. To enlarge the general headquarters of the leagues in Recife, at 216 Respiolo Street. These headquarters consist of the following personnel:

Francisco Jullião: Honorary president.
Maria Ceares Barreto Novais: Secretary (also consulting attorney in the Economic Department of SUDENE)
Jonas Albarquerque Sosa.
José Severino Cunha.
Dzacy Megalhaes Florencio: Treasurer (Recife attorney and member of the state committee of the Communist Party of Pernambuco).

Emmanuel Egberto de Araujo.
Rivadavis Braz de Oliveira: One of the group trained in the guerrilla warfare course in Managua, Cuba.

Luis Seráfin los Santos.
2. Initiation of the establishment of Peasants Leagues Councils in several states of Brazil. In various regions, Jullião procured and obtained the support of ex-student leaders. In 1961, the leader of the Deliberative Council of the Peasant Leagues, was Tarzan de Castro, 25 years of age, who had formerly presided over the Brazilian Union of High School Students (U.B.E.S.). Jarbes Miranda de Santana, ex-president of the (U.B.E.S.) was made head of the Deliberative Council of the Leagues in 1961.

3. Formation of a movement to serve as the convert sector through which recruits for guerrilla training was conducted. This organization was known as Movimiento Revolucionario Triadentes (MRT) (Triadentes Revolutionary Movement). The two principal recruiting officers of the MRT were Clodomir Moraes and Joaquin Ferrais Filho, both had attended the guerrilla course in Managua, Cuba. Later the MRT was transferred to the offices of La Liga, the official newspaper of the Peasants Leagues, directed by Jullião, and managing director, Antonio Avertano. La Liga leases the buildings 1001 and

1002, situated at No. 15 Alcino Guanabera Street.

4. Jullião established an agency in Rio de Janeiro in order to maintain contact with the Cuban Embassy. Regina Coelho de Alburquerque and Nives Borges do Brazil, were in charge of the agency. Regina Coelho's apartment in Avenida Rainhe Elizabeth No. 587, became a frequent meeting place for the Leagues as well as a nightly stop-over for members of the League who were traveling. Regina Coelho was the recipient of all correspondence and verbal messages of representatives arriving in Rio de Janeiro. She immediately contacted Nives Borges do Brazil passing on all information received; on the other hand Nives Borges contacted a member of the Cuban Embassy, usually the Third Secretary, Ana Sermiento, who was informed of the matter in question.

In December 1961, Nives Borges do Brazil left for Cuba in order to receive special instruction in clandestine activities, in preparation for becoming the intermediary between the Leagues and the Cuban Embassy. Notwithstanding the extreme caution exercised by the personnel of the Cuban Embassy to separate Regina and use Nives as intermediary, at times Regina was invited to participate in receptions and other social functions given by Embassy personnel. Besides representatives of other Embassies of the Communist bloc, such as Ludwick Nekar of the Czech Embassy, were occasional visitors to Regina's apartment, generally for the purpose of meeting Jullião and Moraes. These two, during a certain period, frequently spent the night in Regina's apartment; later, fearing that their activities might be under scrutiny, Jullião changed his temporary residence in Rio for the home of Osny Duarte Ferreira, Magistrate of the Court of Appeals.

5. Moraes began the supervision of the purchase of a number of farms in which guerrilla training could be held. In each one of these farms, Moraes placed a director who was responsible for this training. In October 1962 six separate locations existed in Coiss, Maranhão, Matto Grosso, Estado de Bahia, Rio, and Rio Grande do Sul. During the previous year, at least two other farms were closed down. One in Matto Grosso, and the other in Parana. At the end of 1961, the director of the Dianapolis Farm in the State of Goiss, was Amaro Luiz de Carvalho, known by the name of "Palmeira," member of the Brazilian Communist Party of Pernambuco.

