

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3563

As requested, I am sending a copy of the letter and am also sending one to my Congressman here in New York.
Sincerely,

MARGARET M. WELTZ.

WEST ROXBURY, MASS., May 7, 1963.

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BATES: We can start to exploit the weaknesses in the Communist colonial empire by developing an effective policy toward the captive nations.

Last January, Congressmen Flood and Derwinski, introduced H.R. 14 and H.R. 15 respectively which would implement the Captive Nations Week Resolution of 1959 and establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. This committee would conduct inquiries into, study, and prepare concrete recommendations for an effective U.S. policy toward the captive nations. Many other Congressmen introduced similar resolutions.

On behalf of the Boston Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee I am asking you:

- (1) To introduce a resolution of your own to establish a Committee on Captive Nations;
- (2) To support H.R. 14 introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD;
- (3) To use your influence in the House Rules Committee, to which H.R. 14 was assigned, and especially with the chairman, HOWARD W. SMITH, to initiate action on the proposed legislation by opening public hearings.

Although the request does not come from your district, we believe that our fight with communism and our support for the captive nations is of national concern and must have the support of all Americans.

Your action and support in this matter will do much for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF
AMERICA, INC., BOSTON BRANCH
OREST SZCZUDLUK, Public Relations.

Diplomatic Relations With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Tuesday, May 28, there appeared in the Columbia Record, a newspaper in South Carolina, an editorial entitled "Soviets Say We Will Leave Cuba." This editorial discusses reports which have appeared in press that the Communists are predicting that in 1963 the United States will evacuate Guantanamo Naval Base and establish diplomatic relations with Cuba. The editorial, incidentally, notes that the President has denied the validity of such Communist predictions. We need, however, to be repeatedly reminded that Cuba continues to constitute a threat to the free world and to the security of the United States and that any accommodation of the Communists will surely have dire consequences. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

SOVIETS SAY WE'LL LEAVE CUBA

An ominous report from Europe adds to the mounting evidence that the United States is following a line of appeasement in its confrontation with Communist aggressors.

The account came from Columnist Constantine Brown. Judging by his dispatches on subjects with which we are familiar at first hand, he is currently the most penetratingly accurate writer on the affairs of Western Europe.

Reporting from Rome, his home base for the last 2 years, the veteran Washington correspondent says that jubilant Communist bloc diplomats there predict that "this year will be a year of peace and good will." In the Soviet lexicon the beguiling words mean that the free world will make major concessions to Communist tyranny.

The Red spokesmen, particularly pleased by the restraining hand placed on freedom-loving Cuban refugees, see a new spirit in Washington. They note that "things are improving considerably."

Tied in with their optimism is a confident prediction that United States-Cuban relations will be resumed in 1963. This, they say, will be followed by American evacuation of Guantanamo naval base after the 1964 elections.

Here is the strategy the Soviets hint will be used to get American military forces off the island:

After the United States-Cuban rapport becomes effective, Castro will campaign intensively to send the Yanquis home. Anti-colonial arguments which the United States employed to break up the empires of Western Europe will be used against the Cuban base. International pressure will be exerted to make the United States follow the example set by Britain and France in closing naval bases outside their sovereign domains. Domestic leaders will argue that because of the strong military installations in Florida and Puerto Rico, the naval base in Cuba is not needed.

At the same time, a line of reasoning that gained currency when Soviet missiles were first spotted in Cuba will be revived. The contention was that since we demanded withdrawal of Soviet arms from Cuba, we should recall our own. The Russians are furiously reinforcing the island and will be able to make a deal by nationalizing the armaments and removing all except "advisory" personnel, or "technicians."

The Constantine Brown report helps to validate the hellbent determination of our national policy planners to effect an accommodation with the Soviets, and to achieve disarmament and world government within the framework of the United Nations. A prerequisite to that idealistic accomplishment, they evidently believe, would be a parity of strength between the ideological foes. This would mean a slowdown in the West and a speedup in the Communist bloc.

The Soviets and their allies are doing their part. Russia has the world's largest submarine force; Red China, the fourth largest. The U.S.S.R. is vastly expanding its surface fleet. It has the biggest and best equipped army. It is continuously trying to close the missile gap. It has deployed an antimissile system. And it has begun surveillance of our aircraft carriers with long-range bombers.

On the other hand, the United States has discontinued bomber production. General LeMay, main advocate of strategic manned aircraft, will be dropped from the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 12 months. The Skybolt program for planes that could fire atomic rockets more than a thousand miles was scrapped. Development of an antimissile system was delayed at least another year. Land-based missiles were withdrawn from Turkey and Italy.

Our only sensational advance is in the

Polaris submarine program. We now have 9 deployed and a target total of 41. But hear what one of the top naval officers in the submarine service had to say:

"Our Polaris system is good and great. We think it is the best. It is as accurate as any other missile we have. It is hidden and invulnerable. It can fire under water and underway. But we cannot put all our eggs in one basket. That would make it easy for the enemy. We believe in the use of bombers, land missiles, and all our other weapons on land and sea and in the air."

The Polaris is credited with being the sole deterrent against Soviet nuclear attack, but overreliance on a single method of defense could have disastrous results.

Premier Khrushchev has openly declared on an offensive against the free world in "wars of liberation" to upset independent governments. We cannot combat this menace to our sovereignty by vigorous retreat.

Most especially, we cannot withdraw from a frontier only 90 miles away without abandoning safeguards to our national security.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Felton, Sibley & Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the outstanding firm of Felton, Sibley & Co., Inc., which has been manufacturing quality paints and chemical coatings since 1863. This year this great progressive firm is celebrating its 100th anniversary. Their main office is located in my congressional district and many of my constituents, I am happy to say, are employees of Felton, Sibley & Co.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include a historical capsule of Felton, Sibley & Co. in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

HISTORICAL CAPSULE

Business was established at the northwest corner of Fourth and Cherry Streets, Philadelphia, in 1863, where it has remained to this day.

The original members of the firm were Samuel K. Felton and Conrad F. Rau, who formed a copartnership under the name Felton & Rau. When Edward A. Sibley joined the firm shortly thereafter, the name became Felton, Rau & Sibley. In 1892, Mr. Rau withdrew from the firm and the name was changed to Felton, Sibley & Co. Following the death of Mr. Sibley in 1910, the concern was incorporated under the laws of Pennsylvania. Mr. Samuel K. Felton passed away in 1914 at the age of 82, having actively served in the paint industry for over 64 years; and with his passing a leading trade publication wrote, "We mourn the loss of one of the oldest and foremost figures in the paint industry; his fame as a pioneer in the trade is spread over the four corners of the country and his constructive and inventive ideas are just as well known." Mr. Felton was also known far and wide for his humanitarian, philanthropic and church work.

In 1913, the firm celebrated its 50th anniversary. Following are a few excerpts from the many tributes accorded by industry, press and citizenry:

"To be 50 years in the manufacture of paints and varnishes means something and

there are but very few that can stand out in the clear sunlight and give an account of themselves. Mr. Felton, as the head of this grand old firm, you have done your work well and set the pace for the younger ones to follow. To be one of the oldest varnish houses in America, to be among the oldest paint manufacturers and still at the helm guiding the business, is a thing to be proud of."

"No paint house in the country has a higher standard for honorable business methods and uniform quality goods."

"This well-known house bears an enviable record of achievement and the history of such a remarkable growth indicates clearly what may be expected when a manufacturer endeavors to make a product that can be relied upon to accomplish exactly that for which it is made. Scrupulous care is exercised in the making of all their products and, as science finds new ways and better materials, Felton-Sibley is always ready to adopt what was proven after successful experimentation. They are progressive and show a steady increase of business each year because those dealing with them found the products made were as good as present knowledge and machinery can make them. We might further state that, while Philadelphia has concerns that were established many years ago, there is none that is more favorably known in the trade than Felton-Sibley."

"To Mr. Felton and his fortunate associates I beg to present congratulations coupled with the hope that generations yet unborn may look upon the name of Felton-Sibley & Co. with the same respect and admiration that today is accorded to it and to those who made it the synonym of mercantile integrity and human fair dealing."

In 1916, a new structure was dedicated at Fourth and Cherry Streets by members of the second and third generations. Officers were J. Sibley Felton, president; Walter G. Sibley, vice president; Horace B. Felton, second vice president; Howard B. Felton, treasurer; and J. Robinson Silver, secretary. At the dedication it was recalled when nearby farmers drove into Philadelphia with limeseed oil, which they sold to paint manufacturers. In those days the Merchants' Hotel, Fourth Street near Arch, was Philadelphia's leading hotel. Varnish at that time was sold mostly in drug stores, where it was carried in bulk; the customer brought in his own container and the varnish was measured out to him. The owner of a drugstore wanting some varnish would furnish the gum, oil, turpentine, and driers. The varnish maker would take this with his kettles and other equipment and go to an open lot, along a stream if possible, so that he would have water to put out his fire when the kettle was through cooking.

