

ational shortcomings of these schools should be remedied. The prolonged mistreatment of the oversea teachers should be rectified in order that their salaries may be paid in conformity with the law of this land.

I am deeply disappointed with the continued substandard treatment given these teachers by the Department of Defense and appeal to this body to rise as one to correct the obvious and myriad problems of the oversea dependents schools.

**MISSILE RELIABILITY—A QUESTION OF FACT**

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, few controversies in recent weeks have elicited such cries of outraged indignation from the Johnson administration as those which met the statement by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] that this Nation's missile weapons systems left something to be desired in the way of reliability.

As all Members of this body are aware, Mr. President, the statement by the Senator from Arizona was countered with a heated denial by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who termed the charge "completely misleading, politically irresponsible, and damaging to the national security."

Despite this accusation by the Secretary of Defense, a transcript of hearings held by the Senate Committee on Armed Services only a year ago reveals that Mr. McNamara, himself had testified that none of our missile weapons systems had passed reliability tests. Because this testimony by the Secretary of Defense, under questioning by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] so vitally concerns the current charges and countercharges about our national security, I ask that the exchange, as taken from pages 95 and 96 of the published hearings of the Committee on Armed Services on February 20, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

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

Senator STENNIS. This is not a matter of thought control and anything like that, or news control. That is not the issue, as I see it. This is a matter of national security, and I believe in whooping up our side, but that doesn't mean being misleading.

Now, that is the background.

I am advised with reference to the Minuteman, for instance, considered a proven weapons system, that so far there have been only two Minuteman firings at Vandenberg Air Force Base and that they have been both unsuccessful.

Do you recall, is that correct?

Secretary McNAMARA. I understand there have been four, and all unsuccessful.

Senator STENNIS. Four.

Secretary McNAMARA. The Minuteman is operational in the sense that the first flight has been turned over to the Air Force and is operated by operational personnel, but it has only been a matter of days since that happened. [Deleted.] The Air Force has done, I think, a truly remarkable job in bringing that system in rapidly and well. [Deleted.]

Senator STENNIS. I wasn't suggesting it was unreliable, either, but my point is that it is not yet proven—

Secretary McNAMARA. It is not yet.

Senator STENNIS. [Deleted.]

Secretary McNAMARA. I think that is a fair statement.

Senator STENNIS. I understand further that you have had serious problems, too, in the Minuteman guidance system, and that of the eight Minuteman tests which were scheduled at Vandenberg to take place between June 11, 1962, and February 15, 1963, that the actual launchings were only two, and that they were both unsuccessful. You say there were four and how many of them were unsuccessful?

Secretary McNAMARA. There were four launchings, all unsuccessful, I believe.

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Now, this Titan II is scheduled to be operational this year, in March, although the only launch of a Titan II at Vandenberg was last week, and this missile blew up shortly after the launch, is that correct?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. You can't consider it then a proven weapons system.

Secretary McNAMARA. I don't believe, Senator Stennis, that we can consider any of our missile systems today, proven in the sense in which you are using the word.

Senator STENNIS. That was my next question, just what, if any, of them do you consider a proven weapons system?

Secretary McNAMARA. I don't believe any of them are proven in the sense you are using the word. For statistical reasons, based on the law of probability, we must carry out a specified number of launchings under operational conditions in order to develop any accurate estimate of missile reliability. None of the weapons systems have passed through that what I call reliability testing program as yet. They haven't passed through it because of lack of time.

**OUR UNCIVIL TREATMENT OF CIVIL SERVANTS**

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in our society the politician is a favorite target of criticism, sometimes deserved but so often unjustified. Dedication to duty, positive accomplishments are overlooked while extraneous issues become all important.

The noted columnist Paul Harvey effectively described this attitude in a recent column which I think it would be well for every American to review. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Harvey's column be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

**OUR UNCIVIL TREATMENT OF CIVIL SERVANTS**  
 (By Paul Harvey)

You and I would not think of treating the servants in our kitchen the way we treat our civil servants.

A businessman with money is respected.

A politician with money is suspected.

In business, reciprocity is necessary, prudent, and wise.

In politics it's called "a deal."

You make a gigantic mistake in business, you declare bankruptcy.

You make a gigantic mistake in politics, you and your family are permanently disgraced.

The businessman offers a bribe, "that's business."

A politician accepts a bribe, "that's a crime."

Defenders of this double standard insist that what politicians do is "public," what industry does is "private." Why?

Does that defense really make sense when the consuming public pays for the hanky-panky in industry as surely as the taxpaying public pays for the politician's boondoggle?

Another thing: It's smart for a "working man" to get more than he's worth for working less than he's able.

But the politician is expected to "sacrifice," to accept less than he's worth, but be always "on duty."

And who ever heard of time-and-a-half for a Congressman?

A factory hand tries to get into to see the chairman of the board and he'll get old waiting.