Later, this farm was turned over to Carlos Montalroyo. The Farm of Maranhão was directed by Carvalho through his assistant Cleto da Conta Campolo Neto. The farm in Parana was directed by Diniz Cabrel Filho, another longtime member of the U.B.E.S. who joined the leagues. The farm at Rio Grande do Sul was under the supervision of Adamastar Antonio Bonilla, Secretary of the State Committee of the Brazilian Communist Party of Rio Grande do Sul.

6. Moraes continued in his purpose to recruit candidates for guerrilla instructors selecting from them a group which was to be sent to Cuba for intensified training. In a general way, the procedure covering the trip to this group was similar to that of the first group of the Peasant Leagues trained in Managua, Cuba. The candidate traveled to Cuba as a delegate from Brazil to one of the many Cuban anniversaries. Frequently he stayed at one of the best hotels in Havana, visited the city for several days as a tourist, and then began his training in Havana itself or in nearby surroundings. After approximately 1 or 2 months training, the candidate returned and began to put into practice in one of the farms belonging to the leagues, the new technique just learned.

Moraes and Ferreira attempted to evaluate each candidate before final acceptance and

providing training. Before being invited to join the leagues, the candidate was usually subjected to a test on several questions to be answered, such as:

Do you believe in a social revolution for Brazil?

Would you swear to dedicate yourself, even at the expense of your own life, to the success of your objective?

Have you any other interests which would interfere with the bringing about reforms for your country?

Do you consider it advantageous in the event of having to take part in guerrilla warfare in order to introduce these reforms in Brazil?

On November 8, 1961, Josquin Hernández Armas, new Cuban Ambassador in Brazil, presented his credentials to President Goulart. Already at this time, the Ambassador was aware that his government was giving support to the guerrilla groups of the leagues.

On December 8, 1961, when the major number of the farms were being opened, the translation by Mauricio Grabois, of Che Guevara's book, "The War of Guerrillas," was published. This book became the basic manual for all guerrilla activities undertaken in the farms belonging to the leagues.

On December 27, 1961, Alexina Line Crespo de Paula, the wife of Jullião and her two children left Brazil for an extended trip to Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Red China, and North Korea. Alexina acted as messenger for the leagues, which she had frequently done in Brazil. On this trip she spoke to Mao Tse-tung, giving him information on conditions existing in Brazil, all of this mission was confided to her by Moraes. Alexina told Mao that the leagues counted on the support of many high ranking officers of the army; that the leagues were in possession of arms, munitions and money necessary to explode a violent revolution. When Alexina returned from China and related what she had told Mao to various members of the leagues, her statements caused a great feeling of animosity against Moraes among leaders of the leagues. In the opinion of these dissatisfied leaders, the optimism of Moraes had cost them their valuable financial support from Red China.

In January 1962, the Brazilian Army discovered that arms, manufactured in Czechoslovakia were being introduced into the country for distribution, possibly among the Peasant Leagues.

On the 22d of April, Jullião issued a statement of his convictions in his "Declaration de Ouro Preto," in which he said that the Brazilians should aspire toward giving their lives for the creation of a new society, which he said would be "like the dawn."

On April 30, 1962, the Communists Jaos Amazonas de Sosa Pedrosa and Mauricio Grabois arrived in Havana to participate ostensibly in the celebration of Labor Day, but this was only a pretext to cover their real objectives. They both attended the guerrilla course. In the middle of August 1962, two more Communists, Carlos Danielli and Angelo Arroyo arrived in Cuba to take the same course.

At the end of May 1962, Pedro Mota de Barros, another member of the leagues, who accompanied Moraes to the Cuban training camp in Managua, left Brazil on a trip to establish links between Jullião and other Communists revolutionaries throughout Latin America. Mota de Barros visited Chile, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela, where he met with revolutionaries who had trained with him in Cuba. In several interviews he asked them what type of support they could give to the leagues and what could the leagues give to them.