Throughout the years, Felton-Sibley has pioneered and produced almost every type paint product and chemical coating—finishes for hairpins to Army tanks, traffic, bridge, and guard rail paints for bustling turnpikes and expressways—the multitude of interior and exterior household and industrial finishes so popular today.

When planetaria first came on the national scene, Felton-Sibley was commissioned to develop a unique dome finish, which has served as the standard to this day, for retention of acoustic fidelity on unusually high-type ceilings. The Fels Planetarium, Philadelphia; Hayden in New York and Boston; Adler in Chicago; Buhl in Pittsburgh; and the Moorehead in Chapel Hill, N.C., are among the more prominent planetariums using this special formulation.

The Betsy Ross House and other famous historical shrines have been protected and preserved by Felton-Sibley paints over the years. The finishes used in the restoration of Independence Hall were produced by Felton-Sibley after painstaking research. They match as closely as historical records indi-

cate the original paint formulas used almost 200 years ago.

In 1980, Alsamite Paint Co., Inc., Carroll Ltd., Inc., and H. M. Woche & Son, all Philadelphia based firms, were annexed as subsidiary divisions.

Present officers are: Horace S. Felton, chairman of the board; A. R. Steinberg, president; Herman J. Zimmerman, vice president; and David L. Steinberg, secretary-treasurer. Employees number over 150; 40 of which have served 25 years or longer and 6 over 40 years.

Through the trade sales division, a complete line of paints, varnishes, lacquers, shellacs, and paint sundries is marketed by over 1,000 independent retail dealers throughout the Middle Atlantic States. The industrial and painter maintenance divisions serve leading architects, painting contractors, interior decorators, city, State, and governmental agencies, plants, offices, and institutions in all phases of paint and chemical coating requirements.

Felton-Sibley is a charter member and exclusive eastern U.S. constituent of Spectromatic Associates, an international group specializing in the formulation and merchandising of custom tinted paints. Abreast of space-age paint technology, over 1 million colors can now be electronically projected and translated into precise paint formulas by Felton-Sibley through specially developed automated equipment. In addition to participation in local paint groups, active membership is maintained in the National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association and the Federation of Societies of Paint Technology.

After 100 years of continuous manufacturing at the same location, the Felton-Sibley parcel is being appropriated by the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia as part of the program for the development of the Independence Mall Urban Renewal Area.

Plans are being consummated for a new ultramodern plant, consolidating all divisions under one roof with ample area for future expansion and embodying latest manufacturing, shipping, and administrative facilities.

Maryland Lions Tribute to U Thant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 4, 1963, the Lions of District 22 in Maryland honored U Thant, the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

I had the privilege of being present on this occasion and of listening to the remarks of Edgar M. Elbert, LL.D., past international president, 1952-53. In order that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read Mr. Elbert's impressive address, I have obtained a transcript which I ask to be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

I take this opportunity to commend the Lions of Maryland, as well as the Lions International, for the fine work they are doing.

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

My respects and commendations to you, International Director Bob. To our Past In-

ternational Director Massey Roe, and in the interest of time, I shall omit all of the distinguished people at the two head tables with the exception of those who are representing here this evening our distinguished honored guest, the first of whom being Honorable Ambassador of Burma, Hon. Sein, and the second being the Honorable Phillip Dean, and I want to say to that gentleman that I am certainly happy that he changed his baptized name, because I couldn't have pronounced it anyhow. (Gerassimos Theodoros Christodoulou Svoronos-Gigantes.) Now you tell me, isn't this a mouthful? My respects also, to all of the members of the various committees and the governor's staff that have arranged this outstanding event; to all Lions here assembled and guests; and, finally to those of you of the weaker sex who have been born and raised on the gentle hillsides of Maryland and are now mellowing in the love and attention as only Lion's husbands and only Lion's sweethearts can give such attention; to you I say: "a very pleasant evening to you all." [Applause.]

I noticed a Lion to the left of the podium who looked a bit sour at this remark and I want to say to this fellow Lion that if I were to be [flash picture taken] (thank you sir, if they turn out I'll take a dozen) [laughter]. I want to say to this fellow Lion that if I wanted to be very truthful about my observation I might say this is the finest fathers and daughters banquet that I have ever attended. [Applause.]

All right, all right. We start timing now. Fellow Lions, ladies and guests, I would certainly be remiss in the matter of my innermost convictions should I fail to say to you at the outset how very, very happy I am to be back with you. It has been my privilege down through the past 20 years to appear at many, many meetings in district 22 and in particular district 22-C. It has always been a pleasure—I've learned to know you—I've learned to love you. I know that we have in common a great goal—the goal of Lions International, and, to see here tonight what you are doing and to note that you have raised your horizons on an international level—just tugs at my heart to think that I belong to an organization that has widened its horizon to this effect, especially about a man concerning whom we shall hear more. As a matter of fact, I was in your community on April 1, just about the time that the cherry blossoms were beginning to strike out. Three days later I left Vancouver for Tokyo, there on Lions business.

Fellow Lions and ladies, what happened in Tokyo and in the Orient during our Lions International board there would be a topic for a conversation which you and I could have for 2 hours. But, let us shorten the report and say this: it was there, in 1951-52 my pleasure to charter the first Lions Club of Japan. And it was my pleasure to charter three and four in Japan, in 1953. And imagine my amazement to speak there at a 10th anniversary of the Kobe and Tokyo Lions Clubs, and to find out that within 10 short years, 560 Lions Clubs are now constituted in the country of Japan with over 30,000 Lions members. But, before we go any further, I must say to you something that I have promised to do all my life, whenever I address an American audience, a promise that I intend to keep, viz: that from this point at which I stand and look over this audience up and down and right and left, I want to say to you that this is a beautiful sight from where I stand. Oh, not because your clothes are better than they would be somewhere else, not because perhaps that your savings accounts or your bank accounts are larger than somewhere else, no, that isn't the point. I say it because of something that was mentioned here a few moments ago by the man who received this accolade in the name of our honored guest, U Thant. This is a beautiful sight because in this

A3550

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 4

Attorneys for the workers who don't want a union asked for a hearing—which the NLRB already had assured the union it could have.

No soap. No hearing for employees. No election to determine how they feel on the matter.

Just whom is the NLRB supposed to represent? Surely its main interest should be for the workers. Not what the NLRB or the union thinks is good for the workers, but what the people themselves want.

An organizer can get an election any time he can present signatures of employees saying they want one. Why can't the employees get the same consideration?

Under our democratic system, government presumably represents the will of the governed. Excessive NLRB action is making a lot of alert citizens wonder about that.

Castro
Castro Reportedly Given Protection in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article titled "Castro Reportedly Given Protection in Florida," by Mr. Robert Jones, which appeared in the May 5, 1963, issue of the Indianapolis Star. The article states that the Castro forces in Cuba received important help from the United States before Fidel Castro came to power. The article was called to my attention by Mrs. Harold B. Chait, president of the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, 4546 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md., and at her request I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

CASTRO REPORTEDLY GIVEN PROTECTION IN FLORIDA

(By Robert Jones)

One of the great mysteries of the "Cuban problem" is also the least known. The mystery: Who were the Washington officials who spread a mantle of protection over flagrantly illegal Florida-based gunrunning to Fidel Castro and his guerrillas from 1956 to 1959?

There would be no Cuban problem today—and no elaborate U.S. security network to protect Red Cuba from similar operations—if Florida had not, during those years, been turned into a privileged sanctuary for Castro subversives.

Castro and his guerrillas were financed, armed, supplied, and reinforced from Florida. The Castro revolution could never have triumphed had officials enforced U.S. laws.

Few Americans outside Miami realize how wildly and flagrantly the law was violated by Castro agents in that city when Fidel was fighting in the Sierra Maestra.

Miami was virtually a Castro military base. Arms were trucked semiopenly through the city. An airlift shuttled tons of munitions to Castro's guerrillas from Miami airfields.

Ships packed with armed rebels—similar to the anti-Castro raiders now being feverishly suppressed—left south Florida for Cuba almost daily.

This was not mere bureaucratic negligence. Again and again, the Batista government and local law enforcement officers tried to persuade Washington to bring the situation under control.

Not only did the State Department resist the pressure, word was passed that Federal agencies in Florida were to keep hands off Castro operations.

Irritated, Miami law officers expressed oblique resentment at the Government's attitude in a report dated August 4, 1958, and released by the Dade County Department of Public Safety:

"Several weeks ago, at a request of Michael Fox, Chief of the Miami Beach Police Department, a meeting was held at the Miami Beach Police Department. This meeting was attended by Charles Zmuda and Sylvester Billbrough of the Public Safety Department. Chief Fox, Captain Webb, and Pat Purdue represented the Miami Beach Police Department.

"According to Mr. Zmuda, the meeting was also attended by Agent Davis of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The purpose of the meeting was for mutual aid and cooperation in dissolving the operations of the Cuban revolutionaries.

"As a result of the meeting, large amounts of guns, ammunition, and hand grenades were seized and confiscated by the joint efforts of the Public Safety Department and the Miami Beach Police Department. It was at this time that Agent Davis stated that the Federal Bureau of Investigation wanted nothing to do with the activity."