In politics your door is expected to be open all the time, you are expected to be available to anybody.

That's not all: In business, longtime experience is an asset, an endorsement, a virtue.

In politics too long and you're a "hack."

A businessman's careless remark would never get out of the board room.

A politician's total image is crucified by one intemperate utterance quoted out of context.

The press contributes to this double-standard; let's admit it. There are too many "it has been rumored" accusations about politicians which get printed on the front page and retracted, if at all, somewhere in the want ads.

If you are in one business and buy stock in others, you are "diversifying."

If you are a politician with outside income, you are "profiteering."

If you give a few hours to the community fund you are hailed as a selfless, public-spirited citizen.

A lawmaker sacrifices precious months out of his year to attend legislative sessions and you wonder "what's he getting out of it?"

The Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare recently published a report called "Ethical Standards in Government." It was the judgment of the committee that ethical standards among public officials are generally higher than those prevailing in so-called private business.

In a Republic we elect men to do our deciding for us.

Theoretically we elect our best men. Actually we tend to elect men our own size.

How is it that we presume to demand of these ordinary creatures such extraordinary conduct?

**ADDRESS BY SECRETARY WIRTZ AT NEW REPUBLIC 50TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET**

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, last night I attended the 50th Anniversary Banquet of the New Republic. This remarkable journal has for half a century served as a vehicle for the expression of stimulating, constructive thought on public affairs.

One of the distinguished guests who addressed the banquet was our brilliant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz. I ask unanimous consent that his superb address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

It is hardly equal time, after reading the New Republic for over 30 years, to be rationed to 5 minutes in reply.

Josh Billings was right that "brevity is the child of silence and a great credit to the old man"; but there was good sense, too, in Woodrow Wilson's unyielding protest against campaign whistle-stop speeches, that "5 min-

utes is only time to commit a compound fracture of an idea."

Gil Harrison's instructions are not to look back tonight, but ahead.

I see the future more clearly in the soft lantern light of faith than in the glaring headlight of reason.

Eternity has already shrunk, in the illumination of logic, to a matter of minutes: that little time that can run while man lives a single spark away from ultimate destruction, his knowledge of power daily outstripping his wisdom about its use, with more and more of democracy's decisionmakers knowing less and less of what they are deciding.

To care about the future only as it will see the ascendancy of human over material values is to watch with a fascination that fights against fear a generation of machines maturing as no generation of human beings ever has—so that any moment now some clanking robot will pull itself erect and announce: Cogito, ergo sum.

We take, nevertheless, the brief against that kind of reason, the brief for faith and for the future.

Children of unfathomable mystery, surrounded still by secrets that dwarf to insignificance what is so far known, we have no basis—unless the premise be taken as itself the conclusion—for asserting that only what can be proved is true.

The only dangers, except for cataclysmic accident, are that we will build our syllogisms too much on experience, too little on vision; that we will forget that "the inevitable is only what we don't resist" and the unattainable only what we don't attempt; that we will stumble and fall on the sword of our own stupidity.

It is not the stupidity of the ignorant that threatens so much as the stupidity of the successful—who seek to protect their petty conceits behind maginot lines of race or religion or geography, content with the little innovations of their own dubious piety, fighting change because the status quo has been good to them.

The divine right of the successful is as false a notion as the divine right of kings.

We look ahead tonight knowing the future is still infinite if we will stretch our minds far enough and fast enough to keep ideas abreast of ideals; if we will reassess, under technology's pressure, the revolutionary new relationship between war and peace and between work and leisure; if we will seize the sense of the future that will let us stand on a clear night and look at a heaven full of more stars than the number of all the men and women who have ever lived, and realize that those stars are now very close to our reach and are part of our children's future.

If I am because I think, I will be because I believe—even if only in the grand mystery of it all, and that it is worth the eternal quest.

That search is not wisely or even safely made alone.

Free minds need testing by free minds, by critics who are not common scolds, by wasps with the sense of humor to separate what is important from what isn't, by those who, while "starting little insurrections in the realm of conviction," still believe in more than disbelief.

So it is that we depend upon the editors of the New Republic—we who would push reason beyond reason to faith—in a fuller future.

#### MOMENT OF TRUTH FOR THE OAS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the special committee appointed by the OAS to investigate charges of Cuban aggression against Venezuela has made its report. Beyond any doubt it has been proven with detailed evidence and photographs

that a substantial cache of arms was buried for use in guerrilla fighting against the Government of Venezuela. These weapons included some U.S. military equipment shipped to Cuba in 1957. They included very substantial amounts of ammunition, guns, submachine guns and so forth, produced in Belgium in 1959, shipped to Cuba, and then brought to the Latin American continent. And they also included a small boat and outboard motor shipped from Canada to Cuba in the fall of 1963, allegedly for use by poultry experts in the Cuban Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, to date, Castro has been formally accused of aggression by six different Latin American countries. Certainly, in this case, the evidence is incontrovertible. The question now before the OAS is a critical one. Will the group take action and show that it is an effective international body capable of dealing with aggression and subversion, or will it drop the issue from lack of leadership or effective political guidance?

On two previous occasions the OAS has met to consider the Cuban danger, and failed to reach meaningful accord on total isolation of this cancer.

Mr. President, this issue is a critical one for the future of the OAS. It is most perceptively analyzed in an article by Charles Keely of the Copley News Service. Charles Keely has considerable background and experience in reporting Communist subversion in Cuba and Latin America and this article is a lucid exposition of the issue now before the OAS and in effect before every nation of this hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the Record the text of the article by Charles Keely.

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

#### OAS ARRIVES AT MOMENT OF TRUTH (By Charles Keely)

WASHINGTON.—If the Organization of American States does not impose sanctions on Cuba, the future of the organization itself will be endangered, the Costa Rican Ambassador here said.

"Venezuela has presented a clear case of Cuban aggression," said Gonzalo Facio, the Ambassador. "If the OAS does not penalize the aggressor, the inter-American system is in jeopardy of collapse."

Facio's fears concerning the future of the OAS are widespread among Latin diplomats and U.S. officials.

"It is the moment of truth," said an Uruguayan diplomat. "The Western Hemisphere is at the crossroads."

Facio was Chairman of the OAS Council in 1963. He was also a member of the five-nation investigating committee that went to Venezuela to look into charges that Castro smuggled arms, agents, ammunition and propaganda into that country last November.

The committee found Cuba guilty, and has presented its findings to the OAS, which will consider sanctions against Castro.

To date, Castro has been accused of aggression by six Latin countries—Panama, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Haiti, Honduras and Venezuela.

Under OAS laws, this aggression is in direct violation of the inter-American treaty of reciprocal assistance—the so-called Rio Treaty of 1947. The pact grew out of the

conference on war and peace held in Mexico City in 1945 to consider World War II Nazi and Fascist threats to the hemisphere.

It says, in effect, that if the OAS finds any country guilty of aggression against one of its members, a series of sanctions, up to and including the use of armed force, can be imposed upon the aggressor.

The treaty was used, for example, by Venezuela in 1960 to impose sanctions on Dictator Rafael Trujillo who was accused of trying to assassinate President Romulo Betancourt. OAS nations broke relations and applied economic sanctions on the Dominican Republic.

Whether the OAS will take similar steps against Castro is the most intriguing question in the hemisphere today. It is also one which vitally concerns the Johnson administration during this election year.

The Rio Treaty is a cornerstone of the OAS and inter-American system. To do nothing to Cuba would solidify criticism of the OAS as nothing but a debating society and render the mutual defense pact useless.

Five Latin nations still maintain diplomatic and economic ties with the Castro regime which was expelled from the OAS in 1962. Brazil, Mexico, Uruguay, Chile, and Bolivia exchange Ambassadors with Havana and have limited trade ties with Cuba.

Since Venezuela cannot vote on its own case, it will take 13 of the OAS members—or a two-thirds majority—to impose sanctions on Cuba. Nose counting is already under way in Washington and throughout the hemisphere.

Venezuela reportedly will ask the OAS, probably at a mid-April foreign ministers conference, to break all hemispheric ties with Cuba. This would mean the curtailment of only about \$16 million in trade. But it would mean that Castro would have to close his five Latin embassies, centers of Communist subversion in Latin America.

It also would mean that Cuba would have to cease commercial air flights to Mexico, her loan remaining transportation link to Latin America.

The United States is concerned that strong sanctions might further strain relations with so-called "neutralist" Latin nations which still deal with Cuba. But the heat of an election year is firing up the U.S. stand.

Presidential Assistant Thomas Mann recently told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the United States would support any Venezuelan proposal, including the diplomatic and economic sanctions.

It has been learned that additional support may come from unexpected quarters. Venezuela has sent a mission to each of the five Latin nations which still recognize Cuba, in an attempt to gain support for the sanctions.

Bolivia and Uruguay reportedly have promised President Betancourt to support his demands. If these pledges hold, only Chile, Mexico, and Brazil are expected to oppose sanctions. Chile is in the midst of a presidential campaign which the extreme left has a chance to win. Brazil's strong leftist movement is friendly to Cuba. Mexico traditionally has opposed intervention in the affairs of another country and would like the matter to be taken up by the United Nations where it would certainly die.

The issue at stake in the OAS is that after five bids by Castro to openly subvert Latin nations, Venezuela finally has dragged him to court.

If he is not found guilty and severely penalized, his next aggression could be successful, the hemisphere would have two Cubas, and the Rio Treaty would be reduced to a scrap of paper.

#### KING PAUL OF GREECE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with sincere sorrow and regret that the