In the beginning of July 1962, the farm in Parana was closed after one of the men who had been trained in Cuba, was mortally wounded by local farmers. The victim was

19-year-old Antonio Thiago Filho. Upon learning of this assassination, Moraes instructed the leaders of the farm to bury the young man and to close the farm, without giving the news of his death for publication.

In August 1962, the revolutionary plot of the Peasant Leagues began to appear. The first incident took place in Pernambuco when Joel Arruda Camara and Manuel Tertuliano, brother of Julião, and 12 other members of the leagues were arrested by the Brazilian Fourth Army. When arrested, they had in their possession documents revealing guerrilla operations plans prepared against rural properties located in nearly 30 municipal districts of Pernambuco. Julião reacted by stating that the imprisonment and the documents were part of a lie created by reactionaries against the leagues, and sent a telegram to President Goulart, protesting the Army's action.

The second public manifestation took place in August when Rivadavia Bras de Olivera, the same person who attended the training course in Managua, together with Atausipa Alves de Lima and José Bartolomeu de Souza, were served with a prison warrant in an office belonging to the leagues in Rio de Janeiro, situated on 496 Russel Street, apartment 803, which had been rented by Paulo Bezerra de Andrade, and employee of the newspaper A Lig, official organ of the Peasant Leagues. On that occasion a large quantity of Communist propaganda was found in the office.

The third manifestation of this revolutionary plot was the discovery of one of the farms of the leagues in Dianopolis, in the State of Goies on November 23, 1962. Guerrilla operation plans, again were occupied.

Temporary imprisonment was decreed against 26 members of the leagues by Judge Moreira Marques. Among these were Clodomir dos Santos Moraes, Amaro Luiz de Carvalho and Joaquin Ferrieros Filho, all of whom had been trained in Managua, Cuba. Besides these, another training companion was included, Clovis José Estevez de Souza.

The fourth manifestation was the imprisonment of Clodomir dos Santos Moraes, Celia Lima and José Francisco da Silva on December 13, 1962. Clodomir was arrested while transporting a shipment of arms to members of the leagues; he carried a visiting card of Antale Chardin, chief of the consular section of the Soviet Union Embassy on which Chardin had written a note apologizing for falling to keep an appointment with Julião. Celia Lima, who had been traveling companion of Moraes for some time, was more than just a companion. Moraes had included her in his guerrilla activities, giving her the supervision of what she called School of Revolutionary Development, situated in a house in the northern zone of Rio de Janeiro, where courses ranging from ideological indoctrination to sabotage were held.

The fifth and most recent manifestation of the guerrilla activities is the contents of the documents found in the wreckage of the Varig plane which crashed near Lima, Peru, on November 27, 1962. The documents will explain many of the leagues' problems, in the development of their guerrilla capacity as well as their overall program.

Beginning in 1962, many of the Leagues' leaders commenced complaining about the activities of Moraes, accusing him of dedicating more importance to his own interests than to those of the Leagues; of not concerning himself with the welfare of the Leagues' members, and what is even more important, of diverting funds given by the Cuban Government for promoting guerrilla activities, for his own personal use.

During the development of the Peasants Leagues, the Cuban Embassy in Rio de Janeiro, constantly directed their activities. The official of the Cuban Embassy, principally responsible for the operations of the Leagues, was Miguel Bruguera del Valle,

in reality a member of the Cuban Secret Service in Brazil, acting under the pretext of his post of cultural counselor of the Cuban Embassy. At times, Bruguera had two other assistants—"cultural attachés," Felix Pita and Arturo Garcia Rodriguez. They maintained constant contact with Moraes and occasionally with Julião. Haroldo Hall, representative of "Prensa Latina" in Rio de Janeiro, also helped Bruguera in his contact with the Leagues. Bruguera directed the Cuban subversive operations which involved Brazilian Communist organizations, through the mediation of such well-known Communists as Mullis Bandsire, João Amazonas and Mauricio Grabois. In July 1962 Bruguera accompanied a group of Brazilians on a trip to Cuba to attend the celebration of the 26th of July anniversary. On August 24, 1962, Bruguera accompanied the Cuban Ambassador, Josquin Hernández Armas, to Goisins, where the Ambassador addressed the law school. On this occasion, Bruguera met with Tarsan de Castro, head of the Deliberative Council of the Peasants Leagues of Goise. This meeting between Bruguera and Castro is referred to in one of the documents found in the wreckage of the plane which crashed in Lima. Bruguera and Tarsan maintained frequent meetings to discuss the actions of Moraes, with which they were not in accord. Later, they continued their frequent meetings to discuss the disagreements occurring in the Leagues during the last 6 months of 1962. Bruguera wrote two letters to his chief (Petronio) in the Cuban Government in 1962, explaining the then existing conditions in the Leagues, signing them with his pseudonym, "Gerardo." Bruguera gave the two dispatches, with a copy of a letter in which he complained of the actions of Clodomir Moraes to the postal messenger, Raúl Capero Bonilla, who presided Cuban delegation in the recent Congress of the FAO, held in the Copacabana Palace Hotel, shortly before the delegation departed on their ill-fated journey. These dispatches have been recovered, the material referred to showing subversion in Brazil has been summarized in the press. Brazil frantically tried to cover up the dispatch report and to keep it secret because it documents Communist activities in Brazil.

NOT EVEN THE REDS FORESAW THEIR RISE TO POWER

(By Louis R. Stein)

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL.—Brazilian Communists wield more power today than they would have dreamed of when President Joao Goulart took office a year and one-half ago.

The man most responsible for giving a leg up to the Communists is the President himself.

Sr. Goulart has named numerous Communists and fellow traveling nationalists to key administration jobs and facilitated election of Communist slates in labor unions formerly controlled by more conservative leaders.

Yet anyone in Brazil will tell you the President is not a Communist.

The 15-man Cabinet contains three notorious Marxists: Hermes Lima, Foreign Minister; Joa Mangabeira, Justice and Interior Minister, and Almino Afonso, Labor Minister. Two doubtfuls in the Cabinet are Celso Furtado, Minister for Planning who was a Communist in his youth, and Jose Ermirio de Moraes, millionaire industrialist who financed the election campaign of Miguel Arraes, Communist governor of the northeastern State of Pernambuco.

DECLARED

Raul Riff, Sr. Goulart's press secretary, is a self-declared Communist. Evandro Linse Silva, director of the presidential secretariat, is closely linked with the Communists.

The most important labor organization taken over by the Communists since Sr.

Goulart's inauguration is the National Industrial Workers Confederation which unites most industrial unions in the country.

Sr. Goulart personally intervened in the last CNTI election on behalf of the Communist-backed slate led by Dante Pelecani.

Sr. Goulart named Francisco Mangabeira, an extreme leftwing nationalist son of the Justice Minister, to be president of Petrosbras, the Government oil monopoly. Petrosbras is the largest single firm in Brazil.

"Watermelons" (green outside, red inside), a term used here to describe fellow travelers, hold many lesser posts in the Government.

NO VETS

Congress has no control over composition of the cabinet or choice of government agency directors. It can summon ministers to give an accounting but cannot veto nominations.

Sr. Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party has assisted election of Communists to Congress. Communist Party leader Luis Carlos Prestes says the current Congress contains 17 Communists. Most ran with PTB backing.

There were only 16 Communists in the Federal Legislature at the time the Party was outlawed in 1948. Sr. Prestes, then a senator, was among those who lost his mandate. The Party still is officially illegal but operates openly without interference.

It is feared in democratic circles here that Sr. Goulart is riding a tiger. Leftist forces around him could cause considerable trouble and possibly destroy his austerity program if they decided to actively oppose it.

Finance Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas, now in the United States for money talks, has already run up against leftist criticism which, for the nonce, is being held in check by Sr. Goulart.

All efforts to bar Communists from the armed forces and Government jobs have been thwarted.

The latest attempt was a bill written by Social Democratic Party (PSD) Deputy Mendes de Moraes. It was killed in committee.