The limited resources of the local police were, however, quite inadequate to cope with what was an international conspiracy.

But once Castro triumphed, the hands-off policy was reversed. The FBI was ordered to crack down on anti-Castro activities. And today, the U.S. Government is forced to spend millions of tax dollars in deploying air, land, and sea security forces to prevent an anti-Communist duplication of Florida 1956-59.

Debt Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Harley L. Lutz entitled "Debt Discipline" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, May 29, 1963.

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

DEBT DISCIPLINE: AN EFFECTIVE CEILING REQUIRES CONTROL OF SPENDING

(by Harley L. Lutz)

Congress, once again, has pushed the Federal debt limit a little higher. The latest hassle, which ended yesterday with a temporary boost, was a rear-guard tactic. Everyone knew that some increase was inevitable, as it has been time after time over the past decade. The reason is clear. Federal spending will have risen by more than 50 percent from 1955 through fiscal year 1964—from \$64.4 billion to an estimated \$98.8 billion. In the same period revenues were so far outrun as to cause an aggregate estimated net deficit of \$46 billion.

The principal issue to be discussed here is whether there should be a debt limit. The

history of the overall limit since its introduction in 1938 does not make a very good case for it, even aside from the immense debt increase during World War II. In February 1946 the debt dropped to its postwar minimum of some \$252 billion and in June of that year the limit was lowered from \$300 to \$275 billion. As Congress debated action yesterday, the limit was \$305 billion and Treasury operations were bumping against this ceiling.

In approaching the issue posed here, the first and most important question is: Do we really mean business or are we to continue the hypocrisy of this kind of sham battle against uncontrolled spending? If the administration, the Congress, and the people are not willing to accept the discipline of a firm debt limit, then the policy of debt limitation should be discarded as a bit of fiscal flummery. The position taken here is that there should be a debt limit and a firm policy of its strict enforcement.

NO MAGIC FIGURE

There is no magical, absolutely definite figure for this limit. The deficit for fiscal year 1963 is by this time fairly well set and provision must be made to cover the expenses, whatever they may be. The case is different for the fiscal year 1964, especially in view of the slow pace of congressional action on the appropriations for this year. Various well-considered recommendations for reduced spending in 1964 have been advanced by responsible persons and organizations, and other sound proposals could no doubt be developed if such guidance and support were needed to stiffen the backbone of the Congress in a firm stand against further borrowing.

From the operational standpoint there can be no question that the 1964 budget can be reduced enough to involve no additional increase in the debt limit, beyond whatever may be necessary to cover the 1963 deficit. The political hazard of a bold stand for financial sanity has probably been exaggerated by such myths as "spending and electing," but a firm national policy of debt control would provide timid candidates with a reasonable excuse for getting less Federal spending in the home district where success in such endeavors is the chief argument for reelection.

It must be emphasized that a debt limit, by itself, would not restrict Federal spending although, as indicated below, it would tend in that direction. The primary purpose of a firm debt limit is to prevent unrestrained debt-financed spending.

Among the reasons for a firm debt limit policy are the following:

1. The absence of a debt limit would tend toward even less compunction regarding debt financing and an even greater readiness to resort to it than now exists. The abuses of authorizations to spend from public debt receipts as a means of bypassing the scrutiny of the appropriations committees have been frequently exposed.

EVIDENCE OF INTEGRITY

2. Debt limitation is widely regarded as visible evidence of fiscal integrity, that is, the honesty and sincerity of the Government's intention regarding the value of the currency and of all fixed investments. The rigmarole of a debt limit which always moves upward just one step ahead of spending is a kind of lipservice to the concept of fiscal integrity but it is of no avail as a protection against the perils of unlimited debt increase.

3. A firm debt limit would be a powerful source of confidence among investors with regard to the stability of the public debt as a long-range investment. While there are other factors involved, the shift of investor preference from long-term to short-term Federal debt paper invites speculation as to the degree of confidence in the future value of long-term Treasury bonds. In 1946, for

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3549

of Ivy league habitues, or other superficial adolescent malades.

I believe these symptoms go deeper. I believe they are harbingers of a more virulent and fearful disease. I believe they are external evidences of a malignant misconception of the relationship between individual freedom and submission to authority. Rebellions against methods of teaching, marking, discipline, required standards of dress, demeanor, and deportment in private institutions of learning indicate quite clearly that many people, parents and pupils alike, are confusing the political freedom of individuals in a democracy with the disciplinary and academic conformity intrinsic to a private educational institution.

Private schools and colleges are not built by public funds, supported by public subsidies, directed by public representatives, do not offer curriculums of public, democratic choice, and are not subject to private or individual judgments of policy, so long as the institutions are licensed by the state as being in the interest of the common good and by the church as being contributory to common spiritual welfare.

They are built, owned, operated, and governed by private organizations, either religious or lay. No student is bound to attend them; but if the student is permitted to attend, he or she must submit to the authority responsible for them. If they object to that authority, they are free to leave; but as long as they remain, they must obey or else be forced to go. This principle is necessary for the maintenance or order and justice in and toward the institution; but it is also equally essential to the proper character formation of the students, to which the institution commits itself to develop in all their charges as law-abiding citizens of our America of tomorrow.

I might say parenthetically that this same principle of submission holds true, with adaptations of course, to public institutions of learning, for no society can achieve its end without the exercise of authority. What kind of a reversal of order would result if those to be educated governed the educators; if those who came to learn were allowed to teach the teachers and determine the courses of study for themselves?

Not only is this theme timely, it is most appropriate to this dedication, because the foundress of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus, Mother Cornelia Connelly, had such strong convictions on the necessity of respect for authority and the autonomy of authority as the basis of sound education that she fought for its preservation in her philosophy program, and techniques of education through opposition from her blood relatives and conferees at home, through local ecclesiastical personages, all the way to the top echelons of government in Rome itself. Finally, toward the end of her life she won her case against terrific odds, and since then her victory has proved its merit in the achievements of her spiritual daughters.

The life of Cornelia Connelly, wife, mother, nun, and probable saint, reads as grippingly as a first-class detective story, so compelling that only with great restraint can one put down her biography once it has been opened.

A profitable use of our time today might be spent on outlining for you some of the principles that guided the evolution of Mother Connelly's educational program. First of all, she started with the premise that her plan of operation could be most effective if it were limited in scope only to those children of homogeneous cultural background. She knew it would not do for a whole system of public education where schools were compelled to accept all children, regardless of home condition. Her program demanded that the respect for authority required in the school had to be supported by

the same respect for authority in the home, where education really begins, where it most extensively developed freely, and where it reaches its flower and maturity.

Notice that she did not require sameness of intellectual ability, sameness of racial ancestry, sameness of social standing—but only sameness of cultural background in which the authority of home life followed the divine natural pattern of the father being the head, the mother his handmaid, and the children being the God-entrusted charges for the parents to guide, govern, and direct until the time when the youngsters were capable of functioning independently through the exercise of their fully developed faculties and powers. Only in such cases would the home complement the school in its efforts to educate the child.

Her technique of teaching employed St. Thomas Aquinas' axiom, "Nil in intellect, nisi prius in sensus," as its launching pad. "Nothing passes into the intellect, without first passing through the senses." Hence she insisted upon eye appeal as a premise to intellectual interest. Get the child interested with its senses and imagination, and then you can teach her to memorize and to understand.

Applied to the abstract subject of arithmetic, she urged that mathematics be started "partly with a box of bricks, a box of cards, weights, and a few plain figures capable of being taken to pieces, so that their eyes and imagination become involved in the observation of objects. They do not use numbers for their own sake but for the sake of the things numbered. They count by sight and are not able to abstract numbers from the things."

She believed that the lessons learned must be short and within the capacity of the child. Yet she was careful to discriminate and to protect any particular sparks of individuality and inspiration she divined in any of her pupils. Justice, she believed, did not lie in equality of treatment, and she felt firmly that "one yoke for the lion and the lamb is tyranny."

"Be accurate" was her favorite advice, but nonetheless she advised her nuns not to be too severe in the criticism and correction of compositions. "We are not to expect a perfect composition from a child. It is easy to correct redundancy, but a barren genius has no remedy."

Thus we see her recognition of individual differences of talent and ability, which can be encouraged and developed to the full, over and above the basic requirements exacted of all pupils.

There are other distinctive features of Mother Connelly's educational philosophy, of course; but these are sufficient to highlight their value as being worthy of your endorsement and justification for the investment you parents are making in this form of private but expensive type of education.

To the students here at Holy Child let me say a final word of admonition: "To whom much is given, of her much is expected." You are enjoying rare opportunities of education, purchased by those who love you and who are dedicated to your total development with all their souls. Your responsibility of profiting by these opportunities is great indeed. Do not be turned aside from the attainment of these goals by the temper of our times. Remember that you are here to learn and make your own a solid set of values that will equip you for outstanding citizenship and leadership in moral perfection. The key to your full response is humble and willing submission to authority in school and at home.

Let it never be said that you are weeds growing in a hot house of unreality. Orchids and flowers of rare delicacy require a warm climate of extraordinary protection until they are mature and strong. But there comes a day when these blossoms of beauty

and fragrance can be admitted to the unstable elements of the world outside, where they will radiate their loveliness and charm without danger of wilt or blemish, because their inward stamina has been strengthened and readied to such a degree that they can withstand the perils of heat and cold without losing the vigor and loveliness of their inner life. May such be the fruits of every graduate of this new Academy of the Holy Child Jesus.

Labor Relations Board Makes People Wonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Spartanburg Herald of Spartanburg, S.C., has posed a most important question in an editorial dated May 30, 1963, and entitled "Labor Relations Board Makes People Wonder." I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

LABOR RELATIONS BOARD MAKES PEOPLE WONDER

What is the proper function of the National Labor Relations Board?

Is it to be a partisan, a promoter, a protector of labor union organization—with very little regard for the wishes of the people affected?

Or is it to be a fair and impartial arbiter of collective bargaining, with the principal aim of guaranteeing freedom of choice for the individual?

With almost every official act, the NLRB is expanding the image of itself as being a champion of the union organizer. And this is the agency which exerts the official U.S. Government policy on affairs of the workingman.

Its latest ruling concerning a Spartanburg firm intensifies concern about NLRB fairness.

Sixteen months ago, the NLRB called an election at P. Garvan Co. after the union showed to the Board's satisfaction that enough employees wanted a union to warrant an election.

They did vote for union representation. But the union and the company never have reached a contract agreement.

A group of employees decided they did not want to be represented by the union any more. They circulated a petition asking the NLRB to call a new election—a legal and accepted procedure. Ninety-one out of 95 workers signed.

When this application went to the NLRB, its spokesman said that if an election were approved a hearing would be scheduled for the union to argue its case on appeal.

The opposite happened. The NLRB would not accept the petition. The union had filed a charge that the company was not bargaining in good faith. This, said the Board, would have to be settled first.

To stop an election, the union can churn out charges about as fast as a typewriter will go.

Congress falls in its own duty to enact a directive concerning them.

Both the executive branch of the Government and the Congress need to catch up with the courts of America. The courts are so far ahead of the Congress and the executive branch of the Government in making available to the Negroes of this country their rights under the Constitution of the United States that we in the Congress ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

EXHIBIT 1
S. 1665

A bill to require that all State or local programs supported with Federal funds shall be administered and executed without regard to the race or color of the participants and beneficiaries

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the policy of the United States that, in all programs administered or executed by or for the benefit of the States or their political subdivisions and supported, in whole or in part, with funds provided by the United States, no individuals participating in, or benefiting from such programs shall be segregated or otherwise discriminated against because of race or color.

SEC. 2. No moneys shall be paid by the United States to or for the benefit of any State or political subdivision thereof under any program of Federal assistance—

(1) to plan or provide facilities, services, benefits, or employment in such State or political subdivision,

(2) to defray administrative expenses of a program in such State or political subdivision, or

(3) to defray the cost of carrying out a program in such State or political subdivision,

if the participants in or beneficiaries of such program in such State or political subdivision are segregated, or otherwise discriminated against, because of race or color.

SEC. 3. The programs of Federal assistance referred to in this Act include, but are not limited to, programs—

(1) to assist the construction of hospitals, schools, highways, airports, parks and recreational areas, community facilities, and public works generally;

(2) to provide old-age assistance, medical assistance for the aged, assistance to needy families with children, assistance for maternal and child welfare, assistance to the blind, assistance to the disabled, and public health and welfare assistance programs generally;

(3) to provide financial assistance to the unemployed and assistance in the training, retraining, and placement of workers;

(4) to provide assistance to business, including agriculture;

(5) to provide assistance to educational institutions and to individuals for educational purposes; and

(6) to provide assistance to National Guard and civil defense activities.

CARE FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 522) to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers.

SHIPS SUPPLYING COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in keeping with my practice of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the number and names of ships which have been supplying Communist Cuba, I wish to bring the record up to date at this time.

During the period May 8, 1963, to May 17, 1963, 11 free-world freighters and tankers totaling 85,077 gross tons called in Cuba. In the course of this period four Lebanese freighters of a combined weight of 28,710 gross tons stopped in Cuba. This tonnage places Lebanon at the head of the list for this period. In connection with the increased appearance of Lebanese vessels in Cuban ports, it is only fair to note that Lebanon under its laws is capable of exercising only slight control over the movement of its vessels. I am advised by reliable sources that over 50 percent of these vessels traveled in ballast to Cuba to accommodate the exportation of Cuban sugar products. Lebanon is currently revising its statutes and regulations relative to the registry of its merchantmen to the end that more effective control can be maintained over its flagships. It is my understanding that Lebanon is holding the registration of new vessels in abeyance until such time as new regulations can be enacted. A perusal of the names on the list of Lebanese ships calling in Cuba since January 1, 1963 would lead one to believe that they are for the most part the proprietary interests of Greek nationals. I intend to pursue this further and provide my colleagues with a full report at a later date because if such is the case it is most unfortunate in light of the Royal Hellenic Government's recent action to curtail Greek shipping to Cuba. The flag of registry and tonnage of those ships calling in Cuba during the period May 8, 1963, to May 17, 1963, is as follows:

Ardgem, British, 6,981; *Athelmere*—tanker—British, 7,524; *London Victory*—tanker—British, 12,132; *Embassy*, Greek, 8,418; *Maria Santa*, Greek, 7,217; *Malou*, Lebanese, 7,145; *Gtorgos Tsakiroglou*, Lebanese, 7,240; *Mantric*, Lebanese, 7,255; *Noemi*, Lebanese, 7,070; *Achille*, Italian, 6,950; *Trebisnjica*, Yugoslav, 7,145.

CUBAN MILITARY BUILDUP

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on May 9, the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate issued an interim report on the Cuban military buildup. The report was based not on the opinion of the subcommittee, nor on the opinion of any one member of the subcommittee, but on the facts as the subcommittee found them to be. The report of the subcommittee was concise and contained a minimum of editorialization.

Unfortunately, some people have, nevertheless, made a great effort not to comprehend what the report said. One of the best jobs of misreading the report appeared in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post on Tuesday, May 28. I ask unanimous consent that this letter to

the editor be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

INTELLIGENCE IN THE CRISIS

As a Naval Reserve intelligence officer, I cannot let Roscoe Drummond's analysis of the recent Stennis subcommittee report on our intelligence in the Cuban crisis, which appeared on May 20, go unchallenged.

Mr. Drummond says something needs to be done because of the inability of John A. McCone and our other intelligence chiefs to convince the subcommittee that all Soviet long-range missiles have been removed from Cuba.

Well, this report is a wondrous document: you can prove either side of the question by it. I suppose this comes from a desire for unanimity. But there is a grave question, when as fundamental an issue as the integrity and competence of our Nation's intelligence services are concerned, whether the public interest is really served by an inquiry that stops short of a clear-cut verdict just to keep everybody happy.

In any event, one thing is clear: all of the report's conclusions which refute charges against our intelligence services are based on facts, while those which give aid and comfort to the critics are either self-contradictory or rest on nothing more substantial than theoretical skepticism.

Take the matter of strategic missiles, for example. The intelligence chiefs to a man conclude these missiles have been removed. To oppose this impressive professional judgment the committee offers only absolutes and philosophical skepticism. Theoretically, to be sure, anything is possible. But is this really any way to run a railroad—or a country?

Likewise, the substantial errors the committee says resulted from a belief by some intelligence officials that the Soviets would never put missiles in Cuba vanish in the face of facts appearing elsewhere in the same document.

For example, from July 1962 on, all rumors about such missiles—whether contrary to subjective beliefs or not—were scrupulously checked out, we are told, with uniformly negative results. Until the pictures came in from that October 14 U-2 flight nobody—either in the Senate or out—had any confirmation of any long-range missile rumors.

So what substantial errors were there? What more could intelligence have done, even had they believed otherwise? Should they have represented as confirmed fact rumors for which no confirmation could be found? Or was the subcommittee perhaps indulging some of the administration's more vocal critics in its midst by taking the intelligence community to task for a failure to manifest psychic powers prior to October 14?

Whatever the ultimate answer to our troublesome problems in Cuba, it can only be complicated by an unwillingness on the part of those in possession of the facts to repudiate unequivocally unfounded charges against an intelligence community that actually turned in a magnificent and highly successful performance last October.

SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
Member, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives.

Mr. THURMOND. Among other charges hurled at the report is the allegation that one can prove either side of the question by it.

Mr. President, if there is this much misunderstanding about the report, I think it should be translated into the simplest possible language for the bene-

fit of those who will understand it only in four letter words. I will, therefore, attempt to paraphrase in simple English the major findings of the subcommittee.

The U.S. intelligence chiefs do not know if Soviet nuclear missiles are now in Cuba or not. They do not believe there are any Soviet missiles in Cuba. They do believe there could be Soviet missiles in Cuba. They do not know how many Soviet missiles came into Cuba last year. They photographed a lesser number of missiles in Cuba than the 42 Premier Khrushchev said he took out. They cannot testify that they know the Soviet missiles in Cuba last fall are gone.

The intelligence chiefs testified that there are thousands of caves in Cuba and that many of the caves are suitable for storing concealed nuclear missiles. They do know that some of these caves are being used for military purposes. They have seen military activity going on around the mouths of the caves. They do not know what is inside, but they prefer to believe the caves are used only for ordinary, non-nuclear military supplies.

Our intelligence chiefs rely primarily on photographs taken from high-altitude U-2 planes for our information on Cuba. The method is good, but not perfect, for seeing what is lying around on open ground in the daytime. The method is susceptible to camouflage. It cannot see through forests. It cannot see what takes place at nighttime, and obviously, it cannot see inside caves. Almost everything our intelligence chiefs know about Cuba now is what can be seen on open ground in the daytime from a high altitude.

Our intelligence services also do not know how many Soviet troops are in Cuba now, or how many were there at any other time. Last October we came very close to having to fight in Cuba, this time with American troops, not refugees. At that time our intelligence services estimated considerably less than 8,000 Soviet personnel in Cuba. Now they say there were at least 22,000 Soviet troops in Cuba last October. They do not know if that number is high enough because they cannot see to count troops deployed under forest cover or in hilly areas with the primary method which they are using for gathering intelligence. What a surprise would have been in store for our GI's had they gone into Cuba last October to find the enemy at least 3 times stronger than expected.

Officials in the executive branch have told the American public that our intelligence shows some Soviet troops have been withdrawn from Cuba. Our intelligence chiefs say they believe 5,000 Soviets left Cuba between October and November 1962, leaving 17,500 Soviets in Cuba. They believe another 4,000 to 5,000 Soviets left since January 1963. They also state, however, that there are left in Cuba about 17,500 Soviet troops. Either our intelligence chiefs cannot do simple arithmetic, or they just plain do not know what number to start subtracting from or adding to. Whatever the reason, it is obviously the administration's policy to fix a certain number

for the Soviet troops in Cuba, whether it is true or not. Furthermore, our intelligence chiefs do not know how many Soviet troops are arriving in Cuba each week. They do not know whether the number of Soviet troops they believe left Cuba were withdrawals or merely rotations. Last, but far from least, they have no evidence that any combat ground troops for the Soviet mobile armored groups in Cuba have been withdrawn.

Our intelligence chiefs refuse to accept human resource reports of refugees and others of 40,000 Soviets in Cuba—just as they refused to accept human resource reports of Soviet missiles in Cuba last summer—but they do concede that Soviet military strength in Cuba is so great that a revolt from within or an invasion by refugees from without is impossible. Unlike the time of the Bay of Pigs, today an invasion of Cuba would take an all-out assault, on the order of Iwo Jima or Salerno in World War II. This should answer those who complain that the Cuban people should rise up and get rid of the Communists.

One of the excuses for our lack of intelligence last fall is a story reported by the news media of a jealous fight between CIA and the Air Force. According to this publicly disseminated story, there was a photography gap between September 5 and October 15 while CIA and the Air Force squabbled over who was going to run the reconnaissance missions. So far, the administration has not given the subcommittee any evidence of a photography gap or any facts to support the rumored squabble.

We did find that the evaluation of intelligence information during the crisis last fall was hopelessly poor. Official estimates were based primarily on negative information; that is, that the reports of the Soviet military buildup could not be confirmed beyond a reasonable doubt. This attitude by our intelligence evaluators was the result of an unfounded belief that it would be against Soviet policy to undertake a nuclear buildup in Cuba. This belief had official sanction, recognition, and approval, and, for that reason, the intelligence services were in the awkward position of having to come up with absolute proof beyond a reasonable doubt in order to challenge this official, but false, belief on Soviet policy.

Although our intelligence on Soviet military power in Cuba is inadequate, incomplete, and in some cases obviously untrue and unreliable, the subcommittee feels that our intelligence people deserve credit for proving last October beyond a shadow of a doubt that Soviet nuclear missiles were indeed in Cuba, and for doing a job that can be considered competent under such unfavorable political conditions and limitations as they experienced here in Washington.

However, our intelligence services do not really know very much about Cuba, and the subcommittee is deeply worried over the intelligence community's restriction to aerial photography, most of it high altitude, in gathering intelligence on Soviet nuclear threats to America's heartland, which are at such close

range in Cuba as to allow us practically no warning time and perhaps not even time to retaliate.

As for the hemisphere as a whole, although our intelligence chiefs know that the strategic island of Cuba is today a bristling armory of Communist weapons and troops, they are restricted from really finding out the whats, the whys, and the wherefores of guerrilla and subversive threats to every Latin American country.

No matter how well designed are the slick public relations programs aimed at quieting the fears of the American public about Cuba, they cannot change the facts. The Soviets know what they have in Cuba, and no public relations lullaby is going to erase their knowledge of the threat of the armaments in Cuba. Nor is any public relations program going to help us know what is in Cuba, and, for now, we just do not know.

One thing we do know: the intelligence chiefs testified that if the missile systems and their personnel are available in Cuba in a state of maximum readiness, the Soviet medium range nuclear ballistic missiles can be made operational within a matter of hours. Even if the missiles are in storage in Cuba, they can be taken out and fired within a matter of hours after Moscow gives the order. From these admittedly limited findings of the subcommittee so far made, several facts are obvious. First, aerial reconnaissance alone, particularly when it is limited almost exclusively to high-altitude flights in the daytime, gives us only very limited intelligence about Communist military forces in Cuba. For instance, we still do not know how many missiles came into Cuba before last October, nor where they were during the time between their arrival in the Islands and the time they were conspicuously displayed for us to photograph. Intelligence chiefs admit that this period of successful concealment of nuclear missiles in Cuba was not less than 1 month.

From this, it is not difficult to deduce the fact that we shall remain in ignorance of the precise nature and size of the military buildup in Cuba until we either demand and get onsite inspections, or until we untie the hands of our intelligence services and allow them to use the broad spectrum of intelligence collection devices and methods in which they are trained, rather than making them stick primarily to aerial reconnaissance.

This, in simple language, is what the report has to say. Had the facts developed by the subcommittee shown that our intelligence collection and evaluation was totally creditable, the report would have said so. On the other hand, had the facts developed by the subcommittee shown the work of our intelligence services to be all bad, the report would have said so. As it is, the report has pointed out the defects and lack of knowledge which generally prevailed and still prevails, while commending the intelligence services for doing a very creditable job last October with aerial photography when they were given the all-out go ahead to do so.

The chairman of the subcommittee has announced that the investigation will continue. I am sure that all members of the subcommittee would like to state to the Senate in a final report that our intelligence services are then doing a thoroughly creditable job, both in collection and evaluation, and that they know precisely what is going on inside Cuba. This can only happen, however, if the intelligence community is treated loose to use all means at their disposal without any restrictions based on the hope of preventing irritants to the Kremlin bosses.

It is now within the power of the subcommittee to give the intelligence services the go-ahead. Unfortunately, the subcommittee can only report the facts, and cannot make them. It would be a sad day indeed if the subcommittee did nothing more than climb on the bandwagon of the public relations campaign to downgrade the military buildup in Cuba.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I feel I should suggest the absence of a quorum before bringing up a conference report.

I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that I shall then be recognized to present the conference report.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON].

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

SISTER CITY PROGRAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, what I consider to be a most worthwhile project of the people-to-people program is being observed in my State of Kansas and 37 other States across the Nation. It is the sister city program which fosters mutual understanding between communities in this country and abroad. The sister city portion of the people-to-people program is one of its most important functions. Headquarters of the program, with which many Senators are familiar, is in Kansas City, Mo. President John F. Kennedy is honorary national chairman, and former President Dwight D. Eisenhower is chairman of the board of trustees.

Sister city affiliates are promoting international friendships which better serve to cement relationships among our other friends throughout the world by

actual and continuous contact among the lay citizens and the officials of the cities and towns of this Nation and their affiliated cities abroad.

I am particularly interested in this program, Mr. President, because Kansas has two cities, Leavenworth and Wichita, which are participating in the sister city plan. Leavenworth's sister city is Wagga Wagga, New South Wales, Australia, and Wichita has Orleans, France, as her sister city.

Last week, I had the pleasure of visiting with Miss Jeanette McGarry, representing the people of Wagga Wagga, who had just completed a 3-week stay in Leavenworth, Kans. Former Leavenworth Mayor J. F. Mitchell organized the sister city program in his area in 1961, and it was at that time that Leavenworth selected Wagga Wagga. During Miss McGarry's 3-week stay, she was the guest of the present Leavenworth mayor, Victor Shalkoski, Jr.

Included in this young lady's busy itinerary while in Leavenworth were tours of such projects as county soil conservation areas, Girl Scout troops, League of Women Voters meetings, volunteer hospital groups, art galleries, and churches. In addition, she visited our State capitol at Topeka, where she was given a tour of our State government offices. With this impressive tour by Miss McGarry, I know that the social and governmental bond between Wagga Wagga and Leavenworth has become more understandable to her, and has given her a clearer picture of our communities and their way of life. In October, Vera Lee McGinnis, who was chosen Miss Leavenworth, will repay Miss McGarry's visit, and spend 3 weeks meeting and becoming acquainted with the residents of Wagga Wagga.

Miss McGarry's hosts while a visitor in our country were Lt. Col. and Mrs. W. H. Wansley, of the Australian Joint Services Mission to the United States. I compliment Miss McGarry for the fine representation she offered while visiting Kansas, and I believe the sister city plan of the people-to-people program is accomplishing a most beneficial purpose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of those States with cities having sister city programs be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ACTIVE TOWN AFFILIATIONS BY STATE (AS OF MARCH 1963) COMPILED BY AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION

ARIZONA

Phoenix—Orange, France.
Tucson—Trikkala, Greece.

CALIFORNIA

Alameda—Lidingo, Sweden.
Alhambra—Granada, Spain.
Arcadia—Tripolis, Greece.
Artesia—Koudekerk-aan-den-Rijn, Netherlands.
Bakersfield—Wakayama, Japan.
Bellflower—Los Mochis, Mexico.
Burbank—Inchon, Korea.
Burbank—Solna, Sweden.
Campbell—Vohburg, Germany.
Chula Vista—General Roca, Argentina.
Claremont—Guanajuato, Mexico.
Claremont—Kumasi, Ghana.

Coronado—Puerto Montt, Chile.
Delano—Asti, Italy.
Delano—Morelia, Mexico.
Downey—Guadalajara, Mexico.
El Segundo—Guaymas, Mexico.
Fresno—Lahore, Pakistan.
Fresno—Moulmein, Burma.
Gardena—Ichikawa, Japan.
Glendale—Hiraoka, Japan.
Gonzales—Somoto, Nicaragua.
Hemet—Cootamundra, Australia.
Lodi—Kofu, Japan.
Lodi—Lodi, Italy.
Long Beach—Valparaiso, Chile.
Los Angeles—Elath, Israel.
Los Angeles—Nagoya, Japan.
Los Angeles—Salvador, Bahia, Brazil.
Menlo Park—Galway, Ireland.
Merced—Albury, Australia.
Merced—Fort Archambault, Chad.
Merced—Mercedes, Uruguay.
Modesto—Barranquilla, Colombia.
Monrovia—Monrovia, Liberia.
Montebello—Ashiya, Japan.
Napa—Como, Italy.
Norwalk—Hermosillo, Mexico.
Oakland—Fukuoka, Japan.
Pasadena—Ludwigshafen, Germany.
Pasadena—Mishima, Japan.
Palo Alto—Palo, Philippines.
Redlands—Hino, Japan.
Redondo Beach—La Paz, Mexico.
Redondo Beach—Managua, Nicaragua.
Richmond—Shimada, Japan.
Riverside—Sendai, Japan.
Sacramento—Manila, Philippines.
San Bernardino—Tachikawa, Japan.
San Diego—Yokohama, Japan.
San Francisco—Osaka, Japan.
San Jose—Okayama, Japan.
San Jose—San José, Costa Rica.
San Leandro—Ribeirão Preto, Brazil.
Santa Ana—Santa Ana, El Salvador.
Santa Barbara—Cuzco, Peru.
Santa Cruz—Ajaccio, Corsica.
Santa Fe Springs—Santa Fe, Argentina.
Santa Monica—Mazatlán, Mexico.
Sausalito—Vina del Mar, Chile.
Sonoma—Chambolle-Musigny, France.
South Gate—South Gate, England.
Stockton—Shimizu, Japan.
Studio City—Ajajic, Mexico.
Torrance—Konya, Turkey.
Vallejo—Trondheim, Norway.
Paso Robles—Aguas de Lindoia, Brazil.

COLORADO

Boulder—Meppel, Holland.
Colorado Springs—Fujiyoshida, Japan.
Denver—Brest, France.
Denver—Takayama, Japan.
Littleton—Bega, Australia.

CONNECTICUT

Bristol—Bristol, England.
Darien—Mercara, India.
Glastonbury—Glastonbury, England.
Hartford—Thessaloniki, Greece.
New Haven—Madras, India.
Newington—Talca, Chile.
West Hartford—Concepción, Chile.
Westport—Marigny, France.
Woodbridge—Linqere, Senegal.

DELAWARE

Dover—Lamia, Greece.
Newark—La Garde Freinet, France.
Wilmington—Kalmar, Sweden.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington—Bangkok, Thailand.

FLORIDA

Clearwater—Nagano, Japan.
Coral Gables—Cartagena, Colombia.
Fort Lauderdale—Medellin, Colombia.
Hollywood—San Salvador, El Salvador.
Homestead—David, Panama.
Miami—Bogota, Colombia.
Miami Beach—Fujisawa, Japan.
Orlando—Gotania, Brazil.
Pensacola—Chimbote, Peru.
Pensacola—Miraflores, Peru.

Royal Palm Beach—Terresopolis, Brazil.
St. Petersburg—Takamatsu, Japan.
Tampa—Cordoba, Argentina.

GEORGIA

Savannah—Guatemala City, Guatemala.
Thomasville—Luneburg, Germany.

HAWAII

Honolulu—Bruyeres, France.
Honolulu—Hiroshima, Japan.
Honolulu—Naha, Okinawa.

ILLINOIS

Chicago—Milan, Italy.
Deerfield—Ludinghausen, Germany.
Glen Ellyn—Calatayud, Spain.
Western Springs—Rugeley, England.

INDIANA

Mishawaka—Soest, Germany.
Terra Haute—Taijima, Japan.

IOWA

Davenport—Kaiserslautern, Germany.
Des Moines—Kofu, Japan.
State of Iowa—Yamanashi Prefecture,
Japan.

KANSAS

Leavenworth—Wagga Wagga, Australia.
Wichita—Orleans, France.

KENTUCKY

Lexington—Deauville, France.
Louisville—Montpellier, France.
Louisville—Quito, Ecuador.
Shelbyville—Bitburg, Germany.
Versailles—Versailles, France.

LOUISIANA

Alexandria—Kochi, Japan.
Monroe—Lajes, Brazil.
Pineville—Omagari, Japan.

MAINE

Calais—Calais, France.
St. Stephen—New Brunswick, Canada.
Scarborough—Scarborough, England.

MARYLAND

Frederick—Landau, Germany.
Forest Heights—Villavicosa, Philippines.
Hagerstown—Wesel, Germany.
Rockville—Pinneberg, Germany.
Takoma Park—Jequie, Brazil.

MASSACHUSETTS

Amherst—Arcachon, France.
Boston—Kyoto, Japan.
Boston—Strasbourg, France.
Newburyport—Binh Hung, Vietnam.
Wellesley—Vohenstrauß, Germany.
Weston—Rhombas, France.

MICHIGAN

Bay City—Ansbach, Germany.
Bay City—Mechelen, Belgium.
Benton Harbor—Judiai, Brazil.
Detroit—Toyota, Japan.
Escanaba—Levadia, Greece.
Frankenmuth—Gunzenhausen, Germany.
Harper Woods—Epernay, France.
Harper Woods—Ettlingen, Germany.
Kalamazoo—Kingsion, Jamaica.
Kalamazoo—Numazu, Japan.
Kalamazoo—Fvugeres, France.
Saginaw—Tokushima, Japan.
Wyoming—Manizales, Colombia.

MINNESOTA

Minneapolis—Santiago, Chile.
Montevideo—Montevideo, Uruguay.
New Ulm—Ulm, Germany.
St. Paul—Nagasaki, Japan.
Worthington—Crailsheim, Germany.

NEBRASKA

Oakland—Hammenhog, Sweden.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Lacontia—Lilienfeld, Austria.

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic City—Royan, France.
Cedar Grove—Vilshofen, Germany.
Franklin Township—Kuusjarvi, Finland.
Hackensack—Passau, Germany.

Levittown—Avila, Spain.
Madison—Seven Oaks, England.
Montclair—Graz, Austria.
Newark—Newark-on-Trent, England.
New Brunswick—Tsurooka, Japan.
Trenton—Judiai, Brazil.

NEW YORK

Albany—Nijmegen, Netherlands.
Buffalo—Kanazawa, Japan.
Cortland—Peshawar, Pakistan.
Garden City—Aix-en-Provence, France.
Garden City—Coburg, Germany.
Jamestown—Jacobstad, Finland.
Long Beach—St. Marc, Haiti.
Lynbrook—Tobaru, Okinawa.
New York—Tokyo, Japan.
New Rochelle—La Rochelle, France.
Niagara Falls—Ise, Japan.
Niagara Falls—Lome, Togo.
Rochester—Rennes, France.
Rye—Rye, England.

NORTH CAROLINA

Asheville—Petropolis, Brazil.
Charlotte—Arequipa, Peru.
Fayetteville—Thiers, France.
New Bern—Bern, Switzerland.
Winston-Salem—Bucaramanga, Colombia.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fargo—Kaolack, Senegal.

OHIO

Barberton—Mishima, Japan.
Berea—Verria, Greece.
Chillicothe—Tulua, Colombia.
Dayton—Augsburg, Germany.
Lakewood—Kozu City, Okinawa.
Mansfield—Dar-es-Salaam, Tanganyika.
Toledo—Toledo, Spain.

OKLAHOMA

Clinton—Jujuy, Argentina.

OREGON

Corvallis—Antofagasta, Chile.
Coos Bay—Larvik, Norway.
Eugene—Chinju, Korea.
Forest Grove—Bornova, Turkey.
Klamath Falls—Rotorua, New Zealand.
Lake Oswego—Fucon, Chile.
Medford—Alba, Italy.
Milton-Freewater—Waimate,
New Zealand.

Milwaukie—Nago, Okinawa.
Portland—Sapporo, Japan.

PENNSYLVANIA

Berwick—Berwick-on-Tweed, England.
Bethlehem—Tondabayashi, Japan.
Chambersburg—Gotemba, Japan.
Cheltenham—Cheltenham, England.
Manheim—Mannheim, Germany.
Pittsburgh—Bilbao, Spain.
Swarthmore—Stade, Germany.
York—Aries, France.
York—Asuncion, Paraguay.

RHODE ISLAND

Newport—Shimoda, Japan.

TENNESSEE

Johnson City—Guaranda, Ecuador.

TEXAS

Corpus Christi—Yokosuka, Japan.
Dallas—Dijon, France.
Eden—Kordel, Germany.
El Paso—Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.
Houston—Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of
China.

Lubbock—Hannover, Germany.
New Braunfels—Braunfels, Germany.

UTAH

Ogden—Hof, Germany.
Salt Lake City—Matsumoto, Japan.

VIRGINIA

Abingdon—Abingdon, England.
Hampton—Southampton, England.
Luray—Luray, France.
Norfolk—Mojl, Japan.
Portsmouth—Dunedin, New Zealand.
Richmond—Richmond, England.

WASHINGTON

Bellingham—Tateyama, Japan.
Bremerton—Olongapo, Philippines.
Port Angeles—Rosenheim, Germany.
Seattle—Kobe, Japan.
Spokane—Nishinomiya, Japan.
Tacoma—Kokura, Japan.
Vancouver—Arequipa, Peru.

WEST VIRGINIA

Fayetteville—Lezoux, France.

WISCONSIN

Beloit—Pinerola, Italy.
Racine—Montellmar, France.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and the Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of May 28, 1963, pp. 9065-9066, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a relatively brief statement on the conference action on H.R. 5366, the Post Office and Treasury Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964.

The conference report contains a total of \$6,045,466,000. This is \$48,440,000 over the House bill, \$24,000,250 under the Senate bill, \$383,951,830 over 1963, but \$101,376,000 under the estimate.

For the Treasury Department, the conference bill contains \$1,103,650,000, an increase of \$108,614,530 over 1963. The amount allowed is \$49,580,000 under the estimate, and \$8.5 million under the Senate bill. Contained in this total is \$552 million for the Internal Revenue Service. This is \$48,900,000 over 1963, \$6 million over the House allowance, and \$26,300,000 under the estimate, and the sum allowed provides for a total of approximately 61,000 average positions, an increase of approximately 600 employees over the 358 provided in the House bill—for a total increase of approximately 900 average positions over 1963. The amount allowed is \$3 million and 500 average positions less than the Senate bill provided, but was all to which the House conferees would agree.

For acquisition, construction, and improvement in the Coast Guard, there is included \$51 million, the same as proposed by the House, \$3,750,000 under the

Am I really warning, or am I inciting violence and thus repaying past injustice to one minority with immense and irreparable future injustice to all Americans and to the American vision of unity in diversity which is the greatest gift in all history to free government?

COMMUNISTS IN CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Committee for Collective Security recently directed an open letter to the President concerning U.S. policy toward Cuba. The letter was printed in the Hartford, Conn., Courant of April 29 and has been particularly called to my attention.

Mr. President, I am firmly convinced that the first step toward an effective Cuban policy is a widespread public understanding of the issues involved and the threat that is presented to our Nation and this hemisphere by Soviet troops securely stationed 90 miles from our shores. In my judgment, this letter clearly explores the issues that we must consider, and offers a number of proposals for policy initiatives. Without fully endorsing all that is contained in the letter, I believe it is a constructive contribution to national thinking on the subject. I hope it will have full consideration from our policymakers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this open letter to the President, signed by Roderick Stevens, Sr., be printed following my remarks in the RECORD.

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

A POLICY FOR CUBA

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

Communism has secured a firm foothold in the Western Hemisphere through the military buildup in Cuba by Soviet Russia. The United States is therefore confronted with a choice between the use of force as by invasion, the acceptance through inaction of coexistence with Cuban communism controlled by Soviet Russia, and effective counteraction. Aerial observation, to learn what is happening in Cuba cannot reveal concealed troops, penetrate prepared camouflage, or monitor submarine delivery of military supplies. Whether or not there are defensive or offensive weapons in Cuba presenting a military threat to countries in the Western Hemisphere, the fact remains that, even if Russian military forces are withdrawn, Cuban infiltrators, and guerrillas will have been trained for the invasion and subversion of Latin American countries. Subversion is a form of aggression and can be psychological as well as physical—Czechoslovakia was taken over by the Communists without the firing of a single shot.

The most important means of preventing the spread of communism in Latin America is through the Alliance for Progress whose purpose is to assist each country to raise its standard of living by attacking the basic problems of poverty, disease, and illiteracy.

The United States, however, should call for an immediate meeting of the Organization of American States, and urge it to take measures, short of the use of force, to deal with the Cuban situation.

Following are suggested proposals for consideration by the Organization of American States:

Control the movement of individuals to and from Communist countries, especially Cuba.

Sever telegraphic and telephonic communication and airplane service between the member states and Cuba.

Forbid the use of ports of member states to vessels trading with Cuba.

Establish a Spanish language radio station for standard broadcasting into Cuba.

Jam radio propaganda from Cuba.

Prevent the flow of Communist propaganda through the mails.

Eliminate the right of asylum on university campuses where pro-Communists, many of whom take courses only to foment agitation, claim near-immunity from arrest.

Urge the countries of the free world to reduce and possibly discontinue their purchase of sugar from Cuba.

RODERICK STEVENS, Sr.,
Vice Chairman, Policy Committee,
Committee for Collective Security,
New York, N.Y.

SUPPORT FOR CHURCH-RELATED SCHOOLS

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, the question of support for the 9 percent of American students in religiously supported secondary schools and colleges and the 13 percent in church-related elementary schools is a veritable thicket of thorns that has too long prevented action on needed priorities in Federal aid to education. The Congress has been under attack for its failure to grasp these thorny branches and clear a path to educational betterment for our citizens.

Last week our colleague Senator RIBICOFF made bold to deal with this problem. He introduced bills that would provide a \$1,500 income tax deduction for parents of college children and deductions of \$100 for each child in a private secondary or elementary school. He further proposed Federal recognition of the concept of shared time, whereby children in church-related schools may use public school facilities for special purposes. He advocated assistance for special-purpose instruction and laboratory equipment, teacher training, auxiliary services such as school lunches and bus transportation, and assistance to institutions of higher education. Senator RIBICOFF's bills reveal a nice understanding of constitutional limitations and a most enlightened awareness of the problems of church-related and private educational institutions.

I commend him for his forthright approach to this issue. I warmly support the carefully drawn programs he has studied, prepared, and advocated in the Senate of the United States. It is my strong hope that his bold initiative may receive the support it must have if the needs of church-related schools are to be met and this tiresome, harmful issue laid to rest where it can no longer distract us from the important objective of adequate education for all Americans.

APPLICATION OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS TO MEXICO

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the finest and most illuminating discussions of the Alliance for Progress which I have seen in some time appeared in a recent "Letter to Maine" prepared by the distinguished junior Senator from that State [Mr. MUSKIE].

The observations in the letter are the result of a visit Senator MUSKIE made to Mexico as a member of the Third Interparliamentary Conference between the United States and Mexico. The Senator follows a cogent summary of the general concepts of the Alliance with a penetrating analysis of their application in Mexico.

I ask unanimous consent that this clear and concise and very well written letter to Maine be printed in the RECORD, so it may be read all the way from Maine to Hawaii.

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

LETTER TO MAINE FROM SENATOR MUSKIE

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., April 8, 1963.

DEAR FRIENDS: For the past several weeks, political events in Canada, culminating in the general election this week, have drawn our attention to the north. There we watched our friendly neighbors, entangled in domestic issues, reflecting their frustration over the economic and military impact of the dominating U.S. presence. Very similar frustrations influence our friends to the south in the Republic of Mexico. Both countries are basically friendly toward us. Nevertheless, even good friends can fall out unless there is continuing effort to resolve our differences.

From March 15 to 24, I was a member of the U.S. delegation to the Third Interparliamentary Conference between the United States and Mexico. We met with our Mexican counterparts in Guanajuato, located 230 miles northwest of Mexico City.

The agenda included: (1) An appraisal of the Alliance for Progress; (2) a perspective on the Alliance for Progress; (3) specific mutual problems including tourism, border trade, Mexican migratory farmworkers, and cultural exchange; and (4) peace, disarmament, collective security and international relations. Separate committees were appointed to each of these four general areas. I served on the first committee. We were provided with an instantaneous translation of everything said by our Mexican counterparts so that the discussions moved along rapidly. The talks were friendly, but remarkably frank and even blunt on both sides.

The purpose of the Alliance for Progress, which my committee discussed, is to promote economic development in Latin America and to insure that the fruits of that development are equitably distributed. The concept of the Alliance was announced by President Kennedy. Subsequently it was formalized at Punta Del Este, Uruguay, on August 16, 1961. All Latin American countries, except Cuba, became partners in the Alliance. Thus, each of these countries has pledged itself to internal reforms which are needed if the fruits of economic growth are to be distributed equitably.

Why are the objectives of the Alliance for Progress important? Poverty, ignorance, disease, oppression breed discontent and unrest, which undermine political stability and constitute an invitation to Communist infiltration. The turbulent and revolutionary history of Mexico is illustrative of the explosive forces which can be generated when the masses of the people are forced to live at less than subsistence levels without hope for improvement. The revolution of 1910-17 was the result of just such an explosion. The Government of Mexico ever since has devoted itself, with fluctuating success, toward the objective of closing the gap between the very rich and the very poor. In effect, it had been pursuing the objectives of the Alliance for the past century.

Mountain States to nominate him. But almost no one believes he could be elected.

Since Gov. William Scranton, of Pennsylvania, has successfully kept out of the glare of discussion, this leaves at the moment Gov. George Romney, of Michigan. The feeling is growing that in the end he will be the nominee. In the Eisenhower tradition of a nonpolitical citizens assault on the problems of Government, he has with his attractive personality wide appeal.

In 1936 President Roosevelt talked about issues scarcely at all. If only because he seemed to feel no pressure to discuss the great unfinished task before America, he moved across the country like a benevolent bishop visiting his diocese. In November he carried every State except Maine and Vermont.

One thing rides high in President Kennedy's consideration—to win by a much larger margin than the squeak of 1960. With no positive pressure of the great issues of the day in a year of prosperity he might conclude it would be shrewd to emulate the Roosevelt approach.

GROWING SUPPORT FOR THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I direct the attention of my colleagues to the growing support for the Youth Employment Act recently passed by this body and now being considered for action in the House of Representatives.

A recent poll taken by my Minnesota colleague, Representative ANCHER NELSEN, indicated that 67 percent of the respondents in this predominantly rural area, approved of the proposal to set up a Youth Conservation Corps.

In addition, our office has received a considerable amount of mail in support of the proposal from professional people, judges, social workers, probation officers and law enforcement officials who recognize the importance of this legislation in attacking the problem of high school dropouts and juvenile delinquency.

In a statement to the Beverly Evening Times, Beverly, Mass., Police Chief Edward Aucone, has pinpointed the urgency for passage in the House of the Youth Employment Act. His words, come from the background of many years of experience in the law enforcement field and dealing with juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Beverly Evening Times be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

As I noted during the floor debate on the Youth Employment Act, the outpouring of public support in favor of this legislation was most gratifying. During the Senate hearings on S. 1, 60 public and private witnesses appeared in support of the Youth Employment Act; one lone witness appeared in dissent. Dozens of other organizations filed supporting statements; two statements were filed in opposition. There was a most impressive galaxy of witnesses supporting the Youth Employment Act.

I am pleased to see this support continues to grow. I indeed hope that the House of Representatives can give the Youth Employment Act prompt consideration. This legislation offers our country a historic opportunity to begin making inroads in the national crisis over jobless youth.

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

[From the Beverly Evening Times, Beverly (Mass.) May 16, 1963]

CHIEF AUZONE ASKS SUPPORT OF YOUTH EMPLOYMENT BILL

Police Chief Edward Aucone today called upon the citizens of Beverly to contact their Congressman and urge him to vote favorably for the youth employment and conservation bill which will provide work and training opportunities for our young Americans.

Chief Aucone said: "this bill was passed by the Senate April 10 and it is expected to go before the House in the immediate future; therefore it is important that you write or wire your Congressman immediately.

"Favorable House action on the youth employment and conservation bill will provide work and training for youths from the age of 16 through 21.

"Members of the Youth Conservation Corps will receive \$60 a month in wages. They will be given lodging, board, work clothes, tools and equipment, medical and other necessities. The corpsmen will be under the direct supervision of adult conservationists, foresters, rangers, and others.

"They will work on—and receive training in—various jobs and projects involving general areas as erosion, stream control, reforestation, and construction of outdoor recreation and camp facilities.

"In addition, the corpsmen will be given technical training and educational skills through classroom periods after work hours.

"The youth conservation program acts both as a preventive of youth delinquency and as a needed asset in the conservation of our natural resources.

"The need for these projects is now, and it is an extremely pressing need. Kindly ask your Congressman to give these Presidential recommendations priority and swift, hearty endorsement."

MONGERS OF HATE AND HYSTERIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on June 3, 1963, the Evening Star published an editorial by the columnist William S. White entitled "Mongers of Hate and Hysteria." The editorial puts in proper perspective many of the points as well as the principles in controversy in relation to the racial tensions now raging throughout our Nation.

Mr. White is always objective in his thinking and in his presentations. He has rendered a service to the Nation in the writing of the editorial.

In order that the editorial might have wider distribution and come to the attention of all Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 3, 1963]

MONGERS OF HATE AND HYSTERIA (By William S. White)

This country, which has not in fact ever been very strong on hatred, is being warned, rightly if excessively, against the "merchants of hate."

We ought, however, to be alerted to another sort of merchant, too. This is the monger of hysteria and the peddler of a double-thick based upon double standards of truth and objectivity.

All over this land he is suddenly overstating and inflaming, rather than sensibly

seeking to abate, the current racial tensions of the United States.

To say that these are ugly tensions is to say the truth. To "warn" as many are doing as though on signal, that these tensions are the foreshadowings of national revolution is to speak inflammable falsehood. But this dangerous falsehood can become dangerous reality if the hysteria monger is not quieted or will not quiet himself and so cease bellying "fire" in a crowded national theater.

For now he is raising demands not simply for the just vindication of the Negro's actual rights. He is demanding the creation, for the Negro alone, of false rights which are not now, and never have been in all the long centuries of an Anglo-American concept based on orderly freedom, the rights of anybody at all.

Fairminded men—and being fair now requires fairness to the majority as well as to the minority and fairness also to constitutional truth—will agree that the actual rights thus far denied the Negro must be granted to him. These actual rights include the ballot and an equal opportunity in all the public facilities—the schools, the parks, transportation, and so on.

But they do not include and will never include—unless the Kennedy administration is to seek that destruction through Congress or the Supreme Court—the destruction of the most ancient and irreplaceable right of man in an open society. This is the right of privacy—outside his public obligations, including the private operation, wise or unwise, of private property.

If a shopkeeper can be compelled by unexampled Federal force to serve all who appear there and if on refusing, his business can be disrupted with Federal blessing by demonstrators swarming in from the streets, the institution of private property is finished. When the institution of private property is finished, personal privacy is finished.

The lawyer who prefers to choose his clients—or his clerks—can find his law office seized and occupied by those he has rejected. So can the doctor. So can any editor or other professional man. The employer undoubtedly can be told whom to fire and whom he must not fire.

Private property and private attitudes, however sourly run the one and however wrong the other, are not public utilities nor publicly established and paid-for enterprises. They are not buses on which all are free to ride by dropping in a dime.

And take note of this: This is no longer simply a problem for the South, that region of minority economic power, minority political power, and minority opinionmaking power. So long the South has been the very safe, and very rewarding, whipping boy for the hysteria monger comfortably established far from the scene of tortured dilemma.

But no more. Involved here is all of this country and every man in it, of every color. For, consciously or not, the hysteria monger—that collective symbol for demagogic politicians and emotionally transfixed opinion molders—is reaching for something far different from equal justice for minorities. He is, consciously or not, reaching for the end of orderly freedom.

And he is doing so by a blackmail of fear; fear that unless administration and Congress submit, they—the Negroes—will turn in violence upon their country.

This is more than a libel on the Negro race. This is creating an intolerable either/or climate alien to all that this Nation is.

A terrible issue is being approached not on such criteria as what in fairness and lawfulness should be done, but rather upon what must be done lest "they" bring anarchy and revolution.

Let those who ceaselessly warn of what must be done pause before it is altogether too late and ask themselves: