

dent Kennedy has followed the same approach, with the same attitude. President Kennedy is now seeking to carry out recommendations made by the original Eisenhower Commission.

Mr. President, I hope that when the Senate votes on Tuesday, it will give a resounding vote of confidence and support to all Americans, to all of our citizens who are interested in dealing with our recreation resources, and the future well-being of our children. I hope the Senate will give a large, healthy—even overwhelming—majority vote in support of the pending bill, S. 20.

BAY OF PIGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, yesterday I adverted to certain incidents surrounding the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba in April 1961, and I expressed then, as I express now, my sympathy to the widows and children of the four Americans who were killed in that ill-fated incident.

Reference has been made in this Chamber today, to that invasion, and reference has also been made to it by the former Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon. I should like to make some supplementary remarks on this same subject.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that any American men were killed in that abortive invasion. It is a matter of great regret that four fine American young men had the misfortune to be shot down.

The facts are that all of the four were mature men. One had been a test pilot, and a former World War II pilot. He was 37 years of age. His name was Riley W. Shamburger, Jr. It is stated that he received \$2,100 per month while he was training Cubans as aviators preliminary to the invasion, presumably in Nicaragua and Guatemala.

The second man referred to in the news item was, Thomas Ray, I find, 30 years of age at the time, and had just returned from military duty. Evidently he was not employed at the time he enrolled at \$1,900 a month to train Cubans.

The third, Wade C. Gray, was unemployed at the time he was hired. He had been a radio and electronics technician. He was 33 years of age.

The fourth man, Lee F. Baker, was 35 years of age. He operated a pizza establishment, and also had worked as a pilot.

So, Mr. President, they were mature men. They were either recruited, or offered their services; one at \$2,100 a month and the others at \$1,900 a month. Their recruitment was for the purpose of training Cuban exiles. Their recruitment was not for the purpose of combat duty. Evidently in the excitement of the moment at the time of the invasion, realizing there was a need for trained pilots, they voluntarily took over the controls of two planes. Unfortunately, both of them were shot down.

Since that time there have been statements back and forth regarding these men. Let us accept the statements of the unfortunate widows, the mothers of their children, that their hus-

bands were not soldiers of fortune. But they were mature men who entered this perilous work, one might say, at high salaries. Their widows are presently receiving \$487 a month.

Mr. President, I have done some research on the subject of pensions for widows of servicemen killed in combat. If a captain in the Air Force serving in World War II were shot down, as these men serving in the invasion were, the widow of that captain, without a child, would be entitled to receive approximately \$164 a month from a grateful government until such time as she remarried.

Unfortunately, during World War II many Air Force officers with the rank of captain who had little children were shot down.

If the widow had one child, she would be receiving, from a grateful government, \$205 a month up to the time that the child reaches 18 years of age. With two children, the widow would receive \$225 from our Government. When her children reach 18—and presumably they have by this time—the payment of the pension to the widow, if she has not remarried, would revert to \$164.

I stated yesterday that some of the widows of our men in World War II, who left their comfortable homes and loved ones and made the ultimate sacrifice for their country, and who today are receiving \$164 a month, must be somewhat surprised to read in the papers that the widows of these four unfortunate pilots who were killed at the Bay of Pigs invasion in April of 1961 are receiving \$487 a month and expect to receive that amount as long as they remain unmarried.

I make these remarks only to show what our Government has done and what is being done—I do not know for sure by whom. It may be the Central Intelligence Agency or an organization of Cuban freedom fighters, many of whom are sons of men of wealth in Cuba who were dispossessed. Presumably it is not from that source. I have no knowledge on the subject, but my view is that it may be the Central Intelligence Agency that is making the payments.

That leads me to the conclusion that it would be an excellent idea for the Congress to legislate and select a joint watchdog committee to keep the CIA under observation and see that the expenditures of the organization are properly made. Sometimes, when agencies of our Government have ample funds to spend, some of the officials may not always be zealous in the interest of saving taxpayers' money. My belief is that our Central Intelligence Agency is over staffed and is spending too much of the taxpayers' money. Frankly, I could not prove that. No Member of Congress could. This is another reason why there should be a joint committee of Congress to act as watchdog, and to keep the expenditures and operations of the CIA under constant scrutiny.

Frankly, Mr. President, I have supported appropriations for the defense of our country, which includes tremendous sums for the CIA. I am fearful that having available such huge funds and

being top heavy with executives has encouraged this agency to be spendthrift on occasions. It is high time we become more vigilant and work hard to cut out unnecessary spending and lay off unneeded personnel in the CIA and other agencies.

Mr. President, I wish to add one concluding thought which comes to me because I have just taken from the Bulletin board a report of a statement by former Vice President Nixon, who said in an interview that he has changed his mind about withdrawing from public life.

That is not surprising, and he certainly has the right to change his mind about retiring from public life. It occurs to me it is quite likely that he will try to continue in public life and in the end become California's Harold Stassen. Richard Nixon and Harold Stassen have both in the past been the wonder boys of the Republican Party. I recall that Harold Stassen served as Governor of Minnesota, and then sought the presidential nomination of that Grand Old Party, of which I am not a member, but which I hold in the highest respect. He later occupied an exceedingly high position in the Eisenhower administration.

Finally, as I recall, I believe he ran for the city council in Philadelphia and was defeated.

Mr. President, Mr. Nixon, according to this news item, charged that President Kennedy blundered by failing to provide air cover for the invasion that could have toppled, he says, the Fidel Castro regime, and, he says, former President Eisenhower would never have made that mistake.

The fact is that in 1960, when General Eisenhower was President of the United States, and this California Stassen, Mr. Nixon, was Vice President of the United States, the Castro regime suddenly, and without warning, seized the property of American citizens in Cuba; seized, for instance, millions of dollars of the property of American corporations which were lawfully in Cuba.

Fidel Castro made no pretext then, and has made no pretext since, of giving any payment whatever to corporations owned by American stockholders, or to American individuals when he despoiled them of their properties.

Was there a peep out of the Vice President at that time about a quarantine against Cuba? Was there an utterance from the then President of the United States about invading Cuba? Firm action would have been justified. Vice President Nixon did not utter one yelp, one cry of protest at that time. Now he is talking big. He wants to be a War Hawk in 1963, but he was extremely silent in 1959 and 1960, when the then administration and its leaders also had a real grievance against Castro's Cuba.

I support the firm, determined, resolute, and unyielding policy toward Cuba of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. I am proud of the fact that his policy caused Khrushchev to turn tail last October and to withdraw the aggressive missiles and the aggressive planes from that little island.