NAMELESS

Sr. Prestes said this month that since the Cuban revolution Communists sympathizers have increased six-fold in Brazil.

The Prestes' estimate may be high, there is no denying that there are more Communist sympathizers in Brazil today than ever before.

And, if Sr. Prestes had spoken the whole truth he would have added that the bulk of the new strength yearns for revolt instead of a silent revolution through subversive infiltration.

The mellowed chief of the bloody 1935 revolution now professes to believe the Communists can eventually bring off a bloodless coup in Brazil.

Sr. Prestes wrote the 1958 party manifesto laying down a new nationalistic, anti-American policy to bring the party into line with Nikita Khrushchev's program of subversion as opposed to revolution.

The new line split the party and fostered the formation of several deviationist groups. The strongest of these is led by veterans Joao Amazonas and Mauricio Grabois.

Their weekly newspaper Classe Operaria gives extensive play to Chinese communism and ignores Russia except to criticize the Kremlin. So does the weekly Politica Operaria, published by the Frente Operaria, another splinter group.

The Chinese and Castroites are flooding the country with propaganda. Castro portraits unfailingly appear at student rallies and meetings of the revolutionary rural leagues, led by self-proclaimed Marxist Deputy Francisco Juliao.

In his latest comment on the subject Sr. Juliao said, "The only way out for the oppressed masses is armed struggle."

No one in Brazil could hope to mount a successful coup without control of the armed forces.

The Communists know this. Leftwing nationalist officers also appear to realize it.

Hence, both groups are courting the non-commissioned officers.

Sr. Juliao flatly stated recently that "we expect to carry out our revolution with the help of the sergeants in the armed forces."

BRASS

The importance of the noncoms as an emerging new power within the armed forces was stressed recently by the presence of high brass sitting down front at a noncommissioned officers meeting.

On hand were: Admiral Pedro Araujo Suzano, navy minister; Brig. Reynaldo de Carvalho, air minister; Gen. Osvaldo Ferreira Alves, first army commander; Admiral Candido Aragao, marine corps commander.

The generals applauded political speeches by noncoms who criticized Congress and the courts. The military code actually prohibits any person in uniform from making political statements.

All the officers present were leftwing nationalist supporters of President Goulart. Fellow officers call Admiral Aragao a Communist while General Alves proclaimed at a public gathering that he and fellow traveling Labor Minister Afonso "have the same ideology."

Several sergeants were elected last October to state assemblies with nationalist and Communist backing and one was sent to the Federal House of Deputies.

Although the electoral laws require that they resign from the service before they may be seated they are fighting in the courts to retain their military status while serving as congressmen.

BRAZILIAN ENVOY GIVING EXPLANATION

Brazil's Ambassador Roberto Campos today said his hour-long talk with Under Secretary of State George W. Ball yesterday had "helped to clarify unwarranted misunderstandings" of a U.S. charge that Communists had infiltrated the government of President Joao Goulart.

But the Brazilian envoy sternly warned that "one should be extremely careful in making these accusations."

The controversy has cast a shadow over a visiting mission's efforts to get U.S. aid for Brazil's 3-year multimillion-dollar economic reconstruction program.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FROM COMMUNIST YUGOSLAVIA AND POLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. HARVEY of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include tables.)

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 I brought to the attention of the House the fact that our

President has not taken the action which section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act clearly requires him to take. Section 231 requires that the President shall withdraw most-favored nation treatment from Communist Yugoslavia and Poland and require that the products of these countries be dutiable at the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries. Although this is a matter of principle more than anything else, I want the House to understand that it is not just a demand for action based on legality alone, but that the factual situation is such that serious injury is being caused to domestic industries because of the failure of the President to act in accordance with the explicit requirement of the statute.

There are two rolled zinc plants in Indiana. One is located in Greencastle and the other in Muncie. These plants manufacture zinc sheet and zinc strip. There is substantial production of zinc strip by these plants. Formerly there was substantial production of zinc sheet but imports now have ruined the zinc sheet business in this country. In 1962 more than half of the imports of zinc sheet were of Yugoslavian origin. These foreign zinc sheet imports had an average declared foreign value in 1962 of only 12.1 cents per pound—less than the price which my constituents must pay for the metal from which to manufacture zinc strip and zinc sheet. In 1952 imports of zinc sheet represented a quantity equivalent to only 1 percent of domestic industry production. For 1962 zinc sheet imports represented a quantity equivalent to 48 percent of domestic industry production. I am presenting zinc sheet import statistics and not zinc strip import statistics because the Bureau of the Census only collects data on zinc sheet imports. Zinc strip imports are in a category with a number of other products even though interestingly enough, zinc strip production is many times that of zinc sheet.

Employees in rolled zinc plants in my State, I am pleased to say, are well paid. Their wages are more than eight times the wages paid in metal industries in Communist Yugoslavia. With a situation such as this, combined with the fact that the raw material in the United States costs more than the declared Yugoslav value of the finished manufactured product, it is no wonder that domestic zinc sheet manufacturers virtually have been put out of business and that domestic zinc strip manufacturers probably will suffer the same fate if the President does not act at once to require Communist Yugoslav products to be assessed the same full-duty rates as the other Communist countries.

Under the circumstances, I ask you, why does not the President act? Even if the law were discretionary and he only had authority to act to assist an American industry confronted with ruinous import competition from Communist Yugoslavia, you would think he would act. But this is not a discretionary matter. The law clearly requires that the President shall take this action. He has not acted, and he has given no indication of when he is going to act. This is one of the greatest affronts Congress has ever received from a President. A law is passed which the President signs, and then he does not act as the law specifically provides that he shall act.

New, let us be completely fair about the matter and see if there is any basis for the President failing to act. In 1951 in the Trade Agreements Extension Act the same language was used to require the President to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from countries which are members of the world Communist movement. This involved 13 countries and yet President Truman was able to complete action and issue the necessary directives within 2 months—August 3, 1951, Proclamation No. 2935, 16 Federal Register 7635, and 16 Federal Register 7637. You see, most-favored-nation treatment was not withdrawn from Yugoslavia and Poland at that time because it was determined that these countries, while Communist countries, were not members of the world Communist movement but instead, so-called independent Communist countries—an interesting refinement and distinction.

Because of this distinction and the fact that most-favored-nation treatment was not withdrawn from Yugoslavia and Poland under the 1951 act, it was necessary to include an additional provision in the 1962 act which directed that most-favored-nation treatment be withdrawn from any Communist country irrespective of whether or not the country is a member of the world Communist movement.

Five months have now elapsed since the effective date of the law. Only two countries are involved and yet the President has not acted. President Truman was able to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from 13 countries within a 2-month period, but President Kennedy has been unable to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from only 2 Communist countries in 5 months.

Are we Members of Congress going to do nothing while the President disregards the explicit requirement of the law and American industries are being ruined by import competition from Communist countries?

Zinc strip produced in the United States

	Production (in tons)	Sales		Exports (in tons)	Average number of employees	Man-hours expended	Average hourly pay to employees	Approximate fringe cost per paid hour	Average total hourly labor cost	Labor cost as percent of cost of finished product	Dollars of profit (loss) on these items
		(A) Tonnage	(B) Dollars								
1959.....	22,364	22,221	\$10,773,634	1,052	242	459,716	\$2.37	\$0.48	\$2.85	14.55	\$505,347
1960.....	30,843	30,433	10,823,882	637	228	392,673	2.44	.49	2.93	14.63	(73,197)
1961.....	31,902	31,890	11,028,920	761	236	407,691	2.47	.51	2.98	13.70	(98,273)
1962.....	33,924	34,036	11,635,416	1,016	220	408,171	2.56	.54	3.10	13.67	116,920

Source: Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